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## PREFACE

THIS volume, the first of the series of Toron Studies of the Wisconsin Domesday Book, was to have been issued earlier. The delay in publication is due partly to the magnitude of the task of preparation and partly to an alteration in the original plan. This alteration consisted in combining with the Town Studies another series called General Studies, of which it seemed desirable to publish the first volume, $\boldsymbol{A}$ History of Agriculture in Wisconsin, before the first volume of the Toron Studies. The History of Agriculture serves as a general background for the Town Studies, and enables us to shorten materially the histories of individual towns, thus making for economy in printing. The History of Agriculture (Wisconsin Domesday Book, General Studies Volume I) was issued in December, 1922.

Other general studies will be published from time to time at irregular intervals. The town studies, it is hoped, may hereafter be brought out at fairly regular intervals. This first volume presents the histories of selected towns from a selected list of counties in the older portion of the state. The second volume, already well advanced in preparation, will present all towns in four lake shore counties-Kenosha and Racine, Milwaukee and Ozaukee. Two of these counties being originally open land, the other two heavily wooded, it is believed that their intensive study, in juxtaposition, will throw much light on the historical influences of these contrasted primitive land types. In later volumes, also, we shall probably adhere to the policy of treating together the towns of contiguous areas, whether arranged by counties or otherwise.

In preparing the present volume the Superintendent has received much assistance from curators and other members of the Historical Society. He has also found the press of Wisconsin sympathetic and helpful. County officials, abstractors, attorneys, and private citizens interested in their local history have responded generously to our appeals for aid. We are under obligation to the Milwaukee Title Guaranty and Abstract Company of Milwaukee for donating their services in providing the land ownership data for the town of Franklin, and to the Grant County Abstract Comnany for donating the greater part of the time of their clerks in providing similar data for the towns of Castle Rock and Muscoda. Most of the abstractors whose service we secured declined to make any profit on the work they contributed to this publication. They have charged, for data furnished, only the equivalent of what they were obliged to pay their clerks for doing the work.

In collecting and arranging data in the library, the Superintendent has had the part-time assistance of his secretary, Edna Louise Jacobson, and of Mabel Marks. Beginning in October, 1922, Marie A. Kasten has devoted half-time to this work. She has performed research connected with the towns studied and has written the studies initialed "M. A. K." In connection with several of the studies we are able to present brief supplementary papers from local authorities. Credit for these is given in the proper places. The Society is under special obligation to the Soils Division of the Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey for maps of six towns which we are able to present in this volume. The
drawings were executed by Miss Jennie Pitman. The Soil Survey issues bulletins descriptive of the townships surveyed, and these also have proved very helpful to us. Through the courtesy of the W. W. Hixson Company, of Rockford, Illinois, publishers of the Hixson Atlas, we are enabled to present plats showing owners of lands in the towns studied for the year 1915. That company generously lent the Society their original drawings, and from these our plates were made.

Great pains have been taken to insure reasonable accuracy in the multitude of details with which these studies deal. We cannot hope to have escaped all errors but trust these may not prove unduly numerous. Proper names especially are apt to be misspelled in the public records from which our data are derived, and copyists are not infallible either. Therefore, despite all efforts to correct from local sources the orthography of the names inscribed on the plats, readers may still occasionally find a name incorrectly spelled.

It should be remembered, however, that while a record of individual achievement in farm making is one feature of the Domesday Book plan, the larger value of these studies will be found in the conclusions of a general nature which can be deduced from a comparison of the results achieved by individuals and by communities. From that point of view errors of detail, though always regrettable, are not fatal, and we send out this volume with the hope that it may contribute something toward the more adequate interpretation not merely of Wisconsin history, but of American history in general.

## Joseph Schafer
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# THE WISCONSIN DOMESDAY BOOK <br> TOWN STUDIES VOLUME ONE 

## INTRODUCTION

## THE UNDERLYING IDEA

THE plan of the historical survey, of which the present publication is an earnest, was described under the caption "The Wisconsin Domesday Book," in the Wisconsin Magazine of History, iv, 61-74. Another statement of the plan was published in the Minnesota History Bulletin, iv, 3-20. The title of that paper is: "The Microscopic Method Applied to History." Supplementary matter has appeared in other places, but the two articles cited, if read in connection with this volume, will furnish the theoretical background of the work and also afford a means to measure the success attained in giving concrete form to the original project.

The underlying idea is that since history is made by the common man in coöperation with his fellows, as well as by the superior man, it is necessary for purposes of historical interpretation to know certain primary facts about as many of the people as may still be traced in sources of unquestioned validity. Being concerned especially with pioneer beginnings, and the symbol of pioneering being the new homestead, we believe it is practicable to gain, through publicly recorded data, some knowledge of a large proportion of those who, in the state of Wisconsin, helped forward civilization building by the process of farm making. The individual first settler may perhaps have done nothing more than start a clearing or build a log cabin. Even for that his name is worthy to be preserved if he can be clearly identified, because, although his personal contribution may have been almost negligible, he at least figures as an element in the movement which produced results, and to understand the movement we need to know with all attainable definiteness who composed it. By obtaining the names of first settlers, say, in the town of Eagle, Richland County, and noting their nativity as recorded in the census, we learn that that town was settled mainly by Westerners. Similar data for Whitewater, in Walworth County, show a preponderance of New York and New England settlers; while Franklin, in Milwaukee County, was occupied mainly by Irish, Germans, and Dutch. Here are general facts which are important in platting the curve of development in the communities named, and only by starting with the individual settler is it possible to arrive at such generalizations. Other advantages of the method will obtrude themselves as we proceed.

In a democracy like ours, moreover, the assembling of a record enabling any one in future to ascertain promptly who
was the original maker, or the principal maker, of a given farm will have a great value in social history. A rural state, such as $W$ isconsin has been up to recent times, finds the roots of every form of its society in the soil. Our leaders in all the various departments of modern life are still apt to be the direct products of the farms or, at most, not more than one or two removes from them. And these leaders are derived from no exclusive or limited class of the pioneer farm makers. They may be children or grandchildren of highly trained, sober, industrious, and moral New Englanders; but they may also be the progeny of emigrants from the Tennessee mountains, from Bohemia, Ireland, Wales, Germany, Scandinavia, Poland, Holland, or Finland. Their forbears may have been good farmers and stanch supporters of all worthy causes; or they may have been social derelicts and community liabilities. The frontier has always been a synonym for opportunity to many who had failed in older and more complex communities, and most of those who took the chance made good. Historically there are among our pioneers no "Toms and Harrys" who may safely be ignored because they counted so little in the estimation of their frontier neighbors. Such an one became the father of Abraham Lincoln, and we have almost daily proof of the way in which the Dispenser of talent and genius disregards social boundaries in the distribution of His gifts.

## ANALYSIS OF THE METHOD

The Domesday Book work proceeds by towns, and the starting point is the preparation of a map or chart of the town to be studied. For this map the plat executed by the original United States land surveyor is taken as the basis. The surveyor's topography is copied, and the notes describing the quality of the soil, the timber, trails, etc., taken from the surveyor's notebook, are inscribed on the margin. Data for land entries and data for the ownership of all farm land in 1860 are derived from the county abstractors, whose coöperation has greatly facilitated our work. These data are inscribed on the plat, giving us "Farms and Farmers of 1860." That year is normal for southern Wisconsin because, although many farms were established at an earlier date, it is still possible as late as that to identify a very large proportion of the actual "makers." For the newer parts of the state another date will be used, perhaps 1890.
On the plat, also, in the space assigned to the individual
farm-in case the area of the farm was eighty acres or moreis inscribed the census taker's description for the three census years 1850, 1860, and 1870-provided the ownership has remained constant during the interval from 1850 to 1870 . The five points taken from successive censuses-amount of improved land, amount of unimproved land, value of the farm, value of the livestock and machinery, and number of bushels of wheat raised - enable the reader of the plat to see the dynamics of farm making in the areas studied. The presence on the plats of numerous small farms showing no census data does not necessarily mean that these tracts were raw land. It may mean simply that the spaces on the plat were too small to receive the data. Supplementary matter will be found in the statistical charts comparing the agricultural condition of all the towns at four census periods, and in the texts of the several town studies.

The texts have been prepared in considerable part from census data, the study of the census agricultural schedules being carried down to the latest of the censuses, that of 1920. For population changes we have procured also, from the Bureau of the Census at Washington, a special count by towns from the census of 1920 . The population table accompanying each of the town studies gives the summary of population changes.

A careful investigation has been made of the history of each town treated, in order to bring out not only those features which it holds in common with others, but also and particularly those in which it is unique. The topographical charts, the soil survey maps, county and other local histories, atlases, newspapers, interviews with men and women possessing special knowledge, diaries and other manuscript records have been used in the effort to make the town studies on the points actually covered as authentic as possible. The story of settlement and the agricultural development are presented in accordance with a uniform outline to which we have adhered closely. While the treatment is concise and necessarily lacks something of the human interest inhering in that form of history which treats only those facts that lend themselves to dramatic narrative, it is believed the superior usefulness of our studies will commend them to judicious readers. For one thing, the outline of ascertained facts, as given here, can be made the basis of a much more complete and interesting history of the town in question. The time is about ripe in this state for a crop of town histories. Interest in many localities
is keen, and some towns are already planning such work. Experience in the older states proves that the typical town history is not of maximum usefulness, because it is based too exclusively upon data handed down by tradition. With the Domesday Book Studies, which furnish a skeleton of facts, as a point of departure, it ought to be possible to promote the writing of town histories which shall be thoroughly sound as to content and at the same time readable in style.

The present group of town studies possesses a significance for the history of the state as a whole, and in some respects for more general history. Different readers will draw from it different generalizations. In this introduction I take space to discuss only a few of these generalizations bearing on the process of forming new settlements, and on the influence upon agricultural development both of the physical environment and of the character and experience of the original occupants.

## LAND SETTLEMENT: SPECULATION

Considerable use has already been made of the results of these investigations for describing the history of land settlement. ${ }^{1}$ Light has thereby been thrown on the principles governing land selection, for farm purposes, by the Northeasterners who came to $W$ isconsin in such numbers between 1835 and 1850. These studies also throw light on the process by which German farmers came into possession predominatingly of the great maple forest area of eastern Wisconsin. They help to solve the problem why certain types of American settlers took forest covered land, while others took the prairies or the oak openings. ${ }^{2}$ It was shown that the Yankees, most of whom came provided with either money or credit, took open land which with some expenditure of money for building, fencing, and stocking they could bring under cultivation quickly, and from which they could make large profits by growing wheat. Poorer Americans, and poor immigrants from abroad, were unable to settle on the prairies because they lacked the means required for making farms there. The Germans hugged the lake coast in order to be near the market, and though for other reasons they preferred open land, they were willing to subdue the forest rather than risk becoming marooned in the interior. Yankees, knowing from experience in New York and elsewhere the rapidity with which canals, roads, and railways could be built, ventured inland with little hesitation, for the sake of finding in the public lands just such farm situations as they preferred. ${ }^{3}$

The influence of speculation, or the speculative holding of agricultural lands in any neighborhood, upon settlement is a question of fundamental social importance. Some facts emerge from the study of this group of towns which bear upon that question. In the first place, it seems clear that those towns in the southeastern counties-Racine, Kenosha,
${ }^{1}$ See the author's History of Agriculture in Wisconsin (Madison, 1922),
ecially chap. ii and iii. Also, "The Yankee and the Teuton in Wisconsin," in

"sonsin Magazine of History, vi, 125-145 (December, 1922).
2"Yankee and Teuton," in Wisconsin Magazine of History, vi, 142-144.
'Ibid., 144-145.
and Walworth-where the survey of the lands took place in 1835 and 1836, just at the time settlers were streaming over them for the purpose of making claims, were very slightly affected by speculators. Their lands were sold, in nearly all cases, to actual settlers. Exception should be made of mill sites, which in most instances were objects of strong, sometimes fierce, rivalry and which because they were sought out usually in advance of settlement, went to men who intended to sell them for a large price, or to develop them by erecting sawmills or gristmills.

On the other hand, wherever the survey was made some years in advance of the effectual demand for the land by agricultural immigrants, speculators tended to absorb the best


Fig. 1. Town 7, Range 9 East (Madison, Dane County)
United States Land Office plat showing speculators' entries due to location of
of it for the purpose of reselling to actual settlers. The history of the survey therefore becomes significant. In Wisconsin, surveyors began their work in 1833, soon after the treaties with the Indians had vested title in the United States. The base line taken was the northern boundary of Illinois, from which the fourth principal meridian was run due north to Wisconsin River between the present Grant County on the west, Lafayette and Iowa on the east. ${ }^{4}$ Ranges of townships were then laid off both west and east of this meridian. After the survey had covered the lead region-Grant, Iowa, and Lafayette, with western Green and Dane counties-it was continued eastward to Rock River, which was reached the
©East of the portage the ranges were terminated north at Fox River and
Green Bay.
first year. Next, from an east and west line running parallel to the base line and at the distance of sixty miles north of it, other ranges were marked off north to Fox River and Green Bay. This latter portion of the survey reached the Lake Michigan shore in 1834. That left a block of territory including eastern Rock County, together with Walworth, Kenosha, Racine, Milwaukee, Waukesha, Jefferson, and the southern halves of Ozaukee, Washington, and Dodge, to be completed later, and most of the actual work in that area was done in 1836 (see map in History of Agriculture, 29). As already stated, the surveyors who ran the lines in this district were closely followed and sometimes even preceded by intending settlers anxious to locate claims. These settlers promptly claimed all the most desirable agricultural tracts; by means of claims associations they defended themselves against adverse bids from speculators at the land office sales, and thus practically excluded the speculator class.

But that class of men had almost complete sway within the lines of the early surveys. They went to the land office at Mineral Point and entered everything that seemed to them promising. In addition to town sites and mill sites and steamer landings along Wisconsin River, they bought in a vast quantity of the best-or best located-farm lands. Areas bordering on the streams were favorites; also timbered land in a prairie district, because all prairie settlers would want small tracts of woodland and would be glad to pay good prices for them.

In their expectations of profit from holding farm lands speculators were often disappointed. For, in numerous instances the holding period was long, and when the lands came to be wanted by farmers it was difficult to sell, in competition with land office sales of Congress land, at prices which would recoup the speculators for both principal and interest, to say nothing of such taxes as they had to pay in the interim. ${ }^{5}$ On the other hand, when they were able to buy up farm lands in a desirable region only a year or two before the arrival of the army of settlers, they of course made money fast.

Certain facts about the effects of speculation may be set down as tentative inferences from the study of these towns,
${ }^{5}$ Lands belonging to the Ben C. Eastman estate were sold by the executors, after appraisement in in 11566 and 18 . 1 . These lands lay lor the most part in the
best farming region of Grant and Iowa counties. Yet, with the exception of a ares appraisement
best farming region of Grant and Iowa counties. Yet, with the exception of a
few small tracts specially well located, prices never exceeded $\$ 10.00$ per acre, few small tracts specially well located, prices never exceeded $\$ 10.00$ per acce,
and some tracts sold for as little as $\$ 2.50$ per acre. One brought just $\$ 1.25$, the and some tracts sold for as little as $\$ 2.50$ per acre. One brought just $\$ 1.25$, the
land office price. On the other hand, a tract far in the north covered with pine land office price. On the other hand, a tract far in the north, eovered with pine
timber, was sold to a lumber company at $\$ 31.25$ per acre. Cyrus Woodman sold
some of his Tlinois land, bought at the land office at $\$ 1.25$ per acre, under
 contracts which stipulated the payment of slightly over 81.50 per acre to be paid
within four years-with an advance of 25 per cent per annum. This gave the within four years-with an advance of 25 per cent per annum. This gave the
speculator a part of the unearned increment. However, a good deal of land speculator a part of the unearned increment. However, a good deal of land
entered by Woodman in Wisconsin and intended to be held till it should be worth $\$ 10.00$ per acre, was sold as late as 1861 for very much less than the anticipated price, and some tracts were abandoned in preference to paying taxes on them.
In March 1837 , Daniel Webster entered three tracts in Dane and Rock In March, 1837, Daniel Webster entered three tracts in Dane and Rock
counties, total area 952 acres. These he sold in November, 1842, five and one counties, total area 952 acres. These he sold in November, 1842 , , five and one
half years later, for the sum of $\$ 1,572$, or at the rate of $\$ 1.65$ per acre Considering prevailing rates of interest, the transaction undoubtedly netted him a considerable loss. State lands, especially the 500,000 acres and the other school lands, were much better speculations than government lands,
because only a portion or (in the case of the 500,000 acres) none of the because only a portion or (in the case of the 500,000 acres) none of the
principal had to be paid when the purchase was made, and the state charged prinipal had to be paid when the purchase was made, and the state charged
the lowest rate of interest-7 per cent. Government lands which were pine
bearing were apparently bearing were apparently much better speculations than farming lands.
though we shall have to await a larger number of comparative studies before we can speak decisively upon them. In our list the towns which showed speculation on a considerable scale were Pleasant Springs, Dane County; Plymouth, Rock County; and Brookfield. Waukesha County. The last named case was peculiar in inat the price of two-thirds of the lands was enhanced from the fact of their lying within the grant made to the Milwaukee and Rock River Canal. The two former towns had been picked over by speculators, and much of their best lands absorbed before settlers began to arrive. In all three towns settlement was delayed some years beyond what would apparently have been the normal time, for no other assignable reason than that the lands were not for sale at the customary Congress price of $\$ 1.25$ per acre. Brookfield, where the south one-third of the township was outside of the canal zone and the balance in, seems to prove the point that settlers were unwilling to pay more than $\$ 1.25$ for raw land even though it had special advantages of location. They bought the $\$ 1.25$ land at once because the town was near the port of Milwaukee, but they left the other lands for future purchasers. Most of them sold as much as eight years later than similar lands in the southern part of the town. Only when land prices in the vicinity of Milwaukee advanced markedly did the northern part of the town pass into private hands.

In the town of Plymouth one speculator, James T. Watson, bought in 1836 the northwestern one-sixth of the township (sections $4,5,6,7,8$, and 9 ) ; also, in the same year, the adjoining section 17 and parts of 18,19 , and 20 . He owned a total of eight and one-fourth sections in the town. A goodly proportion of the Watson holdings passed into the hands of Elizabeth O. Dawson, whether through a partnership arrangement or otherwise, and much of the Dawson lands was still out of cultivation in 1860, as the plat shows. The same was true of the school lands (section 16), which had been bought by Edward D. Holton. Most of them were occupied by cultivators in 1873 (see plat), but some, which were swampy, were not. Such of the Watson lands as were of best quality sold largely in the years 1855 and 1856, though some went earlier-in 1845, ' 46 , ' 47 , etc. There is no proof that the speculative lands in the town sold on the average later than the Congress lands, but it is clear that all of the lands went into the hands of cultivators late. Was this due to the fact that so much land in the town was speculator land? A similar statement can be made for Pleasant Springs. Most of the land there which bordered the streams, or had good timber, or was choice farm land, had been purchased by speculators in 1836 and 1837. Settlers, however, did not arrive in large numbers till the late 1840 's and the 1850 's. And it is worthy of remark that the great bulk of the settlers, who entered the left-over lands and bought, usually in small tracts, the speculator lands, were Norwegians.

It will be interesting to watch the results of the Domesday survey on this point: Were American settlers more averse
than Europeans to pay the enhanced price for land which its speculative ownership implied, and did these Americans therefore, when it was possible to do so, avoid the necessity of purchasing speculator lands by going farther afield to procure Congress land? It looks as if this inference might prove tenable. There are even some facts which suggest that the American antagonism to farm land speculators amounted


Fig. 2. Town 6, Range 12 East (Christlana, Dane County)
United States Land Office plat showing early entries for speculation, later entries for farming purposes
to an obsession which caused such settlers on occasion to go farther, to their own hurt, rather than buy of monopolistic holders. But this cannot be asserted as a proved generalization. More cases will have to be studied in order to settle the point. The assembling of land entry and ownership records for entire counties, in which work we are now engaged as a preparation for the next volume of the Town Studies, will be an important means of determining this question. ${ }^{6}$

## TYPES OF LAND

Our survey, as might be expected, reveals decisively the preferences of settlers among the different types of land, especially as respects its timbered or open character, its drainage, its degree of smoothness, and its fertility. The results

- We have the entry records for twelve townships in Dane County. Six of these show a large proportion of speculator land, taken early; and of the six, two
were practically absorbed by speculators, so they need not be considered. Of were practically absorbed by speculators, so they need not be considered. Of
the other four, two were almost wholly settled by Norwegians, who took up the remaining government lands and bought the speculator lands, and two others received a large proportion of Norwegians along with a good many Americans. Five of the other six, which were left open by speculators, were taken up, in the
forties, prevailingly by settlers having American names. The sixth had more forties, prevailingly by settlers having American names. The sixth had more
Norwegian entrymen than American, and Norwegians were also interspersed among the American entrymen in the other five townships.
are obtained by comparing entry dates, and noting the relative time of entry of tracts otherwise similar which differ in those essentials. Our entry record for the town of Mount Pleasant, Racine County (see History of Agriculture, 34) shows that the earliest to be entered in that town were the small tracts of timbered lands, the well drained, tillable prairie lands near the timbered areas, and low prairie or meadow lands in the same neighborhoods. The exposed or open prairie, removed by some miles from timber, and the swamp lands were left until later. The ideal farm was composed of timber-a few acres,-dry prairie for plow land, and low prairie for hay and pasture.

American settlers, having traditions about selecting farms in new regions, were generally shrewd judges of land. The plat of entries in Whitewater, for example, shows with what determination the Yankee pioneers shunned the swales, the thin land, and the rough land of that town. And this case is typical. Tracts which remained long in the hands of the government are almost invariably poor land, as the topographical survey or the soil survey proves. In case of speculator land this may not be true. Foreigners were less expert in land selection. At all events, we find them in many cases willing to take the areas which Americans passed by. There were probably other reasons for this than want of practice in judging the qualities of wild land. One was a disposition to emphasize the advantages of a convenient market, nearness to an established settlement and to churches or schools. The Norwegians who bought the remaining lands in Whitewater town during the later 1840's settled, as it were, in the midst of a prosperous farming community which supplied employment to those who needed it temporarily, where seed grains, work animals, and other necessaries of the beginning farmer could be procured with ease. Also, a flouring mill, sawmill, blacksmith shop, stores, and other conveniences were at hand, as well as schools and churches. These conferred solid benefits compensating to a considerable extent, at least in the early, trying years of pioneering, for the shortcomings of the land itself. Yet, as our study of Whitewater shows, in the long run those who settled on the poor lands were handicapped in their farming operations and remain to this day, on the average, less prosperous than their neighbors who secured the better lands. The same remark can be made, with still greater emphasis, in regard to those who occupied the rough hill lands in the Driftless Area towns-Prairie du Chien, Castle Rock and Muscoda, Highland and Pulaski, Eagle and Orion, also Sparta and Bangor. Settlers in the alluvial valleys or on the broad, smooth, prairie-like uplands maintained some economic advantage over those whose farms were made up of steep slopes and narrow ridges.

Another reason for the failure of foreigners to choose lands wisely was that selections were sometimes made by one or two persons for an entire company. Among Americans, save in the infrequent cases of the land companies, land selection was an individual matter. Every newcomer to a town-
ship passed a fresh, original judgment on its farm land, and perhaps compared it favorably or unfavorably with what he had examined elsewhere. Under these circumstances, it was not possible to find an entire township of inferior land occupied by men who took it ignorantly. A few tracts might be thus entered, but soon the flow of immigration would pass it by, some other township receiving the preference. Whole settlements of foreigners, however, might be planted in poor townships.

Whatever may be the present-day condition, historically there is a striking contrast in prosperity between the town of Norway (Racine County), which was settled, under leadership, by a company of newly arrived Norwegian immigrants, and Pleasant Springs (Dane County), settled by individual Norwegian immigrants. The former, like the latter, developed farms of moderate size. But the Pleasant Springs land was almost all good, while much of the Norway land was of indifferent quality and ill adapted to the kind of farming which was in harmony with the practice of these people. By raising first wheat, then corn and hogs, and finally tobacco with dairying, the Dane County settlement became wealthy. The Racine County settlement, on the other hand, up to 1905 had not gained distinction in any of these lines of production, and the fault could not have been in the people, for they were in all essentials the same as their more fortunate fellow countrymen in Dane. The trouble lay in the unresponsiveness of the soil in Norway town. By persistence in dairying, however, the difference was partly made up at the time of the last census, though Norway farmers are still considerably below Pleasant Springs farmers in income.

Next to surface and soil fertility the sharpest contrast between areas of wild land lay in the character of its native growth, especially the timber. Heavily timbered lands were usually selected for other reasons than the timber itself. This point has been fully developed elsewhere. ${ }^{7}$ Some settlers, however, believed in the superior, more permanent fertility of land which produced a heavy crop of timber, and were willing to undergo the labor of clearing by way of insuring the productiveness of their farms when made.

## PROGRESS OF FARM MAKING

The first condition which made it worth while for settlers to buy land and open farms in a new region was an opportunity to market such products as the land would grow. These studies prove the reluctance of men to buy wild lands-save for speculative purposes-prior to the time when the means existed for reaching a market. They were forced to buy somewhat in advance, otherwise Congress land would be taken by the speculators. But before buying they wanted to be assured that a canal would be opened, a railroad built, or steamboats put on the rivers or lakes almost as soon as they should have products to ship. Sometimes they were disappointed in per-

[^0]fectly reasonable expectations, like the settlers in Richland County who thought the railway would serve their side of the river primarily. But, on the whole, southern Wisconsin has had few communities whose development was retarded by the compulsion of living long in a state of isolation.

Given transportation, the other conditions of progress in farm making lie partly in the land itself and partly in the people who settle upon it. Prairie lands, or openings, were readily transmutable into cultivated farms. If the settlers were ambitious, if they had health, if they possessed the requisite means, such land in two or three years became waving fields of wheat or corn. Timbered land of the stubborn type grudgingly yielded perhaps five acres per year to the plow. The startling contrast in rate of improvement between Eagle and Bangor, two Driftless Area towns of similar conformation but differing timber growth, is no mystery to those who understand the meaning of heavy clearing. But it is also true that certain types of settlers were perfectly willing to dwell in isolation and live on the produce of a few acres poorly tilled, while waiting for something to happen which might relieve them of the labor of clearing the rest. American backwoodsmen were usually capable hands with the ax, when they chose to use it. But many of that class preferred to hunt, trap, raise a few woods hogs and a few cattle, hoping to "pull through somehow," rather than to clear land. Such settlers often lived for years, not from necessity but from choice, on farms with very small clearings. Perhaps it will be plain, from the town studies, what communities were thus retarded in their prosperity.

## AREA OF FARMS

The chart of comparative statistics from the tenth census (1880) shows, at that date, that out of the twenty-three towns compared only six had less than 100 acres of land to the average farm. They were Brookfield, Eagle, Franklin, Mount Pleasant, Newton, and Sevastopol, all save one heavily forested towns when settled. Franklin and Brookfield were so near the city of Milwaukee, that land values may be regarded as a coöperating influence in keeping areas small. Mount Pleasant, Newton, and Sevastopol were lake shore towns also, while Eagle was on the frontier. As to settlement, Brookfield received a goodly proportion of Yankees, together with some Germans and Irish. But most of the land was bought for more than the Congress price of $\$ 1.25$ per acre, which probably acted as a restraint upon purchases. Franklin lands were bought largely at second-hand by foreign immigrants, prevailingly Germans and Dutch. The lands of Newton were entered mostly by the Germans who made farms there, while Sevastopol lands, taken at first for lumbering, shingle making, and fishing purposes, were usually rather high-priced considering cost of clearing when sold for agricultural uses. Eagle was settled prevailingly by Americans from the West and Southwest who were content to enter comparatively small tracts.

Mount Pleasant is a case apart. Its lands, opened early by Yankees, absorbed more and more into the city of Racine, and receiving numbers of foreign settlers, became highpriced and tended to be parceled out into small lots. In the other five towns the process of bringing the lands under improvement was slow and gradual. The average of improved land per farm in 1850 was, in Brookfield 35 acres, Franklin 41 acres; in 1860 Brookfield 44 acres, Franklin 52 acres, Newton 22 acres, Eagle 27 acres, and Sevastopol 12 acres. In 1870 these towns had, respectively, 42, 63, 29, 39, and 24 acres, and in $1880,73,61,47,50$, and 34 acres. The towns near Milwaukee, where land was most valuable, improved faster than the others.

The three towns at the other end of the scale, in respect to size of farms (see Appendix, Table IV), were Muscoda, 190 acres; Bangor, 182; New Glarus, 170. All of the above are in the Driftless Area, all contain much rough land which was not regarded as improvable, being useful only as woodland and pasture, and all were lightly or only moderately timbered. If we take the improved land rather than total acreage as the true representation of the farms, these towns rank much lower in average farm areas. In 1880 Muscoda had 93 improved acres, Bangor 92, New Glarus 88.

## VALUATIONS AND PRODUCTIONS

The five towns having the highest average farm valuations in 1880 were Empire ( $\$ 5631$ ), Mount Pleasant (\$5310), Franklin, (\$5111), Brookfield (\$4933), and Whitewater (\$4878). Of these Mount Pleasant, Empire, and Whitewater were originally open or lightly wooded areas, all of them settled mainly by New Yorkers and their allies from New England, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. Franklin was a German town, and Brookfield largely American with a German amalgam. The last two were heavily wooded, on the whole, though with some openings. Nearness to the port helps to explain the high value of their lands, as also the high value of Mount Pleasant lands. Franklin's lands were valued at $\$ 62$ per acre, Mount Pleasant's at $\$ 60$, Brookfield's at $\$ 59$, as against $\$ 50$ in Empire and $\$ 36$ in Whitewater.

The towns having highest farm valuations were not in all cases the ones showing the highest aggregate production. The five highest on the list in 1880 from the production standpoint were Pleasant Springs (\$1301), Empire (\$983), Bangor (\$959), Whitewater (\$799), and Franklin (\$785). This list, as will be seen, included three out of the preceding list, and two others. But the two interlopers were both exceptional towns in other ways. Pleasant Springs, a Scandinavian town, with rich open glacial lands with farms of moderate size (averaging 125 acres) on which corn throve exceptionally and tobacco ranked as a specialty, was extraordinarily prosperous. The farms were valued at $\$ 4177$, or $\$ 33$ per acre, which was only just below the Whitewater figures. Bangor's average farm was worth less, and the acre valuation
was only $\$ 18.50$. But the farms were large ( 182 acres), and the cultivated land ( 92 acres) highly productive. So that, if these choice acres only were considered, the price per acre would be much enhanced. The poor hill lands in the farms served as stock range. Wheat was the main source of her farmers' incomes. Corn and pork, with other livestock and tobacco, were the leading sources in Pleasant Springs; milk products, wool, hay, and livestock in Whitewater; wheat, wool, and livestock in Empire; and diversified crops in Franklin.

It may be helpful to contrast the five towns having highest production records with the five having the lowest. The latter list includes Prairie du Chien (\$334), Newton (\$342), Sevastopol (\$380), Eagle (\$400), and Primrose (\$441) Here we have three Driftless Area towns, one of them heavily wooded by nature, the others not, and two heavily wooded lake shore towns. In the case of Prairie du Chien a chief cause of low productivity clearly was the quality of the soil. This was not true in the other cases, where the soil was good. Factors working against these towns were the slow rate at which the forest could be removed and (in the two lake towns) the problem of finding crops adapted to the soil and to the cool climate.

## CHANGING STANDARDS: THE 1905 CENSUS

The agricultural revolution of which the symbol was cooperative dairying had not greatly influenced southern Wisconsin by the year 1879, which year is represented in the tenth census statistics. It is desirable to present for the towns studied a statement of average farm incomes for one of the more recent censuses, and compare it with that of 1880 . Such a comparison will disclose the trend of development and throw light upon the operation of the historical influences we have observed hitherto.

The printed census of 1905, the last of the state censuses, provides a satisfactory basis for determining the value of all productions save the most important, the productions of the dairies-which, however, can be approximated. Dairying was carried on largely by the factory method, but also partly in the farm homes. Some milk might be sold from the farms to supply towns and cities, some might be sent to a cheese factory, some might be skimmed and the cream sent to a creamery. The census taker secured from the farmers an estimate of the amount and value of the milk and milk products sold or consumed on the farm, aside from milk sold to cheese factories, creameries, and condensaries. Then he secured from the cheese factories and creameries located within the several towns the record of their purchases of milk, manufacture and sale of butter or of cheese. A special table presents the cheese factory record by towns and counties, and a distinct table the creamery record. The then existing condensaries, two in number, do not seem to have affected the towns studied.

The problem is, from the farm production record, the cheese factory record, and the creamery record, to assemble the data for determining in the case of each town the average production per cow. Having such a basis, it is a simple matter to compute the value of the dairy products on the average farm. The factories reported merely the number of cows contributing, not their distribution as between the town in which the particular factory was located and other towns. Various cases presented themselves. The simplest was that of New Glarus, the Swiss town in Green County, whose people devoted themselves to the production of cheese in factories which ran the year round and received nearly all the milk produced in the town. In that town were twenty-one cheese factories having 116 patrons and 3051 contributing cows. The product, $13,577,661$ pounds of milk, was manufactured into $1,395,712$ pounds of cheese which was sold for $\$ 131,232$. The farms of the town itself, according to the livestock schedule, had on them 2682 cows valued at $\$ 89,805$, and the only home production from them which was listed was 4025 pounds of butter valued at $\$ 657$. That is, practically the entire product of the 2682 cows is accounted for in the records of the twenty-one cheese factories reporting from the town. Since their total product sold for $\$ 131,232$ and the number of contributing cows was 3051 , the average production of the cows in New Glarus must have been $\$ 43$. Since the number of cows per farm, on the average, was 25 , the dairy product per farm would be $\$ 1075$.

In some cheese making towns the factories closed down a portion of each winter, and during that time the farmers made butter at home or sent cream to creameries. In such cases the average may often be found by dividing the cheese factory product by the number of contributing cows to attain the unit production there, and adding to the quotient the average, whether two, three, or five dollars per cow, of the home production or the creamery production. Instances occur of the more even division between cheese factory production records and farm production records. In such cases it is necessary to add to the value of the farm production the value -as nearly as it can be computed-of that part of the factory product which should be assigned to the cows of the given town. Dividing then by the number of cows in the town, the quotient is the unit production per cow. Since factories receive contributions from outside of the town in which they are located, a study of their locations is sometimes necessary to enable us to determine approximately what proportion of the contributing cows belongs to the town under investigation.

Another case is where the table of home productions for a given town proves that most of the milk or the cream must have gone to factories, but where no such factories are listed for that town. I see no way of arriving at the unit of production under these circumstances save by taking as a basis the unit production at the nearest factory. This was done in the cases of Prairie du Chien and Norway. The latter, how-
ever, was weighted on the theory that the cows of Norway, judging from their average value and from the dairying history of the town, were probably somewhat poorer than those of Raymond, where the factory was located.

By employing the production units established as above, and disregarding such slight errors as these are bound to contain, we compute the dairy production of the average farm in each town. A comparison of the results shows that New Glarus stands at the head of the list with $\$ 1075$, made from 25 cows, while Prairie du Chien stands at the foot of the list with $\$ 90$, made from 4.4 cows. Three towns-Sugar Creek, Whitewater, and Primrose (in that order)-follow New Glarus, but no one of them quite attains to the $\$ 800$ mark. After these we have three towns-Norway, Bangor, and Brookfield-with production records of $\$ 400$ or above, and seven-Empire, Franklin, Highland, Mount Pleasant, Muscoda, Orion, and Pleasant Springs-that produced each more than $\$ 300$ per farm. All the rest stand above $\$ 200$ except Sevastopol, which made $\$ 175$.

The primacy of New Glarus in dairying was due to several causes. In the first place, that town is in the blue-grass section of Wisconsin, which is famed for its excellent summer pastures. It was settled by poor but earnest and industrious Swiss Germans, whose housewives early began making "Swiss cheese" over the kitchen fire and gradually developed a widening market for it. When about 1870 the failure of the wheat crop came to be acknowledged, the Swiss farmers knew how to save themselves. They increased their herds, made more cheese, and always managed to sell it. Then came the factories for the coöperative manufacture of Swiss cheese, the model for which was furnished by the Yankee farmers who copied the New York system. Makers for the Swiss cheese factories, however, came from Switzerland, not from Herkimer County, as did so many of the makers in factories producing American cheese. Strict devotion to the business, the improvement and enlargement of their herds, and a friendly rivalry among the farmers, coupled with willing coöperation both in manufacturing and in marketing, made the increase of production a steady, almost uniform movement.

The large number of factories (21) and the comparatively small number of patrons (116) suggest that the factories were small and thickly distributed over the town. In fact, the average number of patrons to a factory was only 5.5 , so that the individual farmer had his factory conveniently at hand. The Swiss makers appear to have attained marked success in securing uniformity in the product, for which the market was nearly always ample.

Attention should be drawn to the fact that New Glarus lies within the Driftless Area and has an appreciable quantity of rough land. In 1880 the improved acreage on that account was only a little more than the unimproved. In 1905 the improved acreage amounted to 15,957 , the unimproved to 6342. By contrast, the town of Pleasant Springs, Dane

County-only a few miles to the northeast in the glaciated district-had 21,147 acres improved to 8 acres unimproved; and Mount Pleasant (Racine County) 22,643 acres improved to 3225 unimproved. We may be reasonably certain that the unimproved land in New Glarus in 1905 was too rough to be improvable. Despite that apparent handicap, however, the income per farm, not only from dairy products but from all products, exceeded that of any other town. To be sure, the number of farms was small and their size such as to compensate the farm owner for any rough lands within his boundary lines. In other words, on the good-sized and large farms of the Driftless Area, where land was comparatively cheap, the farmers who pursued the dairying industry with intelligence and determination, as did the Swiss settlers of New Glarus, could hope to make a better living and build up stronger bank accounts than could those who farmed under the conditions prevailing elsewhere.

Primrose, adjoining New Glarus, shared in its prosperity and from the same causes, though the average number of cows per farm was less and the total dairy product somewhat less. The only competitors of these two Driftless Area towns among those in the drift were Sugar Creek and Whitewater, Walworth County. In the former the dairy product, from 14.1 cows, amounted to the extraordinary total of $\$ 798$; in the latter, from 15 cows the sum of $\$ 790$ was realized. This resulted from the unit production per cow being higher in those towns than anywhere else- $\$ 57$ and $\$ 53$ respectively. It indicates probably the presence of many herds of purebreds and high grades of the milking breeds in those towns where once the shorthorn flourished, and where in consequence the tradition of good breeding was strong among the Yankee farmers. Walworth County is still one of the regions whence less developed dairying communities supply themselves with good breeding stock.

Walworth County having from the earliest times shown marked progressiveness in its agriculture, the two towns here studied always stood high among the towns compared. In 1879 Whitewater was fourth in productions, as she was in 1904, while Sugar Creek had a comparable status. Already at that time dairying was a leading industry there. Earlier, successful wool growing, together with cattle raising and a simpler dairying, kept these towns well up toward the head of the list. So we have here examples of how an intelligent farming population adapted their business successfully to the shifting conditions incident to land appreciation and market changes, moving forward without the slightest loss of status even though they made no important relative gains.

Mount Pleasant represents a town whose production was on the decline. Fifty-five years earlier (1849) her average of wheat production was higher than in any other town compared except Sugar Creek. In 1859 and in 1869 her record, if we aggregate the several market productions, was high though not leading. In 1879 the town stood number eight in average value of productions, from which point the decline
to $\$ 612$ per farm in 1904 marks a distinct change in relative prosperity. If the figure is correct it leaves Mount Pleasant nineteenth in the list of twenty-three towns, only four having a lower average production.

But there is a doubt respecting the correctness of the total, which arises from the failure of the state census to include in its schedule of farm animals a table of horses sold and their value. Mount Pleasant, as our study of that town reveals, became during the two decades following the Civil War a noted breeding ground of fine horses. For a time the interest was centered largely in stock of the "blood horse" or thoroughbred (racing and trotting) variety; later the breeding of purebred draft horses was added or in part substituted. ${ }^{8}$ The devotion to the horse industry was not confined to a few breeders but influenced the farmers generally, as auction notices published in Racine papers show. It would be natural to assume that, so long as the market warranted, one would find in Mount Pleasant a surplus of horses raised for the market and not for the farm. The census of 1905 credits the town with 1256 horses, valued at $\$ 95,975$. The number is absolutely larger than that for any other town in Racine County; in fact, with the exception of two towns in Milwaukee County, two in Trempealeau County, and one in Iowa, it is the largest number assigned to any rural town in the state. The farms of Mount Pleasant in 1905 averaged in size 76.6 acres, of which about 67 acres was improved land. It would be fair to allow one full team to the farm, and perhaps every other farm would support a driving horse in addition. On that basis the farms would require 842 animals, leaving 414 for the market. This would probably represent nearly the annual surplus, which for convenience we will call 400. At the average value of $\$ 76.33^{9}$ that surplus would yield an aggregate value of $\$ 30,532$, or $\$ 90.65$ per farm.

I feel warranted in adding that amount to the Mount Pleasant total, making it stand at $\$ 703$ instead of $\$ 612.10$. But it now becomes necessary also to adjust the other totals, some of which are altered by taking horses into the account. This is true particularly of Franklin, Newton, and Brookfield. In the former were 987 head, worth $\$ 88,245$. Since the number of farms was only 278 and their size averaged slightly under 80 acres, of which over 23 acres was unimproved land, it is obvious that the allowance of 2.5 animals to the farm would be quite as adequate as in Mount Pleasant. On that basis Franklin would require 695 horses and could sell approximately 300 head. The horses in Franklin were given a higher valuation than those in Mount Pleasant, the average being $\$ 89.50$. At that rate 300 would be worth $\$ 26,850$, or $\$ 96.60$ per farm. In Newton were 914 horses valued at $\$ 69,675$, or $\$ 76.20$ per head. The farms, numbering 304, averaged about 69.5 acres, with only 57 acres improved. Probably an allowance of two horses per farm, with the addition of 50 "drivers" attached to the larger farms, would
${ }^{:}$See also History of Agriculture, 118-121.

- Quotient of \$95,975 divided by 1256 .
suffice for home needs, leaving 256 for sale. The total income from that source would be $\$ 19,507$, giving an increment of $\$ 64$ per farm. The only other town on our list which is affected by similar consideration is Brookfield, where the number of horses was 880 , the farms 271 , and their average area of improved land just over 53 acres. To work the 271 farms and supply driving horses to such farmers as would probably care to support them, 600 animals would doubtless be sufficient, leaving 280 for sale. At the average valuation of $\$ 50$ this item would add $\$ 14,000$ to the town's income, or an average of nearly $\$ 52$ per farm.

Rectifying our totals, we assign to Mount Pleasant \$703, to Franklin \$892, to Newton $\$ 745$, and to Brookfield $\$ 805$. This still leaves Mount Pleasant relatively low-in fact, at the bottom of the list of four lake shore towns treated in this volume. This in spite of the fact that its farms were on the average larger in improved acreage than those of two of the other three towns, and its location with reference to a lake port has advantages over all the others. What may be the reason for the discrepancy it is hard to say. But it is a subject which challenges the attention of any one who noted the proud leadership of this town during the early decades of Wisconsin's agricultural history. Mount Pleasant, among the four lake towns studied, is the only one which was originally prairie, the others having been for the most part heavily forested. May that fact have a bearing on the question? For we have seen that the prairies were quickly transformed into wheat fields and that wheat growing was pursued till the soil refused to respond. In the other towns, meantime, settlers were busy clearing and breaking, taking a generation to make their fields, which were never exhausted by constant cropping to wheat, but grew a variety of crops, and being of restricted area received better tillage and more ample fertilization. Or, again, it is not improbable that the families who made farms in the forested towns were more permanent than those who farmed the prairies; this would tend to eliminate losses due to renters and short-period, discouraged owners. A third hypothesis is that the Mount Pleasant owners, on the whole, were not equal to those of the others as farmers, and in consequence suffer by comparison. But we know that in the early period they were distinctly progressive. A close study of population changes would have to be made in order to determine whether and how far this assumption is valid. Here are some of the problems upon which succeeding volumes of these studies should throw much light.

## KINDS OF LIVESTOCK

The four lake shore towns which, as we have just seen, raised horses for the market are the four towns which in our 1905 schedule show a surplus of hay. They raised so much hay that, even with extra horses to feed, much of it remained to be sold. Thus, as is to be expected, there is a correlation between hay and horses. These towns were not so successful
in growing corn, the cool weather at the lake border being a disadvantage. But in the interior, wherever soil conditions were right, corn flourished. One of the outstanding corn towns was Eagle, in Richland County, also heavily forested in the beginning. The soil there produced exceedingly heavy crops of corn. In 1879 Eagle was third highest among the twenty-three towns in bushels of corn per farm, her successful rivals being Sugar Creek and Plymouth-two interior prairie towns having abundance of flat lowlands,-while Highland, Lodi, and Pleasant Springs were near rivals. Eagle produced from 16 acres 697 bushels, or 43 bushels per acre; Plymouth, from 21 acres 813 , or 39 bushels per acre; and Sugar Creek, from less than 16 acres 1065 bushels, or about 70 bushels per acre. The others averaged 39,35 , and 40 bushels per acre. These six towns were at that time noted pork growing centers, Eagle having 17.2 swine to the farm, Plymouth 25.5, and Sugar Creek 19.8. Plymouth among all the towns had the highest number, and Pleasant Springs and Highland, each with 21, the second highest. Lodi tied with Sugar Creek.

We saw that Eagle, in 1879, had a low record of total productions per farm-only $\$ 400$. Its clearing operations were still in progress, and the amount of improved land in the average farm ( 95 acres) was only 50 acres. The quartercentury which had intervened gave that town a different status in the census of 1905, and as the production chart shows, nearly one-half of its livestock income came from other sources than cows or cattle, which means swine. Its farm average total, $\$ 887.30$, compares favorably with the lake shore towns, and in fact ranks Eagle number eight in the whole list. Highland and Plymouth had both declined in pork production, but Lodi, Pleasant Springs, and Sugar Creek all continued to produce generously. However, New Glarus stood next to Eagle in the value of swine sold. New Glarus produced 58,000 bushels of corn, Eagle 145,000, and Lodi 51,000 bushels. Sugar Creek had 189,000 bushels, much of which, doubtless, was fed to cows and other stock as well as to hogs.

The presence in any town of cattle other than cows is reflected in the 1905 table (Appendix, Table V). The census lists "cattle and calves sold." Hence, the averages in column six do not necessarily tell us how many mature cattle were kept on the farms in addition to the milch cows. Something, however, can be inferred from the figures in column seven, showing money received for the animals sold, and from column four, average production per cow. For Bangor, the number of such animals was 6.3 , the returns $\$ 127.50$ or at the rate of $\$ 20.25$ a head. For New Glarus, on the other hand, the first number was 18.4, the second $\$ 158.50$ or $\$ 8.61$ per head. No doubt this means that Bangor still raised steers and sold them at two or three years old, together with culled cows and some calves, while New Glarus sold calves either for the shambles or for breeding, and perhaps an occasional cow. Bangor's production record per cow was not such as to indicate that its
calves were marketable at high prices for the purpose of improving other herds. This remark applies equally to Castle Rock, Eagle, Highland, Lodi, Muscoda, Orion, Plymouth, Prairie du Chien, Pulaski, Sevastopol, and Sparta. In Whitewater and Sugar Creek, New Glarus and Primrose, Mount Pleasant, Franklin, and Brookfield the production average per cow was so high as to indicate the presence in each town of many high-grade or purebred cows, whose progeny would be sought at high prices. Applying these two tests-average price received for animals sold and production average per cow-we may conclude that Castle Rock, Eagle, Empire, Highland, Lodi, Muscoda, Norway, Orion, Pleasant Springs, Plymouth, Prairie du Chien, Pulaski, Sevastopol, and Sparta were still raising some stock cattle, relic of the older farming, while striving to build up their dairying interests. The case of Lodi, which had the largest amount of income from cattle sale, and the highest average value per head, probably reflects an interest in high-class beef cattle and in fattening steers for the market. The dairy production unit in that town was respectable, suggesting either that, with good shorthorn stock as the medium the farmers of Lodi combined dairying and beef raising, or that a group of farmers were buying and fattening cattle instead of dairying.

Sheep it is unnecessary to discuss, for the number of these animals was negligible. Only Empire had as many as 10 to the farm. Whitewater, erstwhile a mecca of sheep breeders, had 70 all told and Brookfield had a total of 22. The rough lands of the limestone escarpment in western Empire evidently united with the wool growing tradition to keep the industry alive there.

## REVELATIONS OF THE LAST CENSUS

We have obtained, through the coöperation of Honorable William M. Stewart, director of the United States Census, the statistics formulated in tables VI and VII of the appendix. The first of these presents the detailed figures from which are derived the average crop incomes of farms in these twentythree towns, the other the average farm livestock and crop incomes, with detailed statistics similar to those included in table V for 1905. These tables bring our comparative agricultural history of the selected towns down practically to date.

In some respects the showing is more remarkable than that based on the last state census, 1905. In the first place, it proves the superiority of dairying over other types of farming as a means of securing agricultural prosperity. The spectacle of New Glarus with 129 farms, 22 more than in 1905, deriving an average income of $\$ 5338$ per farm, of which $\$ 3901$ was from the dairy at the unit rate of $\$ 158.93$ per cow, is little less than thrilling. We observe, too, that the balance of New Glarus's income (except $\$ 9$ per farm) was produced from the sale of other livestock, cattle and hogs, both incidental to dairying. The cattle sold were probably to a considerable extent purebred young stock; otherwise the aggregate,
$\$ 728$, would hardly have been obtained from the 14 animals sold. That town had the highest unit production per cow, and in unit value of cattle sold stood next to Mount Pleasant and tied with Franklin. The average farm income was $\$ 1414$ higher than that of the nearest rival, Primrose, which town also stood second to New Glarus in livestock production fifteen years earlier, but was outstripped by Sugar Creek in aggregate income.

According to the 1905 census the twelve high towns, in order of incomes, were New Glarus, Sugar Creek, Primrose, Whitewater, Pleasant Springs, Bangor, Plymouth, Eagle, Lodi, Norway, Empire, and Franklin. According to the last federal census the corresponding list was New Glarus, Primrose, Empire, Sugar Creek, Pleasant Springs, Whitewater, Bangor, Orion, Plymouth, Eagle, Brookfield, and Franklin. It will be seen that Norway and Lodi, found in the earlier list, fail to appear in the later, while Orion and Brookfield are found in the later.

The order in income of the twelve highest towns and their relations in the two censuses are shown as follows:

| 1905 | 1920 |
| :--- | :--- |
| New Glarus | New Glarus |
| Sugar Creek | Primrose |
| Primrose | Empire |
| Whitewater | Sugar Creek |
| Pleasant Springs | Pleasant Springs |
| Bangor | Whitewater |
| Plymouth | Bangor |
| Eagle | Orion |
| Lodi | Plymouth |
| Norway | Eagle |
| Empire | Brokield |
| Franklin | Franklin |
|  |  |

This comparison shows that New Glarus and Pleasant Springs held their relative positions, Empire made a gain of eight places, and Primrose of one, while Sugar Creek dropped two, Whitewater two, and Plymouth two, Eagle two, and Bangor one. Franklin remained at the bottom of the list. Brookfield rose to eleventh place from thirteenth, and Orion from fourteenth place rose to eighth.

Following is a list of the remaining eleven towns, ranked according to incomes as shown by the two censuses 1905 and 1920:

| 1905 | 1920 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Brookfield | Lodi |
| Orion | Norway |
| Muscoda | Mount Pleasant |
| Newton | Pulaski |
| Highland | Newton |
| Mount Pleasant | Muscoda |
| Pulaski | Highland |
| Castle Rock | Sparta |
| Sevastopol | Sevastopol |
| Sparta | Prairie du Chien |
| Prairie du Chien | Castle Rock |

Two facts in these lists are noteworthy: first, that the four contiguous towns of the Driftless Area in Grant and Iowa counties-Muscoda, Highland, Pulaski, and Castle Rockappear almost consecutively in the 1905 list; second, that

Prairie du Chien, the low town by heavy odds in 1905 , passed Castle Rock in 1920. Other features are the rise of Pulaski to fourth place from seventh, the descent of Newton to fifth place from fourth, and the rise of Orion from second place in the low list to eighth place in the high list-a gain of five points.

It is surprising to find Prairie du Chien, the town which in 1904 produced an average income of $\$ 295$ per farm, attaining in 1919 twenty-second place, with an average income of $\$ 1394$. The explanation, however, seems to be at hand. For one thing, the number of farms in the town declined from 131 in 1905 to 88 at the last census. Since no change took place in the town boundaries, this means that the farms themselves were in 1920 almost 50 per cent larger on the average than in 1905. In other words, the reorganization in the interest of economic or business farming, which in some towns occurred thirty years earlier, took place in Prairie du Chien during the interval named. Secondly, the town had gone strongly into a livestock economy. In 1905 there were 581 cows, in 1920 there were 901 . In 1904 only 3.2 cattle per farm were sold, in 1919 the average was 8.2. At the earlier date the average income from other livestock (hogs) was $\$ 64.50$, in 1919 it was $\$ 315$. The total livestock production in 1904, including $\$ 90$ per farm from dairy products, was only $\$ 228.50$. In 1919 the aggregate was $\$ 1220$, including $\$ 585$ worth of dairy products derived from 10.2 cows at a unit rate of $\$ 57.10$. In addition to the livestock income, Prairie du Chien in 1904 had credit for $\$ 23.50$ worth of potatoes per farm and $\$ 43$ worth of grain. In 1919 the aggregate crop income was $\$ 174$. Thus it appears that despite the double handicap of a light soil and rough land, this town, owing doubtless to its favorable location, has recently experienced a decided improvement in its agricultural character. Most significant of all, the change seems to have been effected, in the main, by the original families, although a comparison of the recent plat of landowners with one of 1902 shows some new names.

Castle Rock's experience has been the reverse of that just described. In that town, where also there was much rough hill land, with comparatively narrow belts of alluvial in the two principal valleys, the best and most productive farms have always been in the valleys of Blue River and Fennimore Creek. A number of the best pioneer farms were in new hands; some were rented, others recently sold were undergoing reorganization and had not yet been brought up to a normal state of production. That town, naturally capable of maintaining nearly as many cows as New Glarus, had an aggregate of 1125 in 1905, and 1459 in 1920. Moreover, the number of farms had increased by the process of subdivision from 111 in the former year to 130 in the latter. So the number of cows per farm had risen only from 10 in 1905 to 11.5 in 1920. This shows that the dairy business was lagging. The sale of cattle, in 1904, brought $\$ 132$ from 9.1 head; in 1919, $\$ 232$ from 8 head. While the sale of hogs (other livestock) amounted in the former year to $\$ 150$, it brought $\$ 292$ in 1919.

The town of Castle Rock has been largely transformed socially, many of the original farm makers leaving no trace in the names of present owners. Doubtless the numerous changes of ownership, the coming of new families and departure of old settlers, have prevented anything like a steady development of local organization for rural improvement. So we find some farmers dairying and some not; some hauling milk to a near-by cheese factory, others selling cream; some with their eyes on the dairy citations, oscillating between the cheese factory and the creamery. The trouble with Castle Rock is quite as much a want of social morale among the farmers as anything else. In 1904 the production average for that town was $\$ 582.50$, while for Muscoda it was $\$ 689$, for Highland \$624, and Pulaski $\$ 607$. Fifteen years later the record was: Pulaski, \$2150; Muscoda, \$2057; Highland, $\$ 2006$; and Castle Rock, $\$ 1393$. In other words, considering the change in the buying power of money, Castle Rock farmers were hardly as well off in 1919 as they had been in 1904, while those in all three of the adjoining towns had made substantial gains.

When we compare the four Grant and Iowa County towns with the two in Richland County, Eagle and Orion, we note a marked difference. Orion's income of $\$ 705$ in 1904 became in 1919, $\$ 2571$; Eagle's income advanced from $\$ 887$ to $\$ 2526$. The number of farms in those towns had remained practically static, each having lost but 3. But the number of cows in Orion had risen from 1369 to 2000, and in Eagle from 1360 to 2228. The unit income per cow in Eagle advanced from $\$ 30$ to $\$ 113.63$, and in Orion from $\$ 31.43$ to $\$ 105.62$. Alongside these latter figures Castle Rock's $\$ 64.97$ per cow makes a poor showing. There, again, the figures fail to reveal any real progress in herd improvement as against conditions of fifteen years earlier, for $\$ 64.97$ in 1919 was practically the same in real value as the $\$ 25.50$ per cow which was Castle Rock's record in 1904, while Eagle and Orion had forged ahead in unit production. Those towns show comparatively little change in farm ownership, the lands cleared so slowly and painfully by the pioneers remaining generally in the hands of their descendants. And here we have a notable instance of the adaptability of the southwestern stock to the requirements of the new agriculture. The "Hoosiers" in these towns not only continue to raise fields of splendid corn, but they build fine barns and silos, as well as farm homes, and they spend money judiciously for the improvement of their herds. The social changes there have been marked. These are the result, however, not of the replacement of old families by new, but of the better education of the younger generation.

It seems probable that Newton-and perhaps also Mount Pleasant, Brookfield, Franklin, and Sevastopol-suffered at the period of the last census from the partial or complete failure of the pea crop. In 1904 Newton derived over $\$ 75$ per farm from that source, in 1919 nothing. That single cause may suffice to explain the decline in status of this town. The meteoric rise of Pulaski to a higher position in the list
is clearly due to a developing interest in dairying. From 6.9 cows per farm in 1905 the town had advanced to 14.5 in 1920, which is a greater gain than we find in Eagle or Orion, and far greater than that in Muscoda, Highland, and Castle Rock. The relative improvement in herds is indicated by the comparative unit production per cow in 1919, which in Pulaski was $\$ 83.89$, in Muscoda $\$ 79.52$, in Highland $\$ 74.32$, and in Castle Rock $\$ 64.97$. Pulaski had not yet attained to the plane of Eagle and Orion, but its gain over the unit for 1904, $\$ 29.42$, must be regarded as highly encouraging. Orion's improved status, also, is explained by a new emphasis upon dairying and particularly the improvement of herds.

The special crop towns in 1919 were Pleasant Springs, where the 221 farms made an average of $\$ 1616$ from the sale of tobacco; Lodi, where tobacco accounted for $\$ 418$ of the aggregate income; Plymouth, where it brought in $\$ 516$; Franklin, which derived $\$ 359$ from potatoes, hay, and grain; Brookfield, a large producer of potatoes; Mount Pleasant, where the sugar-beet crop amounted to $\$ 345$ per farm; Sevastopol, as an apple producer (the table ignores the cherry crop, which was equally famous and probably at least as profitable) ; and Sparta, which derived an appreciable part of the average farm income from small fruits. It seems not unlikely that cabbage, a crop which was highly favored in the lake shore towns, would have changed the aggregates considerably had it been noted in the table.

## THE TOWNS BY GROUPS

I The Lake Shore Towns.-From the population standpoint, as from that of production, the lake shore towns have a definite character assignable to the influence of location. For one thing, those four towns-Mount Pleasant, Franklin, Brookfield, and Newton-though fluctuating somewhat in numbers from time to time, on the whole increased largely in population between 1850 and 1920. Brookfield is an apparent exception, since its census total in 1850 was 1944, and in 1920, 1973 -only 29 more. But it seems probable that several hundred railway laborers, enumerated in 1850, ought to be excluded from the count because of their purely transient character. Franklin had 1248 in 1850, and 1712 in 1920; Mount Pleasant, 1101 in 1850, and 4070 in 1920; Newton, 551 in 1850, and 1515 in 1920. The variation, as will be seen from the accompanying summary of the population tables for these towns, occurred mainly in the intervening census dates.

| Town | 1850 | 1860 | 1870 | 1885 | 1895 | 1905 | 1920 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brookfield... | 1944 | 2071 | 2239 | 2137 | 2079 | 2015 | 1973 |
| Franklin.... | 1248 | 1773 | 2092 | 1963 | 1824 | 1753 | 1712 |
| M. Pleasant. | 1101 | 1819 | 379 | 2541 | 2777 | 3592 | 4070 |
| Newton.... | 551 | 1391 | 1992 | 1892 | 2139 | 1741 | 1515 |

The violent fluctuations in Mount Pleasant, as shown in this table, are partly attributable to boundary changes in the city of Racine, which encroached on the rural town, and in
readjustments of boundaries between Mount Pleasant and other rural towns. The other three towns had boundaries which remained constant throughout the period 1860 to 1920 , $^{10}$ and between 1885 and 1920 Mount Pleasant's boundaries were modified only by the growth of Racine. It is apparent, however, that as the city enlarged landward the population adjacent to it would become urban, until a new area was incorporated, and the process would be repeated over and over. Under the circumstances, it is impossible to draw safe inferences about rural population changes from the general statistics of population for this town. The other three towns were located far enough from their respective port cities to remain distinctly rural, though the varying fortunes of the hamlets within them affected the results to some extent. On the whole, our best means of determining the condition of their strictly farming population is from the census count of farms, which was as follows:

| Town | Number of Farms |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1850 | 1860 | 1870 | 1880 | 1905 | 1920 |
| Brookfield. | 193 | ${ }^{247}$ | 320 | $343^{11}$ | 971 | ${ }^{996}$ |
| Franklin. | 150 | 199 | 235 | 259 | 278 | 912 |
| Mount Pleasant. | 139 | 252 | 259 | 301 | 337 | 212 |
| Newton. |  | 288 | 298 | 292 | 304 | 279 |
| Total. | 418 | 926 | 1112 | 1195 | 1190 | 999 |

The total number of farm families (counting one family to each farm) in the four towns was less by 5 in 1905 than in 1880, and in 1920 it was 191 less than in 1905. Between 1860 and 1870 the increase was 186 ; between 1870 and 1880 it was 83. Somewhere in the period between 1870 and 1920 a decline had occurred. The movement was not uniform in the several towns. Brookfield lost 24 farms between 1870 and 1920, Franklin lost 23, Mount Pleasant 47, and Newton 19.

In 1860 Newton had less than 14,000 acres in its farms, in 1870 it had over 15,200 , and in 1880, 23,499 acres. In that heavily wooded town the farms were in process of making, out of raw land, up to $1880 .{ }^{12}$ And so long as that process was going on, the average size of all farms increased. Thereafter began the reverse process of dividing the farms, which augmented their number. For convenience of comparison the table of farm areas in these towns, for five census dates, is printed herewith.

| Town | Size of Farms |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1850 | 1860 | 1870 | 1880 | 1905 |
| Brookfield. | 92 | 81 | ${ }_{65}$ | 83 | 73.7 |
| Franklin. | 109 | 91 | 83 | 82 | 80 |
| Mount Pleasant. | 125 | 101 | 117 | 89 | 76.6 |
| Newton... |  | 60 | 51 | 79 | 69.5 |

[^1]By reason of the population increase, accompanied by enhanced values of farm land and reductions in farm areas, the farms were being treated to a more intensive type of cultivation, in which field specialties like peas for canning and, later, cabbage played a part. Milk production, however, remained a standard feature, the markets for the three southern towns being Racine and Milwaukee. Almost every farm had its small herd, from 8 to 12 well-bred cows. On the larger farms the numbers were higher. Fine poultry, garden truck, fruit, and berries-symbols of a more economical system of farming-were all in evidence to a considerable extent.

Living near the port cities, in wealthy counties, these farmers have the benefit of admirable roads for marketing produce and for pleasure driving. The automobile has made them essentially suburbanites. But the neighborhood "taverns" continue to be used for social gatherings, and some of the country churches serve for the worship of the country people who remain rural in their habits.

A striking characteristic of the lake shore towns is the very large proportion of families who are of European origin. The count of the total population by individuals fails to bring out the fact clearly, because so many of the children in families whose heads are of foreign birth are native born. Thus, Brookfield has 1698 of native American birth and only 275 of foreign birth; Franklin, 1476 native to 236 foreign; Mount Pleasant, 2600 to 1470 ; and Newton, 1367 to 148. But Newton's "foreign" families-that is, families whose heads are foreign born, are 15 per cent of the whole number, Mount Pleasant's are 58 per cent, Franklin's 25 per cent, and Brookfield's nearly 26 per cent. In 1870 each of the four towns had a preponderance of foreign families, the aggregate being 1421 against 303 whose heads were at that time native born. The older generation having largely passed away, their children born in this country are now in most cases heads of the existing families. The original Yankees who made so large a part of the early population, especially in Mount Pleasant and in Brookfield, have largely disappeared from the farms. Bohemians and Poles have been added to the earlier German, Irish, and Dutch elements. Scandinavians have never been numerous in those towns. The plats showing farm owners in $1915^{13}$ reveal the paucity of names having American or English origins. But even these fail to tell the whole story. For in the lake shore towns many farms the owners of which may very likely be Americans are in the hands of renters. The state census in 1905 attempted to indicate the rented farms as well as those occupied by the owners and those which were mortgaged. Though the results of this count have not been printed, they have been transcribed for some towns from the manuscript census. Brookfield, for example, had 75 rented and 112 mortgaged farms; Franklin had 63 rented and 83 mortgaged. While Newton had but 3 rented, 129 of its farms were mortgaged.

Politically, the people of these four towns in recent years
${ }^{3}$ See figs. 6, 12, 16, 21 .
have been pretty consistently Republican. Historically, however, they have fluctuated a good deal. Brookfield, starting in 1856 as a Fremont town, gave a slight plurality to Douglas in 1860 and a very heavy majority to McClellan in '64. It then remained Democratic until 1896, and even gave Bryan a plurality of one over McKinley in 1900. It was strong for Roosevelt in 1904, back with Bryan in 1908, gave a majority for Wilson in 1912 and in 1916, and went overwhelmingly for Harding in 1920. At that election there were 35 votes for Debs, and some Socialist votes were cast from 1908 on. Franklin voted overwhelmingly for Buchanan-202-32-in 1856. It was just as strong for Douglas in 1860, for McClellan in 1864, and continued to be Democratic though with a diminishing majority till 1896. Thereafter it cast a Republican plurality till 1912 and 1916. The last presidential vote was almost as overwhelmingly Republican as the first was Democratic. In Newton the 1856 vote stood 109 for Buchanan, 108 for Fremont; the 1860 vote was strongly for Lincoln, that of 1864 strongly against him. Grant carried the town in 1868, Greeley in 1872, and Tilden in 1876. From 1880 it was Republican till 1888, when Cleveland and Harrison tied; it voted for Cleveland in 1892, but thereafter remained safely Republican. Mount Pleasant gave Fremont a majority of 205 , strongly supported Lincoln in both elections, and was stanchly Republican till 1892, when the defection of some votes to the Prohibition candidate gave the plurality to Cleveland. Thereafter its Republicanism was unquestioned till 1912. Hughes had a majority in 1916, and Harding all but a few votes in 1920.

II The Southeastern Towns.-This group contains the two towns in Walworth County-Whitewater and Sugar Creek-together with Plymouth in Rock County. All are distant from population centers, but Whitewater has in it the small city of Whitewater, and Plymouth has two hamlets, Footville and Hanover. Sugar Creek is a purely agricultural town.

The first point of contrast between this group and the lake shore group is that here the population has practically not increased. In fact, all three towns show a decreasing total. Whitewater's rural population can probably be said to have declined steadily from 1870 to 1920 , and the same remark holds for Sugar Creek. Plymouth shows an increase from 1870 to 1905, but a considerable drop between 1905 and 1920.

Employing the test based on number of farms, the results stand as follows:

| Town | 1850 | 1860 | 1870 | 1880 | 1905 | 1920 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Plymouth. | 60 | 147 | 165 | 169 | 187 | 189 |
| Sugar Creek | 86 | 150 | 160 | 179 | 176 | 176 |
| Whitewater. | 148 | 137 | 178 | 145 | 147 | 160 |
| Total. | 294 | 434 | 503 | 493 | 510 | 525 |

The table shows a gradual but constant increase for Plymouth, but a decline at two dates for Whitewater and at one
date for Sugar Creek．The aggregate for the three towns in 1905 was higher by 7 than in 1870，and higher by 17 than in 1880．In 1920 there were 15 more farms than in 1905，and 22 more than in 1870．Smaller families must account for the declining population．A condition seems to have been reached early in which all the land was in farms，and nearly all the farms definitely fixed as to area and boundaries．Areas at the census dates to 1905 can be summarized as follows，noting also areas of improved land：

| Town | 1850 | 1860 | 1870 | 1880 | 1905 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Plymouth． | 119－37 | 91－51 | 111－77 | 117－101 | 105－97 |
| Sugar Creek | 120－56 | 129－76 | 126－69 | 117－93 | 118－90 |
| Whitewater． | 145－44 | 126－60 | 107－91 | 133－114 | 119－119 |

The table emphasizes the relative stability of the farms in area，and suggests that the division of a made farm anywhere in this region has been an exceedingly rare occurrence during the past fifty years at least．The farms，in short，have the character of established＂estates，＂which may pass from father to son or even be transferred to strangers，but which persist with their old boundaries from decade to decade．

All of those towns，when first settled，were prevailingly ＇American，of New York and New England stock．All soon became the homes of many foreign families who took up the poorer lands or bought out Americans who were disposed to sell．The story of foreign infiltration is told in the count of heads of families at the several census dates：

| Town |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

As early as 1860 foreign families were numerically in the ascendant，and their decrease in recent census years is，of course，due to the passing of the older generation and the substitution of their American born successors as family heads．In these towns three foreign elements－the Norwe－ gians，Germans，and Irish－predominated，but the English were also well represented and there were appreciable num－ bers of Scotch and Canadians，together with a few French， Dutch，and Swiss．

Whatever their outward make－up，the communities were dominated socially and educationally by the American and other English speaking elements．Those of foreign speech were distributed among the rest，and there were no large groups of Europeans living isolated from their English speak－ ing neighbors．Religious，educational，and recreational life all were under the tutelage of the Yankees，aided and abetted by the adaptable Irish，British，and the early assimilated Norwegians and Germans．

On the basis of general appearances one would be disposed to regard these farmers as rather specially well－to－do．Still，
in 1905 Plymouth reported 86 mortgaged farms，Sugar Creek 59，and Whitewater 56．The＂estate＂idea is em－ phasized by the number of rented farms，which was large at that time－44 in Plymouth， 72 in Sugar Creek，and 22 in Whitewater．

Politically，the people of these three towns represent the extreme of party consistency．They voted for Fremont in 1856，for Harding in 1920，and for every Republican candi－ date between．${ }^{14}$ The Socialist vote in Plymouth was 1；in Sugar Creek it ranged from 2 to 8，in Whitewater from 1 to 7．The Prohibitionists sometimes had as high as 8 votes in Plymouth，while 42 was the upper limit in Sugar Creek，and 116 in Whitewater．${ }^{15}$

III The Central Towns．－New Glarus and Primrose， Pleasant Springs and Lodi make up this group．All are symmetrical，occupying surveyor＇s townships．The farm population，judging from the count of farms at the several census years，declined perceptibly in the quarter－century be－ tween 1880 and 1905，since which time it has increased yet more markedly．

| Town | 1850 | 1860 | 1870 | 1880 | 1905 | 1920 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lodi． |  | 124 | 170 | 115 | 104 | 120 |
| New Glarus． | 44 | 149 | 119 | 130 | 107 | 129 |
| Pleasant Springs |  | 145 | 141 | 178 | 195 | 221 |
| Primrose． |  | 116 | 137 | 147 | 128 | 138 |
| Total． | 44 | 534 | 567 | 570 | 514 | 603 |

This table shows that only in Pleasant Springs did the farms become more numerous between 1880 and 1905．The reason there was tobacco growing，under which farms were sub－ divided．In 1880 they averaged 125 acres，but in 1905 they averaged 108 acres．On the other hand，Lodi＇s farms averaged 144 acres in 1880 and they still averaged 144 acres in 1905．The farms in New Glarus averaged 170 acres in 1880，while in 1905 they averaged 211 acres．In Primrose the average in 1880 was 138 ，in 1905 it was 171.

There is little save geography to justify the association of Pleasant Springs and Lodi with the other two towns．And socially even Primrose does not fully belong with New Glarus． For，although many Swiss moved over into Primrose，that town is prevailingly Norwegian，more like Pleasant Springs than New Glarus．The count of heads of families，as between American and foreign，is as follows：

| Town | 1850 | 1860 | 1870 |  | 885 | 18 | 95 |  | 05 |  | 920 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 罗 | 稛 | 綥 |  |  | 等 | ${ }_{\text {\％}}^{\sim}$ | 先 | ${ }_{8}^{4}$ | 先 | \％ |
| Lodi |  | 179 98 | 198105 |  |  | 96 | 53 | 109 | 47 | 121 | 26 |
| New Glarus | 857 | 9186 | 6168 |  | 149 | 63 | 208 | 82 | 41 | 84 | 35 |
| Pleasant Springs． | 21131 | 41150 | 27150 |  | 186 | 34 | 205 | 99 | 141 |  | 87 |
| Primrose |  | 34116 |  |  | 144 |  | 131 | 74 |  | 103 | 37 |
| But the second figure is wrong，and should be 111．See MS．record of 1880 election in office of Secretary of State． <br> ${ }^{15}$ That was in 1884，before the city of Whitewater was separated statistically |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The count of individuals shows that in Lodi the native Americans were always the dominant factor，while in New Glarus the Swiss were dominant，in Pleasant Springs the Norwegians，and in Primrose also the Norwegians．Lodi has been as determinedly Republican in politics as the south－ eastern towns．But New Glarus shifted from Buchanan to Lincoln，then to McClellan and Seymour，then to Grant，then to Tilden，Hancock，and Cleveland，then to McKinley and Roosevelt，then to Bryan and Wilson，next to Hughes．Fi－ nally，it gave Harding 123 votes as against $\mathbf{3}$ for Cox， 1 for Watson，and 2 for Debs．Pleasant Springs started in with a big majority for Fremont and voted Republican every elec－ tion；so also did Primrose．

IV Towns in La Crosse River Valley．－Bangor and Sparta touch corners and have a common drainage system． They are different in many，if not most，respects，but it is convenient to associate them with reference to a few features． Both are Driftless Area towns and both have considerable quantities of light soil as well as much rough land．

Their rural populations，as the farm count test shows， were increasing up to 1880 steadily and at a rapid rate．Ban－ gor had but 30 farms in 1860，Sparta 109；in 1870 Bangor had 115，Sparta 153；in 1880 the respective figures were 123 and 196．In 1905，however，the farms in Bangor had de－ creased to 115，while those in Sparta numbered 244．Since Sparta had gone extensively into fruit growing，especially berries，it is reasonable to infer that many of the new farms were small．But there is no doubt that farm families had increased considerably in number．In 1920 Bangor had 127 and Sparta 274.

The two towns differed in original social character．Ban－ gor，as early as 1860，had a majority of foreign heads of families－ 81 to 59 Americans，－${ }^{18}$ while Sparta in the same year had 99 American and 19 foreign．The foreign elements of pronounced strength in Bangor were the Germans，Nor－ wegians，and Swiss．The last named had come originally from the Swiss settlement in Sauk County．As late as 1920 there were in Bangor more natives of those three countries than of American states other than Wisconsin．On the other hand，Sparta in 1920 had a total of 154 natives of all foreign countries－the majority of them Germans－to 185 natives of other American states and 1186 natives of Wisconsin．One－ third of Bangor＇s farms were rented in 1905 and 41 per cent mortgaged，while in Sparta less than one－seventh were rented and nearly one－half were mortgaged．Sparta，with fruit growing，was developing new homes．Bangor was perfectly orthodox politically，voting Republican every time．Sparta did the same，but its people glanced off more toward the minor parties，especially the Prohibitionists．

V The Grant，Iowa，Richland Quadrangle．－A study of the six towns represented on the plats of townships 7，8，and 9 west and 7，8，and 9 east－namely，Castle Rock，

[^2] There was a village，Bangor，in the town，
between the farm count and the total of families．

Muscoda, Eagle, Orion, Pulaski, and Highland ${ }^{17}$-reveals a number of points of interest about the agricultural history of the Driftless Area. In the first place, four of the towns lie south of Wisconsin River and two north. The railway and the market were on the south side, and tolls were charged for the use of ferry and bridge. Thus the river was something of an obstacle to free communication, and in consequence the northern towns have had a history which on the social side has made them very distinct from the southern. Muscoda was long the common market for the greater part of the region, the village of Highland in the town of that name being until recent times off the railway. Avoca served considerable portions of the town of Pulaski.

The division of the population between American families and families having foreign born heads, was as follows:

| Tows | 1850 |  |  |  |  | 1870 |  | 885 |  | 1895 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 | \% | 8 | (1) | 䍖 | ${ }^{\circ}$ |  | \% |  | 4 |  | 先 |  | 8 |  | ¢ |
| Castle Rock |  |  | 26 | 59 |  | 98 |  | 11 |  | 5210 | 102 | 54 |  | 1101 |  | 44 |
| Eagle. |  |  |  | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 189 |  | 187 |  | 17 |
| Highland. | 107 | 134 |  | 353 |  | 355 |  | 24 |  |  |  |  |  | 252 |  | 37 |
| Muscoda. |  |  | 67 |  |  | 110 | 011 | 110 |  | 63 |  |  |  | ${ }^{68}$ |  | 14 |
| Orion. |  |  | 85 | 21 |  | 42 |  | 5 |  | 06 | 42 |  |  | 7153 |  |  |
| Pulask | 26 |  | 126 | 70 | 73 |  |  | 133 |  | ${ }^{7} 1$ |  | ${ }^{91}$ |  | 206 |  |  |

This shows the predominantly American character of the northern towns and the predominantly European character of those south of the river-a striking divergence within the group itself. As to foreign racial stocks, aside from the Germans, now found everywhere, we have groups including the Norwegians in the southwestern portion of Castle Rock, the Irish in eastern Castle Rock and in Highland, and a notably large proportion of Bohemians in Castle Rock and in Muscoda. Cheese dairying is combined with pork raising, and an occasional farm is devoted to beef cattle. The Norwegians produce some tobacco.

The tendency of population in this area, as shown by the test of number of farms, was downward till 1905, since which time there has been some increase, mainly in Castle Rock.

| Town | 1850 | 1860 | 1870 | 1880 | 1905 | 1920 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Castle Rock. |  |  | 88 | 112 | 111 | 130 |
| Eagle. |  | 101 | 158 | 196 | 156 | 153 |
| Highland. |  | 280 | 360 | 261 | 246 | 249 |
| Muscoda. |  |  | 70 | 92 | 79 | 79 |
| Orion. |  | 42 | 83 | 102 | 131 | 198 |
| Pulaski. |  | 139 | 162 | 179 | 153 | 148 |
| Total. |  | 562 | 919 | 942 | 876 | 887 |

Between the years 1880 and 1905 the six towns lost, in number, 66 farms, ${ }^{18}$ and the gain between 1905 and 1920 was only 11. This means that the rural population had probably
${ }^{\text {ship }}$ " Although Pulaski and Highland each include more territory than the township which represents each.
town boun apparent increase in Orion is due to a temporary enlargement of the
tharis.
decreased in equal proportion, and the census count confirms this view. Castle Rock, a purely agricultural town, had in 1920 only 15 more inhabitants than in 1870, while it had 51 less than in 1885. In Eagle the population declined from 1302 in 1885 to 929 in 1920. In Muscoda (after the separation of village from farming population) between 1895 and 1920 the decrease amounted to 144 . Orion is the only one of the six towns that on the face of the figures shows an increase, which, however, seems to have been due to the readjustment of boundaries.

The coöperative dairy business, beginning with the establishment of cheese factories about 1881 and 1882, rescued from debt and discouragement the great majority of farmers in this six-town quadrangle. In a few years mortgages were lifted, houses and barns improved, and farms put in better condition for production. This being a region of hills, valleys, and broad or narrow ridges, many changes occurred in the modes of utilizing the land. Alluvial bottoms, which were formerly cropped for corn or hay, with frequent losses incident to freshets, were now made into permanent pastures for dairy cows. The rough hill lands, formerly pastured, became woodland, and are now in many places growing valuable hardwoods. The narrow ridges are mostly used for hay and pasture, the broader ridges for crops, which now include hay and also permanent pastures where formerly wheat was the standard product.

Taking the area as a whole, society has always lacked somewhat in unity, owing to the diverse elements constituting the population. This diversity was reflected in politics as well as in religion, recreational matters, education, and even trade. But conditions have gradually improved in the past quartercentury.

The party record of the six towns varies a good deal. Castle Rock was Democratic through all the elections from 1860 until 1920, when Harding received a majority. Eagle voted for Fremont and remained Republican until 1884, when Cleveland received a plurality of one over Blaine, St. John receiving a single vote. The scale next tipped to Harrison, and back to Cleveland; then it became Republican in a more assured way and remained of that complexion till 1912, when Wilson received the plurality, followed by Hughes in 1916 and Harding in 1920. Highland was always a strongly Democratic town. Buchanan in 1856 received 349 to 52 for Fremont, and the ratio continued thus for many years. Later the vote was more evenly divided, but not until 1920 did the town cast a Republican majority. Then it did, 38 to 206. Muscoda also began with a Democratic majority in 1856. However, that town supported Lincoln in 1860 and again in 1864. Thereafter it was Democratic till 1920. Orion began Republican but gave Douglas a majority in 1860, swinging to Lincoln in '64 and remaining Republican till 1912, when Wilson received a small plurality, which he held in 1916. The 1920 vote was overwhelmingly Republican. Pulaski affords other variations. A Fremont majority in ' 56 and a Lincoln
majority in ' 60 became there a McClellan majority in '64, after which the town was definitely in the Democratic column till 1904, when Roosevelt was its choice. Thenceforward, till 1920, it was steadily Democratic, but Harding received a big majority. Castle Rock has never cast a Socialist vote, Eagle has had from 1 to 4, Highland from 1 to 3, Muscoda 2, Orion 1 to 4, and Pulaski 1. A sprinkle of Prohibition votes appears, mostly in Eagle, Orion, and Pulaski.

VI Scattered Towns.-After taking out the five groups of towns treated above, we have left a remnant consisting of four towns which are so detached as not readily to be assimilable to any of the five groups or yet capable of being organized into new groups. We therefore say a word about each in this place.

Empire, in Fond du Lac County, as famed for its sheep and wool as Whitewater, and more persistent in the pursuit of that industry, was a purely rural town settled mainly by Northeasterners. Beginning in 1850 with 41 farms, it had 119 in 1860, 151 in 1870, and 167 in 1880. Twenty-five years later there were 152 , suggesting some loss of farm families and a tendency to make the farms larger. In 1920 the number was 137, marking a further consolidation of farms. They increased from an average of 111 acres in 1880 to an average of 125.8 in 1905. Corresponding to the decrease in aggregate number of farms, the census count of inhabitants fell off from 1055 in 1870 to 770 in 1920. In 1870 foreign families were more than twice as numerous as American, the Germans, Irish, and English furnishing the bulk of the foreigners.

Empire's political record is not quite as clear as that of some other towns under northeastern leadership. Republicanism triumphed till 1868, when Seymour received 4 votes more than Grant. Thereafter Republican candidates were preferred till 1912, when Wilson was the choice. Hughes was chosen in 1916, and Harding in 1920.

Norway, though it lies in the same county with Mount Pleasant, is not like the latter distinctly a coast town. It is just far enough removed from the lake to have been, in the pioneer stages of development, an interior town. Its people were so exclusively Norwegian as to make this community on its social side practically a colony of Norway. In 1850, out of 146 families 140 were foreign. The next census count showed 9 American families and the 1870 count 12. At that time there were 177 foreign families, and of the total number of foreigners in the town 401 were Norwegians, as against 179 from all other foreign countries and only 21 from other states than Wisconsin.

In this town the population decreased slightly from 1870 to 1920 , though the principal loss was between 1905 and 1920. The farms numbered 93 in 1850, 115 in 1860, and 113 in 1870. In 1880 there were 156 farms and in 1905, 162, while in 1920
there were 179. Farm areas changed from the average of 100 acres in 1850 to 113 in 1860, 132 in 170, 164 in 1880, and finally 123 in 1905. Some remarks on the economic development of the town are found elsewhere, but attention should be called to the statistical tables of farm incomes for 1904 and 1919, which show that much progress has been made since 1880. Politically these people have been as orthodox in their Republicanism as the Northeasterners of Whitewater and Sugar Creek. There have been as high as 9 Socialist votes, however, and a few Prohibition votes.

Prairie du Chien, one of the most historic towns because of the settlement of French "habitants," for various reasons has never become conspicuous in agricultural history. The town had 40 farms in 1860, 161 in 1870, and 113 in 1880. The census of 1905 assigns it 131 and that of 1920, 88. The fluctuations noted were in part due to boundary changes. But, because of the relation to the rural town of the corporation of Prairie du Chien, no safe inferences can be made about population changes from the figures representing them. Apparently, however, recent years have witnessed a consolidation of small farms with larger farms.

The election returns up to and including the election of 1868 do not distinguish the town from the city. Up to 1880 the majority was always cast for the Democratic candidate, save in 1856, when Fremont was the favorite. The vote in 1880 was not representative. Thereafter it was always Democratic. Prairie du Chien until the last census had a large majority of foreign families.

Sevastorol. There remains this unique town, at once new and old, which lies athwart the Door Peninsula and is bounded by the waters of Lake Michigan on the south and those of Green Bay on the north. This geographical situation, combined with the heavy growth of pine and other timber which long retarded improvements, helps to explain the recency of its development and also its peculiar character. For in that region is now one of the state's choicest fruit growing districts, which implies intensive cultivation and a scientific type of agriculture. Sevastopol in 1860 had but 17 farms-so-called. In 1870 there were 48, by 1880 only 94. But in 1905 there were 225 and in 1920 the number was 249 . This tells the story of the change from a comparatively primi-
tive agricultural neighborhood to what is today one of the garden spots of Wisconsin.

In view of the rapidity with which both population and general conditions have changed, the earlier social statistics of this town are of little significance. In 1905, however, out of a total population of 1659,1342 were native Americans and 317 of foreign birth. All but 99 of the natives were Wisconsin born. The foreigners were dominantly Germans, with about half as many Canadians and a few Swedes, Danes, Austrians, Belgians, Bohemians, English, and Norwegians. In 1920 native Americans numbered 1431, foreign born 182; foreign families numbered 88, American 245. It seems that the peculiar requirements of the fruit growing industry have caused here an influx of American families, whereas in other lake shore towns, engaged in less specialized forms of production, the tendency has been toward an increase in the proportion of the foreign born.

In politics, counting from 1880, before which time the voters were very few, the town went Democratic four times in succession. Then, in 1896, came a complete reversal to Republicanism, but Wilson received a majority both in 1912 and in 1916.
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## B A N G OR

LOCATION.-The town of Bangor, organized in 1856, occupies township 16, range 5 west, in La Crosse County. The town is bounded north by Burns, east by Leon (Monroe County), south by Washington, and west by Hamilton and Barre. The town of Sparta (Monroe County) corners with it at the northeast, and La Crosse River, which flows southwest through Sparta, touches Bangor at the northern boundary in section 5.

Surface and Drainage.-The town lies in the Driftless Area, which explains its fundamental physical characteristics. Fish (or Wiant's) Creek in the east and Dutch Creek in the west, affluents of the La Crosse, with their numerous branches, together with Thompson's Creek in the north and Bostwick's Creek in the southwest, water the town so fully that nearly all sections are supplied with running streams. Besides these there are numerous springs.

La Crosse River, the master stream of the region, here flows in the trough of a nearly level alluvial valley about two miles wide, skirted by higher bench land and bordered by bluffs which rise gradually from 250 to 550 or 600 feet above the valley floor. Penetrating the upland, from the valley's rim and from the narrower valleys or coulees, are ravines of varying width, produced by the erosion process which dissected the original upland plain into its present form. Belts of alluvial land border all the streams.

Types of Soll.-The principal types of soil are Wabash silt loam in Fish Creek valley, Wabash loam in the valleys of Dutch Creek and Bostwick's Creek, Waukesha sandy loam and Waukesha silt loam in the level phase of La Crosse valley, the steep phase of Knox silt loam on the gentler slopes, Knox silt on the ridges and the rough, stony land on steep slopes, hog-backs, and wherever the original soil mantle has been much disturbed. All of these except the last are adapted to grain and grass growing when not too steep, in which case they are subject to gullying. ${ }^{1}$ The sandy soils are light, yet not unproductive under careful tillage.

Timber.-The original timber covering of the land consisted of the several varieties of oak, especially white, black, and burr oak, some jack oak, and a little birch. There was practically no heavy timber and the amount of prairie and open land was considerable, especially in the valleys, as the surveyor's notes show. This fact, coupled with the prevailingly light but responsive character of the soil, explains the rapidity of the process of farm making in the more desirable
${ }^{1}$ The coulees, like those of Dutch Creek and the other creeks, are narrow valleys of alluvial from one-fourth to one-half mile in width. Then begins the
hench land and the slope toward the higher ground. Hamlin Garland makes his bench land and the slope oward the higher ground. Hamlin Garland makes his
father say to his grand father (A Son of the Middle Border, p. 61) that those father say to his grandfather (A Son of the Middle Border, p. 61 ) that those
whose farms are crowded against the hills have a hard time of it. He was whose farms are crowded against the hills have a hard time of it. He was
referring to the slopes just mentioned, which were inconvenient to till as well referring to the slopes
as liable to wash away.
areas. The labor of clearing and breaking was comparatively light. It became heavier in the more rugged sections, opened later, since timber grew rapidly on all uncultivated lands after settlement had put an end to the annual burnings.

Beginnings of Settlement.-The earliest entry of land in township 16, range 5 west seems to have been made in 1850, by Abial Morrison-the southwest quarter of section 5. The first settlers, however, are said to have been a group of five Swiss led by John Bosshard, who came to Bangor in 1851 from the Swiss settlement in Sauk County. Three of them located in the valley of Dutch Creek, and the others in the La Crosse valley. ${ }^{2}$ The progress of settlement was slow until 1854. After that it was rapid. However, the year 1860 found the town with considerable government land still untaken. It lay along the steep hill slopes and on the narrow ridges, the least desirable land for farming. All of the best agricultural lands were in private hands.

The special incentive to settlement in the town during the fifties was the building of the La Crosse and Milwaukee Railroad, completed in 1858. It brought the entire La Crosse valley, with its tributary valleys and coulees, within reach of the lake port for marketing purposes.

Progress of Farm Making.-According to the census of 1860, only 5257 acres was included within the 30 existing farms, which is less than one-fourth of the land in the township. Of the land in farms, 2204 acres was under cultivation and 3053 uncultivated. By the next census there were 115 farms, the area of land in farms had increased to 16,852 acres, while the cultivated had risen to 7937 acres. In 1880 practically all the land of the township was included in farms, and the improved- 11,412 acres-was more than the unimproved- 11,103 acres. The process of bringing the lands under complete subjection, therefore, occupied approximately twenty-five years. But the best and most accessible lands were in use within ten years after immigration had fully set in. The censuses of 1885 and 1895 showed a slight decrease in number of improved acres, but the census of 1905 reported a cultivated acreage of 12,716 or an average per farm of 110.5 acres, and an uncultivated total of 11,201 acres or an average per farm of 97.4 acres. There were only 115 farms in the town at this time, and the averagesized farm was 208 acres.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-Classifying for the three census periods of 1860,1870 , and 1880 for sizes of farms, we get the following results: In 1860 all but 5 of the 30 farms in the town had 100 or more acres. None were under 20 acres in area, 2 were between 20 and 49

[^3]acres, 3 between 50 and 99 acres, 11 between 100 and 174 acres, and 14 between 175 and 499 acres. No farm held more than 500 acres at any of the three census periods. In 1870 there were 7 farms under 20 acres, 4 between 20 and 49 acres, 10 between 50 and 99 acres, 48 between 100 and 174 acres, and 48 between 175 and 499 acres. In 1880 there were 2 farms in the class under 20 acres. There were 8 in the second class, 8 in the third class, 44 in the fourth class, and 61 in the fifth class.

As there was a considerable amount of rough land in Bangor as a Driftless Area town, a classification of acres actually cleared at different census periods is also important. In 1860 there were 5 farms having 40 acres or less of cultivated land, in 1870 there were 48 farms in that class, and in 1880, 27. In the class of 41 to 60 acres of improved land there were at the three periods 9,16 , and 18 ; of 61 to 100 acres, 10,31 , and 41 ; and over 100 acres, 6,20 , and 37 .

General Productions.-The relative excellence of the lands for wheat is shown by the fact that Bangor's thirty farms produced, in 1859, 13,088 bushels, which was 436 bushels per farm on the average-the highest rate among the towns compared, with the exception of Pleasant Springs in Dane County. In 1869 Bangor's average per farm, 642 bushels, was the highest by a good margin of all towns compared. In 1879 the town again stood first, with 411 bushels per farm. Of other market cereals, Bangor grew in 1859 no rye or barley. In 1869 her barley yield per farm stood at 105 bushels, next to that of Mount Pleasant, which was highest; and in 1879 the town produced a few bushels each of barley and rye. Hops were grown in 1869 by nine farmers, to the aggregate amount of 24,607 pounds. Ten years later five farmers were still growing hops. They produced 14,800 pounds. No tobacco was grown in the town in those years.

Oats averaged 588 bushels per farm in 1859, 237 in 1869, and 285 in 1879; corn, 303 in 1859, 75 in 1869, and 193 in 1879. Of hay there was less than 6 tons in 1859, 14 tons in 1869, and 17 tons in 1879. The drop in production of oats and corn between 1859 and 1869 was probably due partly to the increasing devotion to wheat raising during the war and in the period of high prices after the war, and partly to the fact that the lands opened up after 1859 were less favorable to corn and oats than the alluvial valley soils and the more level bench lands on which the earlier farms were made.

In average livestock valuation Bangor stood first in 1859, eighth in 1869, and eleventh in 1879. The difference, however, seems to have been caused by increases in the other towns rather than by any decline in livestock production in Bangor, which maintained a fairly consistent record through the three census periods. The average number of milch cows remained
about the same, that of other cattle increased slightly, while sheep and pigs varied a little. The Bangor farmers of the early period, being primarily wheat growers, do not appear to have taken full advantage of the outrange furnished by unoccupied grass-covered ravines, hill slopes, and ridges in order to raise large herds of cattle. The largest herd on any farm in 1860 was 45 head- 15 cows and 30 other cattle. In 1870 the maximum number of cows was 15 , the maximum of other cattle 20 ; while in 1880 one farm had 15 cows and 23 other cattle, and another 8 cows and 35 other cattle. The largest flock of sheep in 1860 was 60 ; in 1870, 51. In 1880 sheep were a negligible factor. Swine, however, had advanced strongly. One farm had 90 head, several others 70 each, whereas the largest number in 1860 was 32 , and in 1870,11 .

The record of cows, as given above, will control the record of dairy productions, which in 1859 consisted of 6050 pounds of butter and 3150 pounds of cheese; in 1869, of 24,235 pounds butter and 275 pounds cheese; and in 1879 , of 14,525 pounds butter and 25 pounds of cheese. Since the number of milch cows in 1880 was greater than in 1870, it is probable that a portion of the milk was made up into cheese at factories. The state census of 1885 credits Bangor with 58,100 pounds of cheese and 35,950 pounds of butter.

By that time, therefore, the dairy business was well established. The number of milch cows was not given separately in that census, but the total of cattle and calves on hand was 1344, just 200 less than in 1880, when the cows numbered 545 and other cattle 999 . Doubtless the number of cows had not decreased, and it had probably increased considerably under the cheese making régime. In 1895 the town had 1001 milch cows. It had one cheese factory and one creamery. The butter product was given as 60,750 pounds, cheese 14,000 pounds. By 1905 the number of milch cows had risen to 1614. The butter product (from home dairying) was 17,220 pounds; the creamery product from 1400 cows, 220,000 pounds of butter; and the cheese factory product from 550 cows, 233,000 pounds of cheese.

Special Productions.-Special crops are not extensively developed in Bangor. Hay was produced to a moderate extent, according to the census of 1905. At that time 2837 acres, producing 4431 tons valued at $\$ 21,875$, was reported; also a small amount of tobacco, 10,000 pounds valued at $\$ 650$, and small amounts of potatoes, 4201 bushels valued at $\$ 1023$, and apples, 2049 bushels valued at $\$ 644$. Cucumbers, melons, strawberries, and small fruits are grown successfully but not to a great extent. Truck crops, which include early and late potatoes, cabbage, melons, radishes, celery, beets, sweet-corn, peas, beans, and rhubarb, are also grown in small amounts. Much more could be done along these lines and also with sugar beets.

Value of Productions.-The value of all farm productions in 1869 was $\$ 117,859$, and the average per farm was $\$ 1033$. Since only 109 farms reported incomes, this would
bring the actual average up to $\$ 1081$. In 1879 the total was $\$ 118,010$ and the average per farm $\$ 959$. At the first period there were 45 incomes of $\$ 1000$ or over, the maximum being $\$ 3720$, made out of livestock and general farming. Thirtythree were between $\$ 600$ and $\$ 999,18$ between $\$ 400$ and $\$ 599$, and 10 between $\$ 200$ and $\$ 399$. There were 3 incomes of less than $\$ 200$. In 1879 the maximum income was $\$ 1856$, made largely from wheat, and there were 11 others of $\$ 1000$ or more. There were 26 of the second class ( $\$ 600$ to $\$ 999$ ), 44 of the third class ( $\$ 400$ to $\$ 599$ ), and 24 of the fourth class ( $\$ 200$ to $\$ 399$ ). Incomes falling below $\$ 200$ rose to the number of 20 . In 1904 the average farm income was practically the same as in 1879 ( $\$ 940$ ). The number of cows in 1905


Fig. 3. Town of Bangor, 1915
After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company
was 1614 as against 545 of 1880 . At the later period the average value of dairy productions per farm was $\$ 469$ and of other livestock $\$ 211$. Crop incomes averaged $\$ 132$ per farm. In 1920 the number of cows had further increased to 2035, the average value of dairy productions to $\$ 1418$ and of other livestock to $\$ 1062$, crop incomes to $\$ 334$, and total farm incomes to $\$ 2814$. Allowing for high prices at this period, there was a real increase in total incomes derived mainly from dairy and other livestock productions.

Manufactures.-According to the census of 1860 the village of Bangor, located on the railroad in sections 4 and 5 , had several stores, a blacksmith shop, and a gristmill. In 1864 a woolen mill was established on Dutch Creek near the
village of Bangor. The gristmill, which was built in 1853 and 1854, was also on Dutch Creek. ${ }^{3}$

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches.In 1857, according to the county map, the settlements were mainly in the two larger coulees of Dutch Creek and Wiant's Creek, in each of which was a school. A few families were living in that portion of Bostwick's Creek valley which lies in the town of Bangor, and there were scattering settlers on the prairie and marsh lands of the La Crosse valley in the two northern tiers of sections. If the villagers and the temporary residents could be subtracted, we would have a farm population at that date of probably not to exceed 300 .

A post office was established in the town in 1854, with Richard Wheldon as first postmaster. The first school was taught for a period of three months in the winter of 1853-54, by William Carl, on the site of the present village of Bangor. The building in which the school was taught was also used as a church. ${ }^{4}$ The 1906 plat book for the county of La Crosse shows schools for town 16, range 5 , on sections $31,16,35$, and 12 , and churches on sections $1,3,5$, and 12.

Population Changes.-The early settlers of the town, in addition to the small group of Swiss mentioned, consisted partly of Americans, partly of Europeans. In 1860 more heads of families were of foreign birth than of native. Wales contributed 10, Norway and Baden each 7, Switzerland 3, England 3, Hanover, Saxony, Hesse, Württemberg, and Bavaria each 1. Of the native group, New York's contingent was 11, Vermont's 10, and there was 1 each from Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Indiana, and North Carolina. In the count we have included only the farmers ( 55 in number) and the resident merchants, a mill owner, and a clergyman. The total population at that census period was 751, but a large proportion consisted of railway and other laborers, some of whom were doubtless transients. In 1870 the aggregate population of the town was 1151. By that time, no doubt, the farm population was much more numerous. In 1885, according to the state census, the farm population was 731, which increased to 778 in 1895 . Thereafter it declined to 695 in 1905, and to 669 in 1920.

The census taker of 1870 found 680 Americans and 471 foreigners in the town, but there were three times as many foreign families as there were American families. Many children of foreigners, therefore, must appear in the count of natives. In 1885 the Americans numbered 509, the foreigners 222, but the foreign families numbered 91 and the American 78, which shows that the original immigrants were disappearing (probably by death) and their American born children were heading families of their own. A great change occurred between 1885 and 1895, when the American families dropped to 40 and the foreign increased to 124. This means, no doubt, that many American families emigrated during the decade,

[^4]and their farms were purchased by foreigners. The last quarter-century shows a strong tendency toward native supremacy. In 1905 there were 60 American families and only 64 foreign, while in 1920 the native outnumbered the foreign exactly two to one ( 82 to 41 ). The total number of foreign born in the town in 1920 was 85 . Yet, the names of farm owners are prevailingly foreign, and the above figures mean simply that the present population consists for the most part of the children and grandchildren of foreign immigrants, with a sprinkling of natives belonging to the older American stock.

Among the foreign elements the Welsh, Germans, and Norwegians are the most important, though the Swiss and also the Irish have had representative families in the town from the beginning and there are a few of other nationalities, as the population chart shows.


## SOCIAL HISTORY OF BANGOR

## Anna M. Jenkins

Bangor was first brought under town government as a part of the town of Pierce in 1852. Sections were withdrawn for the organization of different townships until 1856, when its individual organization was effected. It is located in the eastern part of the county and is unsurpassed for the fertility of its well watered and well wooded valleys, such as Dutch Creek, Fish Creek, and The Prairie. Nestling back from these broader valleys are many narrower ones fittingly designated as "coulees" by our own Hamlin Garland.

Early in the history of the state, companies of men looking about for a suitable place in which to begin a home saw these valleys and found them good to look upon. Here they decided to locate and build the home altar to which they could bring their families. Several distinct classes of settlers were among those who found homes in this fair domain-people from the East who were anxious to locate in more sparsely settled regions, natives of Switzerland who immigrated here from Sauk County and directly from Switzerland as well, sturdy Bohemians who had heard of the "promised land" of opportunity and had come to make their homes here, stalwart Norwegians locating in the deepest coulees because of the homelike appearance of the steep hillsides, and the idealistic Welshmen from the rugged slopes of Wales. Each group built for itself
its own type of civilization and drew unto itself all those of like ideas. Today those different types of civilization are blended and merged into a distinctively American town.

Among the Swiss settlers we find such names as Bosshard, Reudy, Wolf, Darms, and Zimmerman. Bosshard and Reudy settled south of the present site of the village of Bangor in the Dutch Creek valley, and Zimmerman and Darms located claims two and one-half miles east of the village. These settlers brought with them the sturdy honesty and thrift of their forbears in Switzerland, and with them, too, they brought the love of freedom which courses through the veins of every true son of Switzerland. Their industry and thrift made their broad acres blossom as the rose, and today the farms which they developed are pointed out with pride by the descendants of these first settlers. A number of the farms are now owned by the third generation of the family that filed the claim. Later other Swiss families, attracted by the reports of their friends and relatives, came here and located in various parts of the township. Christian and Jacob Hatz, brothers, located on farms in Dutch Creek valley, and their sons, both named John, are prominent in the government of the town and the county.

The first white child born in the township was John Bosshard, son of the original first settler Bosshard. His son, John Bosshard, Jr., is now one of the progressive business men of the village and has served as village president. He tells an incident in the life of his father which pictures the handicaps of pioneer life. In those days bands of Indians roamed about and camped in convenient places on the banks of creeks. One day Baby John was missing. His mother searched for him in his usual haunts, but he was not to be found. Finally the thought of the Indian camp occurred to them, and there they found him. He had strayed out of his mother's sight, and the Indians had picked him up and taken him with them. Otto Bosshard, a brother of John, is a prominent attorney at La Crosse, has served the state as senator at Madison, and in political circles has won for himself an enviable reputation for sterling worth and unswerving loyalty to the state's best interests.

These Swiss settlers organized a Freethinkers' association which was known as the Concordia Society. This society held a prominent place in the social life of the community for many years, and is still in existence. Concordia Hall, which was dedicated to the use of the society, still stands and is in good repair. The society had its physical training department, the Turners, its musical and dramatic department, and a school in which German and English were taught. The first teacher was a Mr. Copling; later Mr. Steinberger, a scholarly man and a Freethinker, taught the school for many years. Some of his descendants, the Reudebusch family, now live at Mayville, Wisconsin.

Joseph Hussa, a Bohemian, came to Bangor between 1858 and 1860, and built a brewery. After his death his sons carried on his business under the name of the Hussa Brewing Company. After the eighteenth amendment was passed the Hussa Brewing Company became the Hussa Canning Company, and the plant is doing a big business and furnishing work for many people.

Numbers of early Welsh settlers came from the East and others came directly from Wales, settling in what is now the village of Bangor and vicinity and in the Fish Creek valley. William Price bought the claim of Darms, who had settled east of the village, and John Williams bought the claim of C. Buol, who moved to Dutch

Creek valley and later located west of the town of Bangor in Hamilton, where the Buol brothers now own acres and acres of the richest farm lands of the county.

John Wheldon was the first settler of the village, locating on a farm upon which, one year later, was laid out the village of Bangor. Later, other additions were made to the village. In casting about for a name for the little settlement, John Wheldon, filled with his love for "Hen Wlad Fy Nhadau" (old land of my fathers), which is every true Welshman's heritage, suggested the name Bangor, and it was at once adopted for town and village alike. The Wheldons, through their efforts, had the first post office opened at Bangor; it was kept in John Wheldon's log house - the first one in the village. Richard Wheldon, John's youngest brother, was the first postmaster. Later, John Wheldon served as postmaster. It was necessary to have the mail brought across the river from Burns, as the stage route was on the north side of the river. It has been said that the citizens of Bangor made an earnest effort to have the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railroad locate on the north side of the river, but fortunately for them their efforts were of no avail. The old Wheldon homestead, with beautiful modern buildings, is now owned by Robert and Griffith Wheldon, sons of John, the founder of the village of Bangor.

The second house in the village, also of logs, was built by David J. Jenkins, who arrived in the fall of 1853 . In 1854 he and John Wheldon built the flour mill on Dutch Creek, which he ran until 1870. After several changes in proprietors the mill came into the possession of John Bosshard and remained so until June 11, 1899, when the modest little Dutch Creek rose in its wrath and by a mighty flood washed away the mill and even the site. Both D. J. Jenkins and John Wheldon took an active part in the government of the little hamlet, both in turn holding the offices of town superintendent of schools, clerk, and justice of the peace. Jenkins in his capacity of justice performed many a marriage ceremony, his smallest fee being a half-bushel of turnips. As town superintendent of schools, so the story runs, he had a unique way of determining the qualifications of a teacher. A young man, a candidate for the necessary credentials for teaching, was told to come to the mill office. He promptly did so and spent the afternoon visiting with the genial proprietor of the mill, without, however, any reference being made to the object of his visit. When the young man was about to leave, Mr. Jenkins said, "Well, you'll do all right." The young fellow proved to be a very successful teacher. Such a primitive method of determining the fitness of a candidate is a far cry from the methods of the present day, when the pendulum has swung away from native intelligence and ability to diplomas, certificates, and degrees. When the office of supervising teacher of rural schools was created in the state, the position in La Crosse County was filled by Anna M. Jenkins, a niece of D. J. Jenkins; another niece, Mrs. Blanche J. Chamberlin, is the present county superintendent of schools-the first woman to hold that position in La Crosse County.

Evan Jones, with a family of four sturdy sons, came to the town in 1852 and settled on a claim just west of where the village now stands. This property has never left the family and is now owned by two of his grandsons.

The Welsh people are naturally religious, and early in the history of the village a Welsh Congregational church was founded. This church was the scene of many a soul stirring "Eisteddfod," a
festival of song and poetry. This festival attracted the Welsh people from all parts of the county, many of them coming in wagons drawn by ox teams. The rafters of the church rang with the volume of sound that poured from the throats of these Welshmen, born with a natural gift of song. Evan L. Evans, John R. Jones, Edward R. Jones, Evan Jenkins, Thomas Eynon, John Jones (Dr. Jones), David Jones (commonly known as Singer Jones, in order to preserve his identity among so many of the same name), John Davis, David Johns, and many others were among the Welsh settlers who settled in the Fish Creek valley and transplanted a bit of Wales among the hills of La Crosse County. Many of their descendants live upon the farms developed by their ancestors. Dr. Owen Evans, a practicing physician of the village of Bangor, is a son of Evan L. Evans, and another son, Oswald, is postmaster of the village of Rockland in an adjoining township. John Jones, known as Dr. Jones because of his power as a healer of broken bones, handed down his gift to his son, William Jones, who for many years alleviated the sufferings of the afflicted with his oils and ointments. His son, in turn, Dr. Walter Jones, fully equipped with the best training available at home and abroad, brave with degrees and diplomas and possessed of the family gift of healing, is winning for himself fame and fortune in the city of La Crosse.

For a time the Welsh of Fish Creek worshiped with the Bangor Welsh, but later built a Congregational church of their own in Fish Creek. Later a company withdrew from this church and founded the Welsh Presbyterian church, which still holds occasional preaching services. It has been said that the church bells of Fish

Creek rang "John Jones, John Evans, John Williams," but today there are many new settlers in the valley who could not respond to such a summons.

Among the eastern people who settled in the village and town were the Darlings, Elijah Hooper, Arthur Page, and C. W. Mackenzie. Arthur Page bought a farm in Dutch Creek, and two of his sons, Waldo and Willis, have a grain elevator and warehouse in the village. C. W. Mackenzie settled on a claim in 1853, and in 1854 brought his family to the home which he had built. One of his daughters married Dr. A. B. Newton, the first practicing physician of the village, and his granddaughter Cordelia, Mrs. Grant Rogers, now owns the beautiful farm home which with foresight her grandfather chose from all the acres about him, because of the charming site for a dwelling place. Mrs. A. B. Newton and Emma Mackenzie still live in the village. Abner Darling located in 1855 on a farm in Dutch Creek, and lived there until 1876, when he came to Bangor and became the proprietor of the Bangor House, the second hotel in the village. The first hotel was the Eagle Hotel, run by Henry Johns.

The Bangor Woolen Mills were built and owned by John Sheydt and John Reudy, and for many years did a thriving business. Later Sheydt sold his interest to Otto Bodmer, and the firm kept the name Bodmer and Reudy after Reudy's death.

From these beginnings-and the persons mentioned are only a part of those who settled in the town and village-has come the present town of Bangor with the incorporated village of the same name. The pretentious, comfortable homes, well tilled fields, and
sleek herds of blooded cattle testify to the richness of the soil of the farms and to the prosperity of the farmers. As a result of this prosperity, schools and churches are maintained, and from the six one-room schools of the town come the recruits for the high school which has been established at Bangor village.

The village now has a population of nearly a thousand people. The high school building with its new gymnasium, erected at a cost of approximately $\$ 15,000$, is the pride of the village and helps in the training of an ever increasing number of young people who are coming to realize that a high school education is the birthright of every American girl and boy.

There are four churches in the village-the Catholic, Lutheran, Presbyterian, and Baptist. Both town and village are largely Protestant, the Catholic church here being of comparatively recent origin in the town. All churches are in a thriving condition.

The industries of the village are such as will best minister to the needs of the surrounding farming districts. The Hussa Canning Company last year had an output of between 115,000 and 125,000 cases of peas, pickles, and sauerkraut, using about two and three-fourths million cans. Their acreage for the coming year is in the neighborhood of 1130 acres.

The village is equipped with electric lights and a fine sewerage system. Two railroads-the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul, and the Chicago and Northwestern-run through the village, making it really a suburb of La Crosse. These facts make of Bangor a very desirable location, and there are rarely empty houses in the village.
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## B R O O K F I ELD

LOCATION.-The town of Brookfield occupies township 7 north of range 20 east of the fourth principal meridian in Waukesha County. It is bounded north by the town of Menomonee, east by Wauwatosa in Milwaukee County, south by New Berlin, and west by Pewaukee. The town of Waukesha corners with Brookfield at the southwest; and the city of that name, which is the county seat of Waukesha County, lies less than two miles west of the town boundary. Milwaukee is about eight miles due east from the center of the town of Brookfield, eleven miles from the western boundary, five from the eastern.

Surface and Drainage.-The glacial character of the land surface is revealed in the succession of depressions trending north and south, and separated by more elevated lands which are a type of moraine. Approximately one-third of the town is low, and some of the lowland marshy. The remainder is well drained, rolling upland. The marshlands occur in the depressions, portions of which are occupied by small branches of Menomonee River in the eastern and by Fox River in the western and southern parts of the town (see fig. 4). The main branch of Fox River in Brookfield has generally been called Poplar Creek. It rises in Menomonee Town and flows south through sections $6,8,17$, and 19. It has a small affluent, with two branches, which waters 31, 29,


Fig. 4. Topographic Map, Town of Brookfield Reproduced from United States Geological Survey Waukesha Quadrangle

30, 32, and 33. The branches of the Menomonee water sections 25, 24, 23, 14, 11, and 2. A number of sections in the central or highest portion of the town are without streams.


Miami clay loam-glaciated, timbered, upland soil, with heavy clay subsoil.

Clyde loam, Clyde silty clay loam-low, poorly drained, mineral
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Fig. 5. Soil Map, Town of Brookfield
Prepared from map made by the Soils Division, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey

Types of Soil.-The predominant types of soil in the town are the Miami clay loam, Miami silt loam, and Miami loam, which in the order given cover the Niagara limestone foundation rock over probably three-fourths of the surface. All of these are strong soils, of glacial limestone origin, and highly productive, though the first named type is somewhat heavy to work. The marshes have a peat soil, and there are also some areas of Clyde silty clay loam, especially along the river bottoms where the land is poorly drained. When re-
claimed by tile draining, such land is very productive, but in its natural state is apt to be shunned by the husbandman. There is practically no sandy or light soil in the town. \({ }^{1}\)
Timber.-The United States surveyor Garret Vliet, when he surveyed township 7 north, range 20 east in 1836, made notes respecting the timber found along the section lines, which may be summarized as follows: All of the southern and eastern portions of the town were heavily wooded with maple, white and red oak, linden, elm, and other timber, with hazel undergrowth-except the marshes, which were sometimes timbered (in part with tamarack) and sometimes open grass lands. The northern sections, although well wooded, had little undergrowth. West of Poplar Creek began the oak openings which covered practically all of the westernmost tier of sections, with parts of the neighboring sections on the east. The beauty of these openings is attested by early travelers and visitors. \({ }^{2}\) From the standpoint of the farm makers, therefore, the northern and western sections were easier to subdue, while the eastern sections, lying nearest the Milwaukee market, were tempting to settlers for other reasons.

Beginnings of Settlement.-Robert Curran is said to have been the first settler in the town. He came in 1836. Later in the same year George Putney came; he bought land in section 28 in 1841. S. G. Putney also visited the town in 1836, but did not bring his family to settle until 1840. His land purchases, in section 20, date from 1849. Augustus Yale settled in section 32 in 1837, buying his claim at the first land sale in October, 1839, which indicates that he settled there at once on his arrival. Other settlers of 1837 were Jacob Stam, Major Farr, E. A. Parker, Augustus Story, Moore Spears, Ezra Maynard, and Mr. Van Vleck. Jacob Stam bought land in section 22 in 1842, Maynard in 1849, Moore Spears in section 25 in 1839. Others mentioned in the pioneer history cannot be identified among land purchasers, though a John Patten Story was an extensive landowner in the southern tiers of sections, and a George Parker bought the northwest quarter of section 24 in 1848. In 1838 several members of the Hatch family, with others, formed the "Hatch Settlement" in the northwestern part of the town. \({ }^{3}\) Their land purchases ranged in time from 1843 to 1849. The civil town was organized by the legislature in 1839, and the county of Waukesha was set off from Milwaukee in 1846. According to the census of 1850 there were in Brookfield 1944 per-
\({ }^{1}\) See soil map in Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, Bulletin (Mo. 29, Soil Series No. 3, Soil Survey of Waukesha County, Wisconsin \({ }_{2}^{2}\) History of .
\({ }^{3}\) Ibid., 729-731 aukesha County, Wisconsin (Chicago, 1880), 471, 473. in part. The He record of land purchases confirms these statements only wards extended into 5 and 8 .
sons, of which number several hundred were transients working on the railway. Sixteen hundred would probably be a reasonable estimate of the number who had homes in the town at that time. The total rose to 2071 in 1860, and 2239 in 1870, after which it declined somewhat (see population schedule attached to this study).

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Land.-The canal grant to aid the Milwaukee and Rock River Canal included alternate sections, beginning with section 1, in the northern two-thirds of the town. Section 10 was selected as "seminary lands," and section 16 was the school section. This left ten sections of government land within the canal zone. The land office minimum price of lands so located was \(\$ 2.50\) per acre, double the regular price of government lands. In Brookfield were twelve sections (the two southern tiers) of land which fell just outside the canal zone. The record of original entries in this town, therefore, will throw light on the relative eagerness with which canal zone lands and equally good lands outside were purchased by farmers and speculators at these divergent prices.

Of the twelve sections lying south of the canal zone, the two easternmost, 25 and 36 , were sold at the earliest opportunity, in 1839, and enough subdivisions of the other ten sections were sold either in 1839 or 1840 to make the equivalent of eight sections. Most of the lands in this southern strip which were left over for purchase after 1840 were swampy. Nevertheless, in 1841 one and five-sixteenths sections were taken, some of the balance going the next year. Three forty-acre subdivisions remained in the government's hands till 1848, and one till 1849. The ten sections in the canal zone went to private purchasers between the years 1839 and 1852. But only 80 acres was sold in 1839, while 2440 acres-more than one-third of the whole-went in 1849. While settlers in Brookfield were independent of the canal, being near enough to the lake port to deliver their products by wagon, it is significant that even lands so near Milwaukee should have been shunned, apparently for no other reason than the price. \({ }^{*}\)

Progress in Farm Making.-The seventh census (1850) assigned to Brookfield 123 farms, having 4309 acres of improved land and 7062 acres unimproved. This gave to the average farm 92 acres of land, 35 under cultivation and 57 wild-whether woodland or hay marsh. Ten years later the number of farms had increased to 247 (double the former number, with one to spare) ; the cultivated land amounted to 10,938 acres, the uncultivated to 9181 , or 44 of the former kind to 37 of the latter in the average farm, which contained 81 acres. Thus the farms were reduced in area on the average by 11 acres, but they increased in cultivated land 9 acres, or approximately 25 per cent. The next decade witnessed another large increase in number of farms, from 247 to 320 ,
\({ }^{4}\) Many tracts were occupied and cultivated earlier, but the purchase was left incomplete in the hope that the government wo
which it did on account of the failure of the canal project.
the cultivated area rising to 13,476 , the uncultivated falling to 7402, which would make the total acreage within the farms 20,878 as against 20,119 in 1860. We will be safe in assuming that practically all the land within the town was included in farms as early as 1860 , and that the later process was one of intensification, attended with a reduction of farm areas and the creation of a number of new small farms. The average farm in 1870, according to the above figures, contained 65 acres, of which 42 was improved land. Probably a correction should be added to the total acreage given for 1870 , since the farms must have included all the lands in the township, or 21,040 acres, according to the state censuses of 1885 and 1895. In that case the average acreage of the farms was slightly under 66 acres instead of 65 ; or, if we assume that the improved acreage was given correctly and the unimproved faultily, the farms would have 42 improved acres to 24 unimproved.

The census of 1880 contains what must be considered a decidely erroneous record of farm areas. These aggregate 28,929 acres, but there had been no change of town boundaries to account for the increase. We shall have to correct that total by substituting for it the state census total of 1885, or 21,040 acres. This gives, as the average area of 343 farms, 64 acres-instead of 83 , the quotient of 28,929 divided by 343.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-The census of 1860 shows 10 farms under 20 acres in area, 83 from 20 to 49 acres, 96 from 50 to 99 acres, 46 from 100 to 174 , and 12 from 175 to 499 , with none over 500 acres. In fact, no farm approached 500 acres in area, the largest being one of 360 acres. In 1870 there were 49 farms smaller than 20 acres each, while 85 were from 20 to 49 acres, 117 from 50 to 99,63 from 100 to 174 , and 6 over 175 , with none as large as 500 acres. At the date of the tenth census, 1880, the record ran: under 20 acres, 58 ; from 20 to 49 acres, 74 ; from 50 to 99 acres, 89 ; from 100 to 174 acres, 90 ; and from 175 to 499 acres, 32.

Remembering that the aggregate numbers of farms in the three successive census periods were 247 , 320 , and 343 , we note: First, there was between 1860 and 1870 a disproportionate increase in the number of diminutive farms, under 20 acres, with a smaller increase during the following decade. Second, the number of farms of small size, 20 to 49 acres, increased by only 2 between 1860 and 1870, which means a considerable proportional decline, while between 1870 and 1880 the actual decrease in the number of such farms amounted to 11. Third, the class of "fair-sized farms," from 50 to 99 acres, increased between 1860 and 1870 by 21 and decreased in the next decade by 28. Fourth, the class of "good-sized farms," 100 to 174 acres, which in 1860 was represented by 46 farms, ten years later had 63 and twenty years later 90 . Of large farms, over 175 acres, there were 12 in 1860, 6 in 1870, and 32 in 1880. If, as the production records suggest, the diminu-
tive areas (under 20 acres) were generally not farms in the strict sense, but mere home sites, the above record can be interpreted to show that the farms were gradually building up to an economical size.

General Productions.-The progress of agriculture in the principal lines of farm activity is indicated on the production charts for the census periods 1850 to 1920, and the standing of the town of Brookfield in any of the given departments relatively to other towns can be readily ascertained from the same source.

The town stood low as a producer of wheat for the same reason that other forested towns did-namely, that the farms were slow in making, as contrasted with prairie farms or farms in the oak openings. \({ }^{5}\) But again, as in the cases of other forested towns, the wheat production fluctuated only slightly from decade to decade, indicating probably that wheat was grown each year only on the newer soils, while those longer under cultivation were devoted to other crops; or, in other words, that wheat was never the sole market crop on Brookfield farms. Other market crops were wool, in which from 1860 the town held a respectable position; butter during the earlier period, and later both butter and cheese; barley, which was produced to some extent from 1850 and became important before 1880; hay, and potatoes. An intimation of the farming methods in vogue in the town is contained in the facts that the butter yield per cow was high in comparison with other towns; the wool yield was high enough to prove that breeding for production was common, though not high enough to suggest a general adoption among Brookfield farmers of the purebred merino; and in 1880, the first census that supplies crop acreages as well as aggregates, the yields of all farm crops were distinctly above the average of the towns compared. The inference is that the farmers of Brookfield were generally careful husbandmen, who conserved the fertility of their soils, tilled the lands thoroughly, and paid attention to the care and improvement of their livestock.

Special Productions.-Mention was made of barley, which was produced in the towns near Milwaukee and other centers of the beer manufacturing industry, the opportunity of delivering the product direct from the farm giving such neighborhoods an advantage over more distant localities. Accessibility to the city markets also explains the relative emphasis upon the production of hay and of potatoes. Maple sugar, however, which was an important special product in Brookfield, has its explanation in the beautiful maple groves of the town and in the fact that a goodly proportion of the settlers, being from northern New England, understood the importance of conserving these groves. Forest products were sold, in 1869, to an aggregate value almost equal to that of the animal products sold. Some farmers made as much as

Not more than one-sixth of the land in Brookfield was openings, the rest beirg generally heavily wooded.
\(\$ 1500\) worth, many sold \(\$ 400\) or \(\$ 500\) worth, and a large majority of all the farmers sold some. This was a continuation of the pioneer business incident to land clearing, and it argues that the extension of fields was still going forward. By 1880 forest products were reported from only a very few of the farms.

Value of Productions.-In 1870 a total of 69 Brookfield farmers, out of 320 , assigned themselves incomes for the preceding year of \(\$ 1000\) or more. The maximum was \(\$ 4530\). On the other hand, there were 34 farms which produced \(\$ 200\) or less. The low incomes were in every case attached to the diminutive farms of less than 20 acres, and it would seem that these were in most cases not intended as farms in the economic sense, but merely as home places for workmen or others whose main incomes were derived from other sources than the land.


Fig. 6. Town of Brookfield, 1915 After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company

There were 76 incomes of \(\$ 600\) and less than \(\$ 1000\), and 60 of \(\$ 400\) and less than \(\$ 600\). The balance were small incomes of \(\$ 201\) to \(\$ 399\). In 1880 the record, for 343 farms, was 79 incomes of \(\$ 1000\) or over, the maximum being \(\$ 3500\), and 44 of \(\$ 200\) or less. There were 95 of \(\$ 600\) and less than \(\$ 1000\), 61 of \(\$ 400\) and less than \(\$ 600\), and 64 of \(\$ 201\) and less than \(\$ 400\). In general, the insignificant incomes in 1880 attached to the diminutive farms, though the large incomes, over \(\$ 1000\), did not in all cases attach to the large-sized farms. In fact, of the 79 incomes ranging from \(\$ 1000\) up, 15 attached to medium-sized farms- 50 to 99 acres; 36 to goodsized farms- 100 to 174 acres; and only 28 to the large-sized
farms- \(\mathbf{1 7 5}\) acres and over. The largest income, however, attached to one of the large-sized farms.

In 1879 the average farm income for Brookfield was \(\$ 635\). In 1904 this average was \(\$ 753\) and in 1919 it was \(\$ 2411\). Allowing for the low purchasing value of the dollar in this last period, the average actual income was probably only about \(\$ 200\) higher than it had been fifteen years before. In average number of cows per farm Brookfield in 1919 stood among the lowest in rank of the towns studied, and its total livestock production per farm amounted to \(\$ 1944\), but only four towns had a greater average crop income per farm at this period.

Manufactures.-The principal factory of the town was the W. D. Bacon steam sawmill, in section 17, installed about the time railway building began (1849 or 1850). It furnished great quantities of railway ties, timbers for cattle guards, bridges, etc., for the Milwaukee and Mississippi Railway, as well as lumber for local uses and for Milwaukee buildings. The mill was operated for a number of years, greatly to the benefit of settlers. \({ }^{6}\)

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches.Hamlets grew up at Brookfield Heights in section 16, at Elm Grove in section 25, and at Blodgett in sections 29 and 30. The last two were located on one of the plank roads from Milwaukee westward, the first on the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railway. Butler post office was just across the boundary of the town, at the intersection of sections 1 and 12 , in Milwaukee County. These places were a convenience to the farmers in the matters of mail, repairs, and small-scale trading. In 1890 there were six schools in the town, so distributed as to accommodate all the farms. There was a Catholic church in section 4, and also an Evangelical church, and a cemetery, formerly around a church, in section 26 . These served the German residents, of whom there were many in that neighborhood and indeed throughout the town, while a Protestant church at Brookfield Heights accommodated such of the native Americans as had the church-going habit, and who were content to worship so near their own homes. The churches of Milwaukee were not too distant to be accessible to Brookfield farmers, but it is doubtful if prior to the coming of the automobile many took advantage of the opportunity they afforded. \({ }^{7}\)

Population Changes.-In 1850 Brookfield had 145 American born heads of families and 168 foreign born, and 1178 natives to 766 foreigners. At this period there were 378 Irish, 190 Germans, 118 English, and small numbers from Scotland, Canada, Switzerland, Wales, and Norway. In

\section*{\({ }^{6}\) History of Waukesha County (1880), 730 .
\({ }_{7}\) One of the best accounts of farm life in}

TOne of the best accounts of farm life in Wisconsin during the period from about 1870 to 1890 is Grant Showerman's \(A\) Country Chronicle, which portrays
life in Brookfield during that epoch. This book throws light on the farm work, life in Brookfield during that epoch. This book throws light on the farm work,
the activities of a superior American farm family-their social connections,
 interest, but says little about the church. Another book by the same author, on
school life, is in manuscript, and it is hoped will be pubbished soon.

1860 the foreign born heads of families had increased from 50 per cent of the total in 1850 to 66 per cent. The next ten years saw a further increase to 77 per cent of the total. This was, however, the peak, and the proportion of foreign born heads of families had decreased in 1885 to 74 per cent, in 1895 to 65.8 per cent, in 1905 to 45.7 per cent, and in 1920 to 25.7 per cent. Germans formed the largest group of foreigners in the total population. In 1860 their number had gone up to 412 from 190 in 1850. In 1870 there were 581 Germans and in 1885, 693. They continued to be by far the largest foreign group down through 1920. Natives from states other than Wisconsin numbered 827 in 1850. In 1860 this number had decreased to 531 and in 1870 to 266 . The largest group among these in 1860 was from New York, and the next largest from New England, especially Vermont. There were also a scattered few from New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Maryland, Virginia, Georgia, and Louisiana. In Brookfield, therefore, we find a marked decline of the Yankee element, which had been a very considerable factor in 1850, and throughout the entire history of the town there has been a large proportion of foreign born, especially Germans. Scandinavians have been an inconsiderable factor.
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\section*{GERMAN PIONEERS OF BROOKFIELD}

\section*{J. H. A. Lacher}

According to the census of 1840, the town of Brookfield, then a part of Milwaukee County, contained a population of 148. How many persons were of German birth or immediate descent it is impossible to tell, for prior to 1850 the census did not give data on nationality. However, several German families lived in the town of Brookfield in 1840. The first blacksmith and third settler in the town was Jacob Stam, a German, who located in the spring of 1837 on section 26. He was an excellent workman, it is said. Besides Stam, Daniel Arlt (Alt), Jacob Weitzel, and George Geb-hardt-also Germans-were residents of the town in 1840. There may have been others, servants included in the families of their employers.

Handicapped by foreign speech and ways, the German pioneers had all they could do to provide for their families and to hew homesteads from the heavily timbered land; therefore, they gave little heed to recording their doings or to keeping alive a close connection with the Fatherland, for which reason it is now difficult to trace their coming and their antecedents among their descendants. Seldom have I been able to ascertain from these the correct names of the birthplaces and districts whence came their forbears. The biographies in the county histories also prove this, for the names are generally spelled wrong. It is therefore difficult to learn the exact year of arrival and place of birth of many of the German pioneers of the town of Brookfield. However, it is certain that the following family heads arrived during territorial days: George Betzold, Jacob Keebler, Charles Scheets, and M. Loebs, in 1842; John Woelfel, Daniel and Magnus Keuper, and Balthasar (Balzer) Loebs, in 1843; John Betzold, John Gebhardt, Ulrich, George, and Fred Woelfel, Philip and George Ramstack, Henry Gerl, and the Gredlers, in 1844; Jacob and L. Rube and others, in 1845; J. Dechant, in 1846; E. Benecke and August Vogel, in 1847.

The census of 1850 records the names of an additional number of heads of families and single adults, the great majority of whom had settled in the town before the above date. Among the former are listed John Adams, M. Benner, August Braun, Henry and K. Dick, Joseph Dickhuhn, John W. Ernst, John Farber, Henry and Joseph Kundermann, Matt. Graf, Charles Hammer, Jacob Hendle, John Hoffmann, August Humbert, N. B. Hurtgen, Ulrich Kohl, John S. Kopp, Joseph Miller, Fred Neu, Christ. Ochsner, Christ. Panzer, L. J. Pfister, Fred Powles (Paulus?), John Ramstack, Henry Richter, H. Sacrison, John Schafer, George Schneider, George and Henry Schlinck, Herman Shirley, Henry Wellauer, R. Wellauer, John Winzenried, O. Viehover, and Matt. Yanty. I will not vouch for the correct spelling of all of these names. Altogether there were 203 individuals of German birth or parentage in the town of Brookfield in June, 1850, when the census was taken. In 1860 their number had increased to 797, according to the census of that year. Among the more prominent of these later comers was the scholarly Louis Hildebrand, called the "squire," a native of the then free city of Bremen. He held many local offices. There were also Christ. Henze, of Elm Grove; George Eyer, an Alsatian; Christian Junemann, a blacksmith from Saxony; and Jacob Spycher (usually entered as "Speaker"), a learned Swiss. Other Swiss enumerated were Jacob Hengy, Christian Winzenried, John and Christian Schmutz, Gottfried Riess, Henry Braeu, and Lybold Auctioner (Leybold Ochsner). We also find Valentine and Philip Meyer of Hesse-Darmstadt, and R. Nettesheim of Prussia. The names of Henry and Jacob Hauert of Baden appeared for the first time in the Brookfield census as "Howard," the spelling adopted by their descendants. Sister Anthony and ten other nuns and nineteen postulants, all Germans, were listed as residents of the town. The census of 1870 shows that the German element had increased to 1064 , the growth being due chiefly to migration from other parts of the country, the cheaper lands nearer the frontier attracting newcomers from abroad. Nevertheless, the demand for farm labor had undoubtedly brought some German immigrants to the town during the decade then just closed.

The census of 1850 classified immigrants by nationality, all German speaking immigrants being entered as coming from Ger-
many. That of 1860 undertook to give their origin by states; this caused much trouble to the census takers, who usually knew little of the geography of central Europe and consequently committed many errors. However, the results are herewith given, the numbers including the parents and their children, whether born here or abroad: from Prussia, 219; Bavaria, 201; Switzerland, 95; Mecklenburg, 72; Württemberg, 48; Germany, 26; Austria, 26; Baden, 20; Hesse-Darmstadt, 18; Saxony, 16; Hanover, 13; Holstein, 9; Bremen, 6; Luxemburg, 3; Hamburg, 2; Alsace, 2; Saxe-Weimar, 1; mixed, 20 ; total, 797.

In considering these totals it should be remembered that the Prussians and Bavarians included a number of Rhenish-Prussians and Rhenish-Bavarians, whose several countries at the apportionment in 1815 of Napoleon's German conquests were allocated, not to their former petty German rulers, but to Prussia and Bavaria, for the prominent part taken by them in the war of liberation. Prussia, especially, was unpopular with the Rhenish people, partly because these were predominantly Catholic while the Prussians were overwhelmingly Protestant, but more particularly because of a difference in character, temperament, and traditions. Some of the RhenishPrussians of Brookfield, like Arlt, Henze, and the Keupers, had such a dislike for Prussia that their neighbors were wont to arouse their ire by taunting them with being "Muss-Preussen," meaning Prussians by compulsion. Indeed, many forsook the vine-clad hills of the beautiful Rhineland and sought new homes in Europe and America, because they could not reconcile themselves to the new régime. Among the immigrants from Rhenish-Bavaria, a part of the historic Lower Palatinate, Michael and Balzer Loebs (later changed to Leps), father and son, were prominent. The former, born in 1789, had campaigned under Napoleon, fought at Waterloo, and ever idolized his great commander. The veteran lived to be past ninety and is buried in the old Evangelical cemetery in section 26.

George Gebhardt, who located in the town in 1840, was the precursor of a considerable colony from old Bavaria which settled in the vicinity of Elm Grove in the forties. These immigrants came chiefly from the Landgericht (judicial circuit) Lauf. Among them were Ulrich Woelfel and six adult sons, the Gebhardts, the Betzolds and their cousins, the Ramstacks, Pfister, the Schlincks, and others. They were devout Catholics and until the late forties attended services in Milwaukee, after which Reverend Dr. Joseph Salzmann, later the distinguished president of St. Francis Theological Seminary, ministered to them. In 1850 they built a church. Among their early pastors were two Bavarians, Reverend Kilian Flasch and Reverend F. X. Krautbauer, who subsequently became, respectively, bishops of the sees of La Crosse and Green Bay. Attracted, no doubt, by the devotion of her countrymen and the generosity of George Betzold, who donated forty acres of land for the purpose, Mother Caroline, superior of the School Sisters of Notre Dame in America, established in 1859 a convent at Elm Grove. It is noteworthy that four daughters of George Betzold joined the sisterhood and several became distinguished educators.

Jacob Keebler (originally Kuebler) and Charles Scheets, Sr (originally Schiedt), from Sulzbach on the Murr River, were the first immigrants from Württemberg to settle in Brookfield. Coming to America in 1840, they worked until they had saved sufficient money to defray the passage of their families, and to provide homes for them on their arrival. Their families reached New York July 4, 1842,
whereupon the fathers started in quest of permanent homes in the promising West. They traveled via the Hudson River and the Erie Canal to Buffalo, and thence by steamer to Milwaukee. A few days later they bought jointly eighty acres in section 26 of the town of Brookfield, erected a log house, then sent for their families, who arrived October 11, 1842. J. and L. Rube (now spelled Ruby), Charles Hammer, J. Hassler, Christian Jack, Jacob Kreider, and others followed. In 1845 the first German Protestant services in the town were held at the home of Charles Scheets, Sr., by Reverend J. G. Miller, of the Evangelical Association. He was a circuit rider, whose regular appointments covered a large territory. A church was organized with the following members: George Eyer, John G. Gredler and his sister Magdalena, Henry Kunderman (now Cunderman), Charles Hammer, Daniel Keuper, Jacob Keebler, Ulrich Kohl, Michael and Balzer Loebs, J. and L. Rube, and Charles Scheets. Mr. Gredler was elected class leader and during the absence of Reverend Miller conducted the services. Young Charles Scheets, now past eightyfour, acted as messenger and notified the members in the towns of Brookfield and New Berlin of approaching services and revivals. Camp meetings were, however, always held at the older Württemberg settlement in the town of Greenfield, Milwaukee County. A log church was erected in 1850 on land presented by B. Loebs-the site of the old cemetery mentioned above. At a later date a brick church was built in the same section on land donated by Charles Scheets, Sr. Two of the early ministers, Reverend J. G. Escher and Reverend C. A. Schnake, both gifted speakers, subsequently became presiding elders of the Wisconsin conference.

Jacob Wellauer became the most outstanding figure of the Swiss colony of Brookfield. Locating there with his parents in 1850, he later went to Milwaukee, where he established one of the largest wholesale grocery houses in the state. Jacob Spycher, a Bernese, likewise came to the town in 1850, almost immediately beginning the successful manufacture of cheese. The first wine produced from grapes raised on his farm found favor in Milwaukee early in the sixties. He was an earnest student of history, and his contributions to the German press on the historicity of Tell, Gessler, et al., attracted wide attention. Another influential Swiss was Jacob Hengy, who was a tailor in Prairieville as early as 1840 , and built in 1845 the famous Exchange Tavern of that place, which he conducted for some years. In the early fifties he bought a farm in the southwestern part of the town, where he lived for years. Other Swiss pioneers were Brennemann, Braeu, Grub, the Ochsners, Riess, Maurer, and the Schmutz and Winzenried families.

The most prominent among the pioneers who hailed from the duchies of Mecklenburg was Henry Clasen, who settled in 1849 in the town of Menomonee, but removed in the sixties to Marcy, in Brookfield, where he became a successful merchant and farmer. Unlike most German immigrants, he came of the ruling class. His father functioned as burgomaster for years in the old country, and Clasen therefore took to politics naturally, not only holding local offices, but serving a term in the legislature and as county treasurer. He was a Democrat.

Herman Schatz, a Prussian from Pomerania, who settled with his parents at Watertown in 1849, saw service in the Civil War and located in 1870 in the town of Brookfield. Originally a blacksmith, he developed a successful implement business. He was elected to the legislature in 1882 as a Democrat.

The town of Brookfield has always been an agricultural community, even to this day containing only one incorporated village. The German pioneers were, therefore, with few exceptions farmers. Yet, among the earliest settlers functioned German blacksmiths, wagon makers, harness makers, coopers, shoemakers, and tavern keepers. After several decades there were also a few merchants among them. By their characteristic thrift, industry, and thoroughness, combined with singleness of purpose, the Germans succeeded where many others failed.

\section*{SOME NATIVES OF BROOKFIELD WHO SUCCEEDED ELSEWHERE}

Professor Grant Showerman, of the faculty of the University of Wisconsin, is a native of Brookfield, born in 1870. He has attained eminence as a scholar, lecturer, and writer on linguistic, literary, and artistic subjects, and is recognized as one of Wisconsin's foremost literary men. At our request, Professor Showerman prepared a list of natives of Brookfield, the majority of them "roughly contemporaries of mine" (as he says), who left the town and made successful careers. The names, he says, represent more than one generation, and not all are living. He does not claim that the list is complete.-Editor.
George E. Robinson, LL.B. University of Wisconsin, attorney,
Oconomowoc; father of Edgar E. Robinson, professor of American history at Leland Stanford University.
Cyrus Dolph, Carroll Academy, LL.B. University of Wisconsin,
attorney, Colorado Springs, Colo.
Michael Clancy, member of police force, Milwaukee.

Albert Hoffman, Carroll Academy, LL.B. University of Wisconsin, attorney, realtor, Milwaukee.
Charles L. Wadsworth, engineer, Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railway.
Alva Russell, Herman Russell, W. J. Russell, Harvey Seymour, Ed. Tierney, James Tierney, E. H. Tucker, O. E. Tucker, T. W. Tucker, Milton Wadsworth, conductors, Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railway.
Fred H. Claflin, baggageman, Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railway.
Glenn Hull, brakeman, Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railway.
\(J_{\text {acob }} \mathrm{Ray}_{\text {a }}\) and Ed. Tucker, operators, Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railway.
William Regan, operator and station agent, Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railway.
Lawson Philbrook, division superintendent of operators, Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railway, Milwaukee.
Clayton L. Putney, offices of Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railway, Milwaukee.
Fred Classen, attorney, hotel keeper, Waukesha.
Charles L. Crossman, dentist, Waukesha.
S. P. Bevier, dentist, St. Louis, Mo.

Harry Allen, professor of physical culture, State Department, Pennsylvania.
Julian Ries, dairyman, president of State Bank, Brookfield.
Holmes Daubner, attorney, Waukesha.
Herman Schatz, agent, C. Aultman Harvester Company; residence, Waukesha.

Walter Hart, cement contractor, Wauwatosa.
Frank Churchill, conductor, Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railway, Portland, Ore.
H. H. Showerman, railroad man, South Dakota pioneer, editor, dairyman, in Brookfield, Bristol, and Webster, S. D., and Walla Walla, Wash.; now of Linnton, Ore.
Ed. Gerritt and Ed. Brown, South Dakota pioneers of one season.
Herbert White and E. N. Cobb, Kansas pioneers in the seventiesstarved out after long struggle.
Hattie, Ida, and Mamie Granger, Clara and Jennie Barker, Emma Lee, teachers.
Everard Chambers, salesman, Denver, Colo.
Willard Chambers, banker, Omaha, Neb.
Oliver Chambers, physician, Wyoming.
Alice Chambers, teacher, Omaha, Neb.
George Gerritt, druggist, Milwaukee.
Frank Gerritt, clerk and singer, Milwaukee.
Viola Hoffman, in movies, California.
Ed. Gaynor, engineer, Milwaukee.
W. J. Gaynor, newspaper man, Waukesha.

Claude Russell, physician.
Mary Brown, teacher, married Superintendent W. E. Anderson, Milwaukee.
Edna Brown, married Herman Earling, of the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railway.
Alice Brown, teacher, married George Winne, clerk, Milwaukee
Bertha Brown, married C. L. Putney (above).
Julia Brown, married T. W. Tucker (above).
Elsie Brown, married J. J. Campbell, operator.
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\section*{THE WISCONSIN DOMESDAY BOOK}

FARMS AND FARMERS OF 1860
STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF WISCONSIN
Under the direction of Joseph Schafer Superintendent \({ }^{\circ}\)

\section*{C A S T L E R O C K}

LCATION.-The town of Castle Rock occupies township 7 north, range 1 west of the fourth principal meridian, in Grant County. This township, in 1849, was made a part of the town of Wingville. In 1851 the north half of the township became a part of the new town of Muscoda, the south half remaining in the reduced town of Wingville. In 1856 the township was given a separate organization under the name of Blue River, which in 1876 was changed to Castle Rock. It is bounded north by Muscoda, east by Highland (in Iowa County), south by Wingville, and west by Hickory Grove. The town lies about eight miles from Muscoda, by the usual roads, and ten miles from Boscobel, both located on the Prairie du Chien division of the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railroad line near Wisconsin River. Other near-by towns are Fennimore and Montfort on the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad (Lancaster division), and Highland, which is now served by a spur of the same line. The south part of the town is nearer the last two places, the north part nearer Fennimore.

Surface and Drainage.-The town lies in the Driftless Area. It is crossed by two streams, the Fennimore and Blue River (the former joining the latter in township 8 north, range 1 west), which have their sources in the northern escarpment of the Military Ridge and flow north through valleys carved in the plateau, which gradually deepen, while the bordering bluffs grow higher as one descends toward the Wisconsin. Each of the two streams has several affluents, the most important one within the town being Six-Mile Creek, which enters Blue River in section 4. The valleys of the streams are from a quarter of a mile to a mile in breadth of cultivable land, which includes the alluvial, the terrace above the alluvial, and so much of the lower slopes of the bluffs as is not excessively steep or forbiddingly rocky. Along some of the affluents, valleys-or coulees-open out in similar fashion, but these are usually narrower, with a larger proportion of steep lands included within the farms. The ridges are generally narrow, but they have more flat, arable land where the streams flow at greater distances from one another, as in the south and central parts of the town, and less in the north, where they approach one another. There is a broader ridge eastward from Blue River and another westward from the Fennimore. The first connects with Highland in Iowa County, the second with Hickory Ridge in the town of Hickory Grove. These ridges are practically spurs running north from the great Military Ridge prairie, \({ }^{1}\) but they were usually lightly wooded.

Types of Soil.-No soil survey of Grant County has been 12, 18.
published to date. But the survey of Iowa County, where conditions are very similar, throws much light upon the character of the soils in adjacent Grant County towns. The prevailing type of upland, or ridge, soil is the Knox silt loam, described as a "light brown or grayish friable silt loam having a soft, floury feel."2 Below the surface soil is a clayey loam. This type is largely of wind-borne origin (loess). It is a dependable soil for cropping, producing all of the cereals, also roots and vegetables, clover, and alfalfa. From the lower, gentle slopes of the bluffs down into the valleys, to the line of the terrace bounding the alluvial, the prevailing type is the Lintonia silt loam. This soil is similar in texture and composition to the Knox silt loam from which, by the process of erosion and deposition, it has been in part derived. There is mingled with it, however, in many places in Castle Rock sandy detritus from the St . Peter and upper Cambrian strata, cut into by \({ }^{2}\) Wisconsin Geological and
Natural History Survey, Bulletin No. 30, Soil Series No. 4, tin No. So, Soin Sories County,
Soil Survey of Io
Wisconsin (Madison, 1914), 15 .


Fig. 7. Topographic Map, Towns of Eagle, Orion, Highland, Pulaski, Castla Rock, and Muscoda
Reproduced from United States Geological Survey Richland Center Quadrangle
the erosion process which formed the valleys. The distinctly alluvial floors are, as in Iowa County, covered with Wabash silt loam and Wabash loam deposited by the rivers. These are mucky in the damper portions, and contain also in spots sand, gravel, and other material derived more directly from the eroding uplands. But the basis of all these soils is limestone. The valleys are well drained by nature, the only standing water being in shallow sloughs, which are easily drained off into the streams. They are especially noted for their abundant production of grasses.

Timber.-The lands of township 7, range 1 west, when surveyed in 1833 by Sylvester Sibley, were described, generally, as "thinly timbered," or "very thinly timbered," with oak. The surveyor found no heavily wooded districts, and the uplands particularly were almost destitute of timber. The valleys had the character of oak openings, the annual fires of the Indians merely keeping the underbrush cleared away there, while on the windy uplands they often swept everything clean, though in places the ridges also contained oak openings.

Beginnings of Settlement.-A glance at the plat of landowners in the town in 1860 will show that the earliest purchases of government land occurred in the years 1836-37 and 1847-50. The total amount entered up to 1850 was very small. The earliest entries, in the thirties, were purely speculative, one being by a territorial judge and one by a surveyor; while those of the forties appear to have been suggested by the possibility of finding lead deposits near the heads of Blue River, a neighborhood in which the Blue River mines figured prominently for a number of years after 1836. The entries of 1850 were, so far as we know, the earliest made by actual settlers in the neighborhood, one of whom, Emanuel Dunston, was undoubtedly the first to establish a home in the upper valley of Blue River, though he lived in the town of Muscoda, not the town of Castle Rock. John Gilleland, a bachelor, who bought forty acres in the valley of Six-Mile Creek in 1850, put up a log house, and raised a crop of corn that year, going to California in 1851, may have been the first settler in the town. \({ }^{3}\)

The movement of settlers which resulted in the agricultural occupation of the Blue River and Fennimore valleys was induced by the survey of the Milwaukee and Mississippi Railway line via Muscoda to Prairie du Chien. From the inception of the project it was known that the railroad would touch the Wisconsin, on which river steamers had been plying as far as Portage (Fort Winnebago) since 183\%. In 1852 Benjamin H . Edgerton, chief engineer of the company, made a preliminary survey of the route from Madison to the Wisconsin and down the valley of that river, and that route was then definitely selected. \({ }^{4}\) Land entries in Castle Rock were numerous in the years 1853 to 1857 , the period during which the road was building through the valley to Prairie du Chien.

\section*{\({ }^{8}\) Letter from Nicolas Orth, August 19, 1922.} See Exhibit of the Milwourkee and Mississippi
Report of B. H. Edgerton, Constructing Engineer.

Agricultural settlers had entered neighboring towns in both Iowa and Grant counties some years earlier, depending for a limited market upon the steamer service at Muscoda and the needs of the mining communities at Highland, Wingville (Montfort), Centerville (the old Blue River mines), etc. Some of these sought out the rich and pleasant valley lands of Blue River and the Fennimore, as soon as assurance of a railroad encouraged men to prepare for raising wheat on a considerable scale. \({ }^{5}\)

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Lands.-Only a few speculative land purchases had been made prior to the beginning of the rapid settlement of the town. Unfortunately, the school lands of the 500,000 -acres grant, of which the state had located 1480 acres in this town, were sold under conditions causing nearly all of them to come into the hands of speculators, who resold these desirable lands to settlers at an advance on the original price of at least 100 per cent. \({ }^{\text {b }}\) The school section also was bid in by speculators, as were various tracts of government lands, though (except in Blue River valley) usually only the leftover tracts remained by a kind of poetic justice "speculator land" for many years, to be used for stock range by the settlers. In some cases, the speculators finally allowed such lands to be sold for taxes.

Progress of Farm Making.-The farms of Castle Rock were in 1860 mainly in the hands of the original entrymen of the land. Owing to the recency of the settlement, they were only well begun at that date; much land was still vacant, and the principal areas occupied were those lying in the two main river valleys, particularly the Fennimore. Much of the ridge land between the rivers remained unclaimed, but east of Blue River toward Highland the uplands were generally in new farms. Only two farms, one in Fennimore valley, the other in Blue River valley, had as much as 100 acres under cultivation. More than one-half the area of the town was as yet outside of farms. \({ }^{7}\) In 1870 the number of farms was 86 , improved acres 4045 , unimproved 9805 - or 13,950 acres within the farms. By 1880 the farms, numbering 112, included 10,652 acres of improved land and 7544 acres unimproved. The averages for the two censuses were: in 1870, 47 acres improved per farm, 114 unimproved; in 1880, 95 improved, 67 unimproved-or 161 acres in the average farm in 1870, and 162 acres in 1880. It is noteworthy that later state censuses show a decrease in the improved acreage, which in 1885 is given as 6405 acres and in 1895 as 7375 acres. This is explained in part by the fact that much land once cultivated, especially in the alluvial areas of the valleys-which were
\({ }^{\circ}\) Mathias Schafer, the writer's father, was a settler in township 8, range 1 east, as early as 1847. He bought school land in section 6, town 7 , range 1 west,
in 1853, and settled there that year. Some of the settlers in the eastern part of in 1853 , and settled there that year. Some of the
the town came first to the mines near Highland.
176. See "Wisconsin's Farm Loan Law," in Wis. Hist. Soc., Proceedings, 1920, 176. \({ }^{7}\) Th
who The exact facts cannot be ascertained from the work of the census taker, who confused the Muscoda and Blue River (Castle Rock) lists inextricably. Only
minute local research can clear the matter up, since the census taker's spelling of names makes identification from the plat impossible in some cases.
subject to periodical overflow-and on the narrow ridges, was later devoted to pasture and hay. In 1905 the improved land amounted to 8152 acres, the unimproved to 14,593 , and there were 111 farms.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-The difficulties surrounding the 1860 census, for this town, are so great, owing to the confusing of names in the Blue River (Castle Rock) and Muscoda lists, that it is futile to try to use the returns for that year except for individual farms which can be identified as belonging to landowners recorded on the plat. In 1870, however, there were no farms of the first class-under 20 acres. There were 3 of 20 to 49 acres, 22 of 50 to 99 acres, 38 of 100 to 174 acres, 21 of 175 to 499 acres, and 2 of 500 and over. The count for 1880 is as follows: none in the first class, 15 in the second, 19 in the third, 39 in the fourth, and 37 in the fifth. Only 2 farms overran the 500-acre limit.

These figures show that the prevailing type of farm, in the period just following the farm making era, was the goodsized farm of 100 to 174 acres, and that the tendency was toward the large farm, 175 to 500 acres, of which type there were 16 more in 1880 than in 1870, while of the next smaller there was 1 more. The increase in small farms, 20 to 49 acres, from 3 in 1870 to 15 in 1880, is accounted for by the recent arrival of a few foreigners, mostly Bohemians, who were passing from the status of farm laborers to that of beginning landowners.

But gross acreage, in a town where uncultivable land is so abundant and so intermingled with cultivable areas, is an imperfect test of agricultural progress. The poorer lands were very cheap; even as late as the middle seventies some of them brought only nominal prices. Any farmer could own hill land who wanted it, for pasture or for wood- since timber grew on the hills very rapidly after the settlement of the country put a stop to fires. So, it is the arable land which must be considered, and by that test only a small proportion of farmers of Castle Rock were in the class of large-scale producers. In 1870, 50 of the 86 farms counted not over 40 acres of improved land, and none of the remaining 36 overran the \(100-\) acre limit, though a considerable number reached it. In 1880 there were 60 farms of 40 acres or less, more than half of the entire number, while 42 contained upwards of 40 but not over, 100 acres, and only 10 had more than 100 acres. These ten were the large farms, and the largest improved acreage in any farm was 200 acres.

General Productions.-The wheat production record of 1860 , as transcribed from the census to the plat, indicated a moderate development by that time in wheat growing. Though the farms were all new-none of them more than six or seven years old-several crops of 500 bushels were made. There was, however, at that date nothing to distinguish Castle Rock as a wheat growing town. In 1869 the average wheat product per farm was 276 bushels, which compares very dis-
advantageously with Bangor, another Driftless Area town, or with Pleasant Springs in Dane County - the first of which had a record of 642 bushels, the second of 586 bushels. Still, Castle Rock stood number eleven in the list of twenty-three towns. In 1879 the average was 187 bushels, and the town's place was number seven in the list of twenty-three. This relatively high standing was due to the doubling of the cultivable area during that decade, and especially to the extension of the area on the ridges-the Knox silt loam soils-and on the lower hill slopes where the soil was Lintonia silt loam. These were the best wheat lands, and when freshly opened were apt to produce a fair crop even under the most adverse conditions. But in five years after 1880 the wheat crop of the town declined 25 per cent, and ten years later it had vanished as a market crop. The maximum wheat production was reported in the census of 1870 , over 23,000 bushels. Other market crops in 1870 were pork, in which it ranked second in the list of twenty-three towns, and beef cattle, in which it stood third. The almost limitless summer range for stock on the unfenced hill lands explains the last item, while the excellence of the alluvial bottoms for the growing of corn made pork raising a profitable industry. There were few sheep, due to a pest of timber wolves and equally destructive dogs. In 1880 the number of swine was 12 per farm, and the number of beef cattle (i. e. cattle other than milch cows) was 5 , a decrease of 1 in ten years. Cows had increased by 1 , and the butter crop had gone up to a respectable figure, though it was still low. In 1885 there were 358 more cattle than in 1880, and it is safe to assume that the increase was largely in cows, for the town was credited with nearly 22,000 pounds of cheese in addition to 18,725 pounds of butter, as against a total dairy product of 19,000 pounds of butter in 1879. The change had been wrought by the cheese factories established for the town in 1881, which revolutionized the agricultural system. Some farmers, instead of running their cows on the hills, now gave up to them the best grass lands of the alluvial bottoms; they weeded out the non-productive cows, buying better ones as far as possible and raising calves from the best producing cows and improved sires to build up the herds. The result is seen in the report for 1895, which shows the town produced in the previous year 61,750 pounds of cheese worth more than \(\$ 5000\), and 23,010 pounds of butter worth \(\$ 3087\). The number of cows at that time was 767. From the beginning of the cheese making era the agricultural prosperity of Castle Rock, so far as the better farms are concerned, has been unquestioned; yet there is so large a proportion of poor farms that the town as a whole has a very low ranking.

Special Productions.-An interesting disclosure of the census is that in 1870 there were 89 working oxen on 86 farms. These beasts were used mostly on the small hill farms, particularly by recent immigrants from Europe. But the small new farms were relatively numerous, and so for a number of years the sight of ox teams working in the fields or
draying on the roads was a fairly common one. By 1880 only 18 oxen were left in the town.

A product which was significant in several respects was clover seed, of which in 1879 the town produced 313 bushels, or nearly 3 bushels per farm. In that item it ranked well, and proved that the farmers were wisely taking steps to restore the fertility of their lands.

There were no forest products sold in 1869. In 1879 nearly every farmer cut some firewood, but only a few sold cordwood from their farms. During the next decade, however, it became customary on some farms to slaughter the fine young oaks which grew so beautifully on the once bare hills, and sell them in the form of railway ties. However, there is much more timber in the town today than was found there by the pioneers in the early 1850's.

Value of Productions.-The value of all farm productions in 1879 was \(\$ 51,586\), or an average per farm of \(\$ 460\). Seventeen of the towns compared were ahead of Castle Rock in this respect, and only 5 were below it. An analysis of the censuses of 1870 and 1880 shows that, according to the former, there were 19 incomes of \(\$ 1000\) and over, the maximum being \(\$ 2700\), with 3 others as high as \(\$ 2000\). Thirty were between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999,21\) between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599\), and 15 between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399\). Only 1 was under \(\$ 200\). The 1880 record shows \(\$ 1500\) as the maximum income, with 1 of \(\$ 1350\) and 6 of \(\$ 1200\), but only 13 over \(\$ 1000\). There were 13 between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999,26\) from \(\$ 400\) to \(\$ 599,41\) from \(\$ 200\) to \(\$ 399\), and 18 of less than \(\$ 200\). One farm reported no income. In other words, two-fifths of all farms were producing less than \(\$ 400\)-a sure sign of agricultural depression and a suggestion that a change of system was inevitable. It was the situation revealed by these figures which explains the exodus around 1880 of small farmers from the town-and from other towns similarly circumstanced. These people went to the Dakotas, to Nebraska, Iowa, even Texas. Some of them, who sold their farms for barely enough to pay off the mortgages, are now wealthy landholders in the prairie regions. Those who remained-usually the owners of the better farms-adjusted their agriculture to the requirements of the new dairying, and prospered; so did also, ultimately, some of those who bought the inferior farms of the emigrants.

In 1904, however, the average farm income in Castle Rock amounted to only \(\$ 582\). Only three towns had a lower average. In 1919 this average had gone up to \(\$ 1393\), but with the inflated prices of that year this actually amounted to probably less than the average of 1904. All the towns studied reported higher average farm incomes in 1919 than Castle Rock. Three towns had a smaller aggregate number of cows, and nine had a smaller average number per farm. Three farms had a smaller average crop income.

Manufactures.-The town of Castle Rock was purely agricultural, but there were for a number of years two grist-mills-one at the hamlet of Castle Rock in section 31, on the

Fennimore, the other near the junction of Six-Mile Creek with Blue River, in section 4. The skilled blacksmith at Castle Rock (John A. Johnson, of Scandinavian birth) performed a service in the way of machinery and tool repairing which approximated that of a well equipped modern machine shop. There was for a time another neighborhood blacksmith on a farm in section 6. Many of the foreigners in the town, though engaged in farming, were skilled mechanics in various lines who occasionally worked at their crafts. \({ }^{8}\)

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches.Castle Rock, in section 31, was the only hamlet in the town. Its business can be summarized in a sentence. It had "Sylvester's mill, Johnson's blacksmith shop, and Van Buren's store." The families of these men, of a millwright, and two or three


Fig. 8. Town of Castle Rock, 1915 After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company
others lived in the vicinity, but even the mill owner and the blacksmith had farms, lived on them, and managed them. There was a post office at Castle Rock, the mail arriving from Boscobel, whence also goods for the store were hauled and whither produce bought at the store, mostly butter and eggs, was transported. \({ }^{9}\) It was the post office which finally gave its name to the town, and the post office was so named from a gigantic pine covered "castle," eroded from the St. Peter formation, which is an arresting object in the picturesque surroundings.
: See History of Agriculture, chap. \(\mathbf{x}\).
: The village was on the land of the mill owner, Daniel R. Sylvester, a native of Maine. He absolutely prohibited the sale of intoxicating liquorss in any buildings
on lots leased by him. When he sold his interesta and rem on lots leased by him. When he sold his interests and removed to Colorado, a
saloon came in, to the serious moral and economic loss of the neighborhood.

The schools of the town have always been of the one-room, one-teacher type. The earliest was opened in a rude log house located in section 6 , probably in the year 1856. Others were added until the number was four, the same as at present. Well remembered teachers of the period 1856 to 1888 were Isaac A. Sabin, a New Yorker; Mathias Schafer, a native of Rhenish-Prussia; Charles Wanek, a native of Bohemia; also Sarah Switzer, Fred Sylvester, and Herbert Johnson, all natives of Wisconsin and all trained in the Platteville Normal School, as was Mr. Wanek. Mr. Schafer was educated in the Gymnasium at Trier (Treves) in Germany, and Mr. Sabin in some eastern school, academy, or college the identity of which has not been ascertained.

Among the Bohemian immigrants to the town were several families of Protestants who, with some of the Germans, maintained a Lutheran church located near the town line in section 4. For a number of years in the 1870's and 1880's the church had a resident pastor, a Bohemian educated in Vienna, who spoke both Bohemian and German, and who was also a practicing physician and a prominent character. He afterwards settled permanently on a farm. Later, preachers have come at stated times, usually once each month, from Chicago. A Catholic church located on section 27 has always been served by priests who officiated regularly in town or village churches located elsewhere. The Norwegians had a church near the hamlet of Castle Rock. Various denominations from time to time used the schoolhouses for holding occasional church services and Sunday-schools. Probably a majority of the farm-
ers were of the Catholic faith, and most of them attended the large and flourishing church at Muscoda or the equally prominent church at Highland.

Population Changes.-The table printed at the end of this section shows that, numerically, Americans and aliens in 1860 were almost equal. But, significantly, the American families numbered 26 and the foreign 59. Ten years later the proportion was 8 to 98 . Then a gradual change occurred. In 1885 there were 21 native families, 115 foreign; in 1895, 52 American, 102 foreign; and in 1920, 101 American and 44 foreign. Castle Rock was practically a community derived from foreign immigrants who at first were German, Bohemian, and Irish, in that order; then Bohemian, Scandinavian, Irish, and German. While most of the inhabitants now are American born, a large majority are of Bohemian stock

The American contingent, though from the first small, was socially and politically important. During many years the leading citizen of the town unquestionably was Daniel R. Sylvester, a native of Maine, who served in the Civil War, earning a captaincy. Afterwards he held many town offices and also represented his district in the state legislature. He was not a skillful politician, however, and his leadership was often challenged successfully, especially since politically he belonged to the minority party in the town, Castle Rock being Democratic. Charles Van Buren, another eastern man, held the town board chairmanship for a series of years, as did also Henry Gore. The division of the foreign element into Ger-
man, Scandinavian, and Bohemian rendered American and Irish control of town affairs easier. In recent years the Bohemians have had things much their own way, though apparently without manifesting any special race consciousness.

As farmers the Germans, who settled there early enough to secure the pick of the lands, were in the lead. One of them (Christopher Dieter) in 1880 was the sole representative of the cattle feeding class, having a herd of 70 steers which he pastured in part and fattened on corn. He raised some of these animals, but bought most of them from the neighbors. Another German had the largest number of swine, 63, while an Irish farmer produced the largest amount of butter. The leadership in securing the cheese factory was taken by an American farmer, and that same farmer (James Black) influenced some of his neighbors to begin breeding up their herds. Germans, Bohemians, Irish, and Norwegians all developed into successful coöperative dairymen.
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\section*{E A G L E}

LCATION.-The town of Eagle, organized in 1853, occupies township 9 north, range 1 west of the fourth principal meridian in Richland County. It is bounded north by Dayton, east by Orion, south by Wisconsin River, which makes the boundary between Eagle and Muscoda (in Grant County), and west by Richwood. From 1868 Muscoda village was reached by bridge over the Wisconsin, whereas previously a ferry was maintained at that place. The village of Orion (once called Richmond) flourished for some years hard by the southeast corner of Eagle, on the same side of the river. Richland City (at one time a smart trading point) lay eight miles farther east, and Richland Center about the same distance northeast over the ridge. Port Andrew, in Richwood, a steamboat landing in early days, was another prime trading point. The building in recent times of the Wisconsin River bridge at Blue River has made that town, located nearly opposite the southwest corner of Eagle, the trade center for a good share of the town. Basswood and Eagle Corners are the principal villages located within the town, though Byrd's Creek, just over the line in Richwood, serves the farmers of Eagle also.

Surface and Drainage.-The town lies in the Driftless Area. It is crossed from north to south by Eagle Creek, which has two main branches (the easternmost of them usually called Hoosier Creek, and the western Mill Creek) and a number of small affluents of each branch. The longer of these (Mill Creek) enters the town in section 6 and flows out through section 36; Hoosier Creek enters at section 26. (For the lesser streams see the plat.) The Richland Center Quadrangle of the United States Topographical Survey covers only the eastern two-thirds of the town (fig. 7). It shows most of that portion to be low, either valley land or terrace, but between the two streams is a ridge which joins at the north the broad upland terminated on the east by the Pine River valley. The portion of the town which lies south and west of Mill Creek valley is largely upland, with, however, a flat stretch near the Wisconsin River. The part of Mill Creek valley which lies within the town is approximately two miles in breadth of cultivable land, including the alluvial, the terrace, and gentler slopes of the bordering bluffs, thus affording opportunity for many excellent farms. Hoosier valley (called Hoosier Hollow) is much narrower and also much shorter. The terrace along the Wisconsin in the southern part of the town is considerably more than a mile in breadth. There are cultivable areas on the ridges also, though these are much restricted.

Types of Soil.-There is no regular soil survey of Richland County. The government surveyor in 1840, Orson

Lyon, pronounced upon the quality of the land along the official survey lines. He found it first-rate in the valleys, sec-ond- and third-rate elsewhere. The reputation of Eagle as a corn producing town suggests that the valley soils must be a very rich Wabash loam or Wabash silt loam, and probably the other soils are analogous to those in Iowa County which the survey described as Knox silt loam on the ridges, and Lintonia silt loam on the terraces and lower hill slopes. Some sand mingled with the soil of the southern part of the town makes it warm and easy to work. Eagle is recognized as one of the best farming towns in the county

Timber.-Unlike the towns of Muscoda and Castle Rock south of the river, Eagle was originally heavily timbered. The surveyor noted, among the kinds of timber, elm, oak, lynn, sugar, ironwood, walnut, aspen, cherry, and ash, aside from the undergrowth. Some small tracts on the hills were "lightly timbered," but in general the land bore a heavy growth which had to be removed before cultivation was possible.

Beginnings of Settlement.-The first land in the town to pass into private hands was the west half of the southwest quarter of section 26, bought by Thomas Jefferson Parish in 1841. This was later the site of Rodolf's Mill. The water power of Eagle Creek, called Mill Creek on account of the mill built there, was the object of the purchase. Parish and Estes built a dam and a sawmill there apparently within a year after entering the land. It was a time when the first impulse of settlement affected the north bank of the Wiscon\(\sin\) in that region. In the beginning it was the timber which attracted settlers. Steamboats plying on the Wisconsin required wood supplies at frequent intervals, and the scarcity of timber on the south side was one reason for establishing wood yards on the north. The lands had recently been surveyed, so that settlers could select claims with reference to the excellence of the land for future cultivation. The removal of the land office to Muscoda in 1842 suggested the development of an important town at that point. Transportation by steamboat was assured, and railway projects, like heaven's lightning, were as liable to strike that region as any other lying so far west. In fact, for several years when the Milwaukee and Mississippi Railway project was in its infancy, the question of route so far as the two banks of the Wisconsin were concerned was left open.

John Coumbe, the first settler of Richland County, established himself near Port Andrew in 1840, having selected his location two years earlier. \({ }^{1} \quad\) The Waters family and Edward Coumbe soon joined him. Esau Johnson also settled there
\({ }^{1}\) See sketch in Wis. Mag. of Hist., vi, 435-443 (June, 1923).
temporarily in 1841, and got out logs to raft down the Mississippi. \({ }^{2}\) Thomas Matthews and Captain John Smith settled at Orion, built the mill dam for Parish, and also established the ferry on the Wisconsin between Muscoda and Orion. Thomas Laws established another ferry higher up the river near the later Richland City. Within three years men were working in the pine timber on upper Pine River at Rockbridge, where a sawmill was built, while others-including Esau Johnson-were operating in the pine forests along the Kickapoo. In a word, the region north of the Wisconsin was the "big woods," and the men who sought it were mostly those who were capable of surviving as woodsmen.

The first settler in Eagle-Matthew Alexander, a Ken-tuckian-took up land in 1840 near the river, where he lumbered and rafted till 1852. Hardin Moore, a bachelor blacksmith, is said to have been the second settler in the town. But these men were "sooners," to use the western phrase. Very few neighbors came in till 1848, 1849, and 1850, when a large number of claims were entered and a smaller number of families actually settled in the town. It was in those years that Hoosier Hollow was occupied by families from Indiana, some of whom were and long remained of the distinctive "Hoosier" type, related to the mountaineers of the Appalachian Highlands. The biographies of early settlers in the town show how generally the families had been inured to frontier conditions before coming to Richland County. \({ }^{3}\) Very few were from the Northeast; more were from Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, and Illinois. Aside from Hoosier Hollow and the lower valley of Mill Creek, the early settlers spread over the terrace along Wisconsin River. All of the lands in the southern tier of sections except state lands were sold in 1845 to 1850 , but not all were occupied in those years. By far the larger number of settlers in the town arrived during the years 1852 to 1857, the railroad building years, though in comparison with Castle Rock, which filled up during the same period, a much larger number of pioneers were on the ground prior to the coming of the railroad. They were engaged in woods work rather than farming.

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Land.-The first of these was the division of the town between smooth, rich bottom land and rough, steep hill land. In every section the hills remained in the government's hands for a number of years after the bottoms were taken up by settlers or by speculators. The amount of speculator land in the town was not large, though some good tracts were entered by men who soon sold to settlers. The state located in this town school
\({ }^{2}\) Narrative of Esau Johnson. MS. in State Historical Library.
\({ }^{3}\) History of Richland County, Wisconsin (Madison, 1906), chap. xvi.
and University lands to the extent of four and a quarter sections (aside from the school section). All of these were in the desirable southwestern portion of the town, and most of them were sold at a higher price than the government charged for Congress land. However, the terms of purchase were advantageous, settlers paying 10 per cent down, and interest at the rate of 7 per cent, \({ }^{4}\) whereas government land had to be paid for in cash.

Progress of Farm Making.-The town of Eagle in 1860 had fewer improved acres in its farms, on the average, than any of the twenty towns compared with it save Newton and Sevastopol. That average was 27 acres, while 82 acres of land remained unimproved in the average farm of 109 acres. No farm in the town had more than 70 acres of improved land, and only one of the 101 farms had that much. In 1870 the number of farms was 158 , the total improved area 6288 , or an average of 39 acres per farm, and the total unimproved 8883, an average of 56 acres. At that census period 3 farms had over 100 acres improved land, the maximum being 140; and 14 from 61 acres to 100 acres improved. Ten years later the farms numbered 196, the improved acres 9954, unimproved 8927, the average being 50 and 45 acres respectively. This put Eagle ahead of Newton, Sevastopol, and Prairie du Chien in the item of improved land, but behind the other nineteen towns. A generation of effort had not subdued the forest. In 1905, according to the state census, Eagle had 156 farms- 14,049 improved acres, and 8218 unimproved, or an average per farm of 90 acres improved and 52 unimproved. This was 1517 more improved acres than the census of 1895 assigned to the town, but inasmuch as that census omitted the schedule for "number of farms," we can only assume they had perhaps ten acres less improved land on the average, unless the number of farms was larger, which is not improbable.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-The several classes of farms, considered with respect to area, in 1860 stood as follows: under 20 acres, none; between 20 and 49, 19; from 50 to 99,39 ; from 100 to 174, 29; and from 175 to 499, 14. Thus the farms were usually of fair to good size. The maximum was 360 acres. In 1870 one farm contained over 500 acres, and two under 20 acres. There were 49 of 20 to 49 acres each, 55 of 50 to 99,41 of 100 to 174 , and 10 of 175 to 499. The big farm, which was owned by C. G. Rodolf, had 956 acres. \({ }^{\circ}\) Ten years later there were 5 diminutive farms (under 20 acres), 38 small farms ( 20 to 49 acres), 75 fairsized farms ( 50 to 99 acres), and 53 good-sized farms ( 100 to 174 acres). The large farms of 175 to 499 acres numbered 24, and one overran that limit, reaching 588 acres. The big farm was owned by James Lucas. Thus the tendency was toward the good-sized and large farms.
\({ }^{\text {4 }}\) In case of " 500,000 -acres" lands, only the interest was paid, the purchase being on a credit of thirty years.

But again, as in the case of Castle Rock, Bangor, and other Driftless Area towns, it is necessary to take account of land actually cultivable in order to determine the agricultural status of the people. In 1860 there were 88 farms having 40 acres or less of cultivated land; in 1870 there were 117 farms in that class; and in 1880, 96. In the class of 41 to 60 acres of arable there were, at the three periods, 12,24 , and 38 ; of 61 to 100 acres, 1,14 , and 52 ; and over 100 acres, 0,3 , and 10 . Small farms grew fewer, others more numerous.

General Productions.-The census data inscribed on the plat show that in 1859 William Recob raised on 50 acres of arable land, located in Hoosier Hollow, 200 bushels of wheat; and Samuel B. Gault, in upper Mill Creek valley, raised 200 bushels on a farm having 35 acres of improved land. These were the maximum crops at that time. The 1870 census records, for the whole town, a wheat production of 17,887 bushels, which is 113 bushels per farm on the average. This placed Eagle as a wheat producer number eighteen among the twenty-three towns compared. Ten years later fifteen of the twenty-three towns were below Eagle in that item, due to the gradual opening of new lands and the persistence in wheat growing on the fresh lands. In 1884 Eagle was credited with 1141 acres of wheat yielding 16,602 bushels or 14.5 bushels per acre. The area was 509 acres less than in 1879, and the product less than half as great. The yield per acre was somewhat larger. In 1894 the acreage and the yield were practically the same as in 1884, but in 1904 there was only 58 acres of wheat grown in the town. Thus it appears wheat growing, on a commercial scale, continued in Eagle about a decade longer than in Castle Rock, a circumstance which was probably due to the later clearing of the ridge lands and to the convenient market for wheat at the mill located within the town. \({ }^{6}\)

However, Eagle was preëminently a corn growing region rather than a wheat area. Her corn fields have long been famous, and in 1879, as the production chart shows, her crop was not only among the largest in the aggregate, but showed one of the highest yields per acre. In 1859 only three of the towns, all of them in the Driftless Area, exceeded Eagle in amount grown per farm. In 1869 she stood number eight; in 1879 two towns, Sugar Creek and Plymouth, were above Eagle in average production of corn per farm, and only five had a higher farm average of swine. The rearing of cattle under the conditions of open pasturage was carried on, in the heavily forested towns, at a disadvantage as against towns having similar amounts of uncultivated land which was not heavily wooded. In Eagle the number of stock cattle was smaller than in the other Driftless Area towns except Orion. Dairying, also, was slow to acquire momentum, but developed rapidly after the factory system began. As late as 1880 there were only 549 milch cows in the town, and the butter yield, which in 1869 was 15,430 pounds from 317 cows, had grown
- Rodolf's mill, in section 26.
to only 39,526 pounds. But the state census records for Eagle in 1894 a cheese product amounting to 268,430 pounds, in addition to 38,810 pounds of butter. Since the farmers of Eagle were growing as much wheat as ever, together with huge crops of both corn and oats, and since the pork yield was nearly twice what it had been in 1879, we have in these figures evidence of genuine agricultural prosperity which has continued unbroken to the present.

Special Productions.-When the process of farm making commenced in Eagle, there was in the town an exceptionally large number of mature sugar-maple trees ready to yield up their toothsome product. That the maple was widely distributed over the town is shown by the fact that in 1859, 46 of the 101 farms made maple sugar. That town was second only to Sevastopol in the average amount per farm which it produced, and the aggregate was more than twice as much as in Sevastopol. In 1869 Eagle stood first in average per farm. Ten years later the total was only 160 pounds. The "sugar bush" was disappearing.

Forest products, it may be inferred, were important for many years. The sawmills took most of the better timber cut by the settlers in their land clearing operations. Some of these mills continued to run as late as 1890, sawing oak and maple flooring, oak dimension stuff, elm sheathing, basswood siding, walnut, basswood, and maple finishing lumber for houses, together with wagon stuff and some furniture stock. In the early days asheries were common and cordwood was sold when possible, but it was usually a drug on the market. One form of forest product which became important after a few years consisted of stave timber and hoop poles. These were sold at the stave and barrel factory established at Muscoda. In 1869 forest products of all kinds were made to the value of more than \(\$ 13,000\), and as late as 1879 the amount exceeded \(\$ 6600\). By that time many railroad ties were included in the output, but lumber continued to be a staple.

Value of Productions.-In 1869 the value of all farm productions in the town was \(\$ 65,639\), which is equivalent to \(\$ 421\) per farm on the average. Ten years later the average per farm was \(\$ 400\), almost the lowest of the towns compared. At the first period there were 6 incomes of \(\$ 1000\) or over, the maximum being \(\$ 3114\) (made out of hops), another \(\$ 2016\), the rest under \(\$ 1201\). Thirty were between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999,31\) between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599\), and 54 between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399\). There were 29 of the extremely inadequate incomes of less than \(\$ 200\). Eight farms reported no incomes. In 1879 the maximum income was \(\$ 1892\), made largely from wheat, and there were 12 others of \(\$ 1000\) or more. There were 34 of the second class ( \(\$ 600\) to \(\$ 999\) ), 39 of the third class ( \(\$ 400\) to \(\$ 599\) ), and 49 of the fourth class ( \(\$ 200\) to \(\$ 399\) ). The incomes falling below \(\$ 200\) rose to the alarming total of 58 , more than one-fourth of the whole. This and the next highest class account for more than one-half of the farms,
which argues a state of severe agricultural depression. Three farms reported no incomes.

According to the census of 1905 the average farm income for Eagle for 1904 had gone up to \(\$ 887\), and this again had risen by 1919 to an average of \(\$ 2526\) for that year. Even allowing for the high prices of this last period, there is indication of increased prosperity and a condition very different from the depression shown by the low averages of 1869 and 1879. Only five of the towns studied exceeded Eagle in the average value of dairy products per farm in 1919.


Fig. 9. Town of Eagle, 1915 After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company

Manufactures.-The Parish sawmill, erected about 1842, was the pioneer of many sawmills, all small, which aided in the disposal of the heavy forest growth as the settlers cleared their lands. The gristmill erected on the site of the first sawmill in 1857 by Charles G. Rodolf, who was succeeded by his son F. G. Rodolf, had a career of considerable distinction nearly to the end of the century, as a plant for the manufacture of flour. A post office, Balmoral, was established at the mill, and a mercantile trade also was usually carried on there. McClintock's steam sawmill on upper Hoosier Creek manufactured lumber well into the eighties -perhaps longer.

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches. According to the town plat of 1874, Eagle Corners in sections 33 and 28 had a post office (established in 1870), as had

Basswood (established in 1869) in sections 9 and 16. On the next plat, 1895, Balmoral post office appears. Opposite the southeast corner of the town was the village of Orion, and at the western boundary Byrd's Creek. Basswood and Eagle Corners were the only considerable villages within the town. Educationally Eagle was supplied by eight or nine district schools. There are eight districts at present, and up to date none of the schools has become a graded or high school. Nevertheless, not only in pioneer days but in more recent times, the communities had some notable teachers, among whom may be mentioned Frank Gile, J. M. Ferebee, Charles Cornwall, Charles R. Pickering, Rose Hamilton, and Joseph M. Cubela-most of whom were normal-trained teachers from Platteville. Mr. Ferebee became county superintendent of Richland County. There was a Presbyterian church in section 24, Hoosier Hollow, and a United Brethren church higher up the valley, in section 12. Another United Brethren church, in section 5, served upper Mill Creek valley, while a Union church was located near Basswood, and church and Sunday-school services were also held at Eagle Corners. \({ }^{7}\) All churches indicated on the plat represent Protestantism, which emphasizes the striking predominance of the native American stock in this town. Tradition asserts that for many years religious views and conditions were distinctly of the frontier type.

Population Changes.-The population was American to begin with. In 1860 there were 128 families in the town, of which 108 were American and only 20 foreign. There were 11 unattached Americans. Of the 139 heads of families and single individuals, 31 gave Ohio as their place of birth, 27 Indiana, 12 each Pennsylvania and Virginia, 9 Kentucky, 7 New York, and 4 Illinois. Other states represented by as many as \(\mathbf{3}\) were Missouri and North Carolina, while Massachusetts, New Jersey, Tennessee, and Maryland had 2 each, and several others 1 each. The proportion of foreign families was slightly larger in 1870, but it was smaller in 1885, and in 1920 it became once more about what it was in 1860. There has been emigration from Eagle as from other towns; yet, while we have no comparative statistics to prove it, the evidence of the land ownership plats is that the original population has been unusually persistent.

This town, on the side of social history, shows more of the characteristics of the older frontier in southern Indiana and Ohio, and in Kentucky, than of the communities established in the southeastern portions of Wisconsin or those made up so largely of foreigners, which were planted along the lake shore north of Milwaukee. Some of the characters, both good and bad, in Eggleston's Hoosier Schoolmaster and his Circuit Rider might have been drawn from Eagle quite as well as from Posey County, Indiana. And, on the other hand, the unmodified "Yankee" was conspicuous on account of his rarity, most men of eastern lineage and birth having derived
\({ }^{\text {T}}\) See Plat Book of Richland County, Wisconsin (Minneapolis, Minn., 1895).
their training and life habit from some western community rather than from "the land of steady habits."
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\hline 1920 & \({ }_{929}\) & 813 & 85 & 898 & & & & & 14 & \({ }_{31}^{42}\) & 187 & 17 & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
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\section*{SOCIAL CONDITIONS IN EAGLE}

\section*{J. W. Pickering}

I was born October 1, 1852, within ten miles of Racine, Wisconsin. My father, John Pickering, having entered 320 acres of land in sections 8 and 9 in 1849, drove by wagon in the late fall of 1852 and built a crude log cabin of one room near the southeast corner of section 9, town of Eagle. I can remember as far back as the summer of 1856 , when there was only about twenty acres of cleared land. It was a very slow process clearing a farm and building a home in those primeval forests, especially as very few had any capital when they first settled in the northern part of the township. I recall seeing in my boyhood days practically all the first cabins built in Bethe school district number one. They were built of round logs, the cracks filled with chinks and daubed with mud to keep out the cold, and the roofs covered with clapboards. In some the stove pipe went through the roof; many had \(\log\) fireplaces with chimneys built of round sticks and daubed inside and out with mud. No cabin had more than two or three small windows. If there was a spring on the land, the log cabin was built near it to save the expense of digging a well. There was a great deal of malaria along the banks of Mill Creek and also rheumatism to afflict the first settlers, who were unable to work much of the time on account of sickness. However, health conditions improved as the clearings were enlarged and most of the crude log cabins were superseded by hewed \(\log\) houses of larger size, with two or more rooms and in some cases an "upstairs," while a few settlers replaced the log cabins with frame structures. My father built in the summer of 1857 the first frame house in Bethel school district number one.

Most districts built their first schoolhouses to match the \(\log\) cabins. I taught in one of them built in the fifties, as late as the winter of 1875 and '76. It was in the northeast section of Eagle, at the upper end of Hoosier Hollow. The valley there being very narrow, the farms were small and poor. The schoolhouse was built of round logs daubed with mud. The seats, six in number, were about ten feet long and were made of slabs-that is, the first board sawed from the log. These slabs had two two-inch holes bored in each end, in which were inserted the legs of the benches. The seats had no
\({ }^{1}\) The interesting items here presented are contained in a letter written by Mr. Pickering from Pasadena, California, September 21, 1922 .
backs. There was no desk in the room, except a small one for the teacher. A board about twelve inches wide was fastened to the wall; by turning around on the seat the elder pupils who sat next to the wall could practice penmanship. My home district was an exception to the rule. The first schoolhouse there was built of hewed oak timber of the best quality, the cracks plastered with lime mortar. There were four large desks with shelves for books for the elder pupils, and good seats with backs to them for the younger scholars. This schoolhouse was destroyed by fire in the summer of 1865 .

The first school in Bethel district number one, town of Eagle, was taught by Newton Wells in the winter of 1856-5\%. The following winter it was taught by a Mr. Baker and in 1858-59 by John Lewis, who made school teaching his life occupation and was known all over Richland County in the early days for his peculiar habit of visiting from house to house. The Bethel school was taught in \(1859-60\) by DeWitt Daugherty. In after years Mr. Daugherty served for many terms as township assessor for Eagle. The Bethel school was taught in the winter 1860-61 by Amy McMurtry. In 1861 a summer session of school was held for the first time by Miss McMurtry, and from this time forward we had six or seven months of school a year. Miss McMurtry taught one month of the winter term of 1861-62. The patrons of the school became dissatisfied and she was suspended by the county superintendent. During the summer sessions of 1862 and 1863 C. E. Livingston was the teacher. The winter school of 1862-63 was taught by Harry Plowman. Mr. Livingston taught the winter term of 1863 until Christmas. He was an excellent teacher, but his one bad habit, drink, resulted in his being killed in a drunken orgie at Port Andrew at that time. The rest of the winter term 1863-64 was taught by Thomas Rummery, who also taught the following winter. The winter of 1864-65 brought the close of the Civil War, which had very much retarded the clearing of new lands and the erection of new buildings. Bethel school district alone had furnished twelve soldiers, of whom Joshua Johns and T. Standish had died in battle, and a Mr. Smith and George Howe had died of sickness.

During the Civil War the inhabitants of the town of Eagle were almost self-sustaining. Through those trying times there was enough land cleared to produce all the corn, wheat, and hay needed for home use. Pasturage was free; the cattle and hogs ranged through the summer on the uncleared land which was not fenced. Almost every family made its own sugar and molasses from the maple trees; and to help out, sorghum was grown and made into molasses. Nearly every farmer kept a few sheep. The wool was carded at a mill on Ash Creek [town of Orion] and most families spun their carded wool into yarn on the old-fashioned spinning-wheel. Some had their yarn
woven into cloth at the mill on Ash Creek; others had their own looms and wove their own cloth, dyeing it with butternut bark. Parched wheat or rye was substituted for coffee. Hides were tanned at a tannery near Richland Center, and some families made their own boots and shoes. There were no luxuries in those days, many families living on two meals a day in the winter and many children having no noonday lunch at school. Wood choppings and corn huskings were held for the benefit of soldiers' widows and orphans. When all were poor, there developed a kind of camaraderie to help one another in sickness and distress, which is wanting now. While Bethel school district, I think, furnished more than its quota of soldiers for the war, the township as a whole did not. Those of draft age who did not wish to enlist, and who wished to avoid the draft, would call a town meeting and levy a tax on the taxable property of the township. The money thus raised was used to give a bounty to those willing to enlist, so that a general draft was avoided. This was a manifest injustice to the wives and widows of those who had volunteered their services for the Union. The women had no vote, neither did the soldiers in the ranks. How impossible such a scheme would be under our present laws!

One of the social features in early days was the spelling school held in the winter at the schoolhouse. Books were not plentiful, so two or three pupils would read from the same book. Reading and spelling are the only subjects I can remember being taught the first four years. In that time the only book I had was Webster's Elementary Speller. Small wonder that I became an adept in spelling at seven years of age. It was lots of fun to match the good spellers of one school district against those of another, and sometimes it was difficult to down some of the best spellers. As I look back I can see the teacher with spelling-book in one hand, a candle in the other (no kerosene lamps or electric lights in those days), hunting for the difficult words. Many of the pioneers had but little education and could neither multiply nor add a column of figures. I recall that Mr. Livingston started a night school to teach adults the rudiments of arithmetic.

When first organized, Bethel school district comprised sections \(3,4,9\), and 10 , the west half of section 15 , and also sections 16 and 17. This fact perhaps accounts for the large size and good equipment of our first schoolhouse. There was also such an influx of new settlers (many of them with large families) between 1853 and 1858, that I feel sure Bethel school district in 1859 (after sections 16 and 17 had been taken, with other sections, to form a new school dis-trict-named Basswood, because the first schoolhouse was built of basswood logs) contained a greater number of families and more children of school age than it has at any subsequent date.

In the early days schoolhouses were almost invariably used for church services as well as for political speeches. Very soon after the erection of Bethel schoolhouse regular church services were instituted by the Methodist church. A Sunday-school was also started, of which Henry Miller was superintendent. He was also the class leader of the church. Mr. Miller was an enthusiastic church member; in coöperation with other Methodists he cleared off the brush and erected a number of \(\log\) cabins and also a large forum of logs for the speakers' stand, for a camp-meeting ground. This was on high land near a large spring of pure water on section 10. On this spot camp meetings attended by hundreds from far and near were held yearly in the month of August from 1857 to the outbreak of the Civil War. The last service I remember on the camp ground was the patriotic funeral for Joshua Johns, who was killed at the battle of Antietam. The Methodist church had a varying fortune from its beginning in Bethel; first advancing, then receding, until about 1879 services were discontinued. Among the early ministers were a Mr. Knapp, a Mr. McMillan, and a Mr. Sackett. The people who settled in Hoosier Hollow were largely of the Presbyterian faith, and erected at an early date a frame church known as the Pleasant Hill Church. Among its first pastors were Mr. Leonard, Adam Pinkerton, Mr. Murphy, and Mr. Sparrow.

Much valuable timber was burned in the first clearings in Eagle town. A sawmill was erected in section 9 on Mill Creek in 1855 or 1856. This soon burned and a second mill was built by Jacob Troxel. This mill supplied the market with lumber for building, and some of it was hauled to and rafted down the Wisconsin to find a market. Troxel sold the mill to McClure, and in 1861 McClure sold it to Joseph Stanley. Mr. Stanley operated the sawmill until the flood of June, 1890, took the dam out completely. Holiday Peters erected in 1878 a steam sawmill about one-half mile south of the Stanley mill, and cut a large amount of logs into lumber. In the early sixties a man by the name of Pilling built a steam sawmill on the banks of the Wisconsin River due south from Eagle Corners, and rafted his surplus lumber down the river. From 1860 to 1870 or later much cordwood was cut and hauled to Muscoda.

Until 1869 the northern half of the township was without mail facilities. That winter (1868-69) R. W. Peters and his brother-inlaw built a small store at what is now known as Basswood, and a post office was established there. For many years Mr. Peters did a large business in railroad ties, the product being rafted down the Wiscon\(\sin\) River to a market. At first (1862) the railroad would buy nothing but number one white or burr oak ties; ten years later they would buy almost anything but basswood or maple. For ten years or more after 1870 hickory hoop poles were cut, and they sold well.
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\section*{EMPIRE}

LOCATION.-The town of Empire, organized separately from Taycheedah in 1851, embraces thirty sections of land in township 15, range 18 east of the fourth principal meridian in Fond du Lac County. The northern tier, sections 1 to 6 of the township, is still included in the town of Taycheedah, of which the entire township once formed a part. No part of Empire is at a greater distance than ten miles from Fond du Lac city, and those farmers living in the northwestern and western portions have a haul of from two to five miles only. Empire is bounded north by Taycheedah, east by Forest, south by Eden, and west by Fond du Lac. The nearest lake harbor is Sheboygan, about thirty miles, reached from 1852 by means of a plank road.

Surface and Drainage.-The town of Empire shows considerable diversity in surface features. The outstanding geographical feature is the ridge or "ledge" of Niagara limestone. This ledge, after paralleling the curves of the shore of


Fig. 10. Topographic Map, Town of Empire
Reproduced from United States Geological Survey Fond du Lac Quadrangle
Lake Winnebago, trends almost due south from the end of the lake through the state, forming the western escarpment of the Niagara outcrop. In Empire it occupies a considerable fraction of the two western ranges of sections, though the flat lands of the Fond du Lac lake-bed plain constitute the actual western fringe in sections 7, 18, 19, 30, and 31. A glacial marsh occupies portions of the two easternmost ranges of sections, and there are slight depressions elsewhere. The topographic chart of the Fond du Lac Quadrangle, which includes the northern half of the town, shows lowlands and uplands intermingled though the difference in elevation of the two types of land is slight. The roads, wherever possible, follow the uplands. Taycheedah Creek has its sources in Empire and flows northwest, breaking through the ledge in its course toward Winnebago Lake, while branches of Sheboy-
gan River, heading near Taycheedah Creek, flow in the opposite direction. The ledge abounds in fine springs, and many springs occur elsewhere in the town. Lake de Neveu, one of the sources of de Neveu Creek, lies in sections 30 and 31.

Types of Soil.-Three main types of soil, closely related to surface features, prevail in the town. First, the well drained or fairly well drained undulating to hilly lands represent the Miami silt type of soil, of which there is a large and almost continuous body lying just east of the ridge, and smaller discontinuous patches intermingled with Miami gravelly loam and with beds of peat in other portions. Second, the Miami gravelly loam, corresponding to the rougher, higher lands, covers the moraine belt in the western portion of the town together with many areas, some of them occupying the equivalent of half a section, which are distributed unevenly through the remainder of the town. The areas of peat represent the marshes. They are frequently bordered by narrow strips of Clyde clay loam. The Poygan clay and Superior clay loam are soils characteristic of the level lacustrine lands which cover the town of Fond du Lac and extend to the limestone ridge in Empire. \({ }^{1}\) Both are strong, productive soils requiring careful cultivation to prevent "baking." Of the others, the Miami silt is the favored variety of soil, with Miami gravelly loam a second choice and peat a very undesirable type.

Timber.-The local historians speak of the southeastern portion of Empire as heavily timbered. \({ }^{2}\) This statement is not warranted by the notes of the United States surveyor N. W. King, who ran the section lines in this township in 1835. He describes most portions as lightly timbered, thinly timbered, etc. Some lines ran through oak openings, and there was also some prairie, both wet and dry. On the whole, we must regard Empire as a territory easy to clear, not a wooded town like Eagle, or like Franklin.

Beginnings of Settlement.-In Empire the first land purchases do not represent the first homes. The earliest recorded entries were made in 1836. These were in sections 18 and 17, and took the entire south half of those two sections, together with the west half of the northwest quarter of \(\mathbf{1 7}\). Other entries in 1837 took the remainder of these sections (except the east half of the northeast quarter of 17) and also the whole of 7 , the north half of 19 , and half of the southwest quarter of 31 . No other lands were taken prior to 1841, few pieces before 1843, and the bulk of the sections sold in
\({ }^{1}\) See Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survev, Bulletin No. 37 ,
Soil Series No. 7, Soil Surveev of Fond du Lual Country Wisconsin (Madison, 1914). Soil Series No. 7, Soil Survey of Fond du Lac County, Wisconsin (Madison, 1914).
\({ }_{2}\) History of Fond due Lac County, Wisconsin (Chicago, 1880), 744

1848 and 1849. A study of the early entries in relation to the topographic chart shows that they were taken for the purpose of controlling possible mill sites on Taycheedah Creek and de Neveu Creek. James D. Doty was one of the most generous purchasers-a fact which, in itself, establishes the speculative character of these entries. The three mill sites ultimately developed in the town were all included among the entries of 1836 and 1837.

The record of land entries indicates that in the history of its settlement the town of Empire represents fairly well the history of settlement in the county. Census returns for Fond du Lac County, up to 1850, were as follows: in 1836, 2 ; in 1840, 139 ; in 1842, 295; in 1846, 3544 ; in 1847, 7459 ; in 1850, 14,510. Rapid progress in settlement appears to have begun about 1846. \({ }^{3}\) That was the time when the Fond du Lac region began actively to develop its transportation facilities. In December, 1846, a Fox River improvement convention was held at Fond du Lac to promote the opening of the routes by Green Bay and by the Wisconsin and Mississippi rivers. \({ }^{4}\) Immediately an alternative plan was suggested, that of a railroad to Sheboygan, and the legislature in February following passed a bill authorizing the organization of the Sheboygan and Fond du Lac Railroad (which, however, was not completed till 1869). About the same time was begun the movement to build a plank road from Sheboygan to Fond du Lac, a work which was completed in 1852.5 It accommodated the farmers of Empire even before its completion, and the project itself, as soon as it was broached, contributed to the activity in land purchasing. The port of Sheboygan was only thirty miles from the east line of Empire, and, with a good road in prospect, the lightly timbered lands of that town were far more attractive to settlers than were the heavily wooded lands nearer the lake.

The first permanent settlers were Gustave de Neveu, A. T. Denniston, and the La Bordes in 1839. \({ }^{\text {b }}\) The early settlers were largely Americans from the northeastern states, but German, Irish, and English immigrants came in rapidly. The 1850 record is unavailable, being combined with that of Taycheedah, but the census of 1860 shows 519 individual Americans to 290 of foreign birth, and 57 American families to 86 foreign families. A goodly number of the natives were American born children of foreign parents. There were 83 Germans, 51 English, and 105 Irish, as against 259 natives of Wisconsin and 260 of other states, New York having fur-
\({ }^{3}\) The' Fond du Lac Whig, Apr. 8, 1847, says: "Within three years has sprung up, as if by magic, our thrivng village of 400 inhabitants, where three years ago stood a solitary log house."
F Fond du Lac Whig, Dec. 14 and Dec. 24, 1846.
" "Simon Pure" (see Fond du Lac Whig, Dec. 31, 1846) advocated the project. For the bill itself, see Lawes of Wisconsin Territory, 1847, p. 23. For analysis of bill, see B. H. Meyer, "Wisconsin Railroad Legislation," in Wis. Hist. Colls., xiv, \({ }^{295}\) History of Fond du Lac County (1880), 423.
nished 159 of them. Scotland was represented by 26 and Canada by 14 .

One of the Fond du Lac County histories (1880) presents sketches of twelve farmers of Empire who came to the town prior to 1860. The list is headed by Gustave de Neveu, son of a French soldier of the American Revolution. De Neveu was not only the first settler in Empire, but the first permanent settler in Fond du Lac County. \({ }^{7}\) He was a well educated man, a lover of books and of art, and was a prominent citizen who at one time was president of the county agricultural society. Of the others, seven were natives of New York, three of England, and one of Ireland. One of the English settlers had been a farm laborer in England. Of John Meiklejohn, who came in 1846, it is said he was "among the first settlers of Empire," and David Lyons, who came in 1844, was "the first" to settle on the ledge. D. P. Giltner, who settled in section 4 in 1848, kept one of the early taverns, at which was held the first railroad meeting in Fond du Lac County, apparently in behalf of the Sheboygan and Fond du Lac Railroad.

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Land.Apart from the mill site speculative purchases already mentioned, there is no positive evidence of speculative intent in the original entries of land, though it goes without saying that some people purchased in the hope of selling again at an advance. No very large quantity of land went to a single person, but some of the original entrymen who became settlers are known to have sold parts of their holdings to other settlers. It seems probable that most of such land speculation as there was, assumed that character.

Differences in quality of the lands were less sharp than in most of the towns. Aside from the ledge there were no hills of serious consequence, and the marshes were so interspersed, in small tracts usually, among the higher lands, that most of the wet areas were taken with the others, doubtless for the hay they promised. In a few cases entry dates show that pieces of wet land were left over for several years. The ledge was taken rather earlier than the rest, due doubtless to its more generally timbered condition, and to its convenient springs. \({ }^{8}\)

Progress of Farm Making.-The town of Empire, in 1860, had 119 farms containing 9219 acres of improved land and 7135 acres unimproved, which is an average per farm of 77 improved and 59 unimproved acres. These totals show that nearly all of the land was included in the farms and also that the progress of tillage, since the first settlement, had been fairly rapid. There were several large farms (see plat), one of them having 730 acres improved, one 450, another 320. Several had 200 acres. Ten years later the farms, numbering 151, included 11,872 improved acres and 6594 unimproved, or 78 and 43 acres respectively per farm on the aver-

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{7}\) See account of de Neveu in accompanying sketch of Empire pioneers.
\({ }^{2}\) History of Fond du Lac County (1880), 744, 1013.
}
age. This was changed in 1880 to 86 and 25 acres. At that time the farms numbered 167 , improved land 14,434 acres, unimproved 4327 acres. In 1860 the farms contained on the average 136 acres; in 1870,121 ; and in 1880,111 . The state census of 1905 assigned to Empire 152 farms, 15 less than in 1880, embracing an aggregate of 19,117 acres, of which 15,724 was improved land, 3393 unimproved.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-In 1860 there was 1 farm with less than 20 acres, 4 with more than 500 acres. From 20 to 49 acres there were 25 ; from 50 to 99 acres, 32 ; from 100 to 174 acres, 38 ; and from 175 to 499, 19 The next census, 1870, showed 3 under 20 acres, 23 from 20 to 49,51 from 50 to 99,47 from 100 to 174, 26 from 175 to 500. There was one over 500 acres. That situation remained nearly unchanged in 1880, the second, fourth, and last classes being the same, the first 4 instead of 3 , the third 63 instead of 51 , and the fifth 29 instead of 26 . The increase in number of farms, from 1860 to 1870 , was 32 . Since the number in class six decreased 3 and the number in class two decreased 2 , the total additions to the other four classes were 37. Of that number class one received 2 , class three received 19 , class four, 9 , and class five, 7. Thus the greatest gain was in class three, farms of 50 to 99 acres in area. During the next decade the farms increased in number by 16 and no class lost, so that number must be added to classes one, three, and five, classes two, four, and six remaining unchanged. Class one received 1, class three, 12, and class five, 3. Thus, once more, it was the moderate-sized farm, of 50 to 99 acres, which was becoming the most common type, though the good-sized farm type, 100 to 174 acres, was more than holding its own, while the number of large farms, 175 to 500 acres, was not growing less.

General Productions.-The wheat crop in 1859 aggregated 36,895 bushels from farms having an aggregate of 9219 acres of improved land. That was a moderately good record, better than any of the lake shore towns showed, but less than the towns in Walworth, Dane, Columbia, Rock, and Iowa counties produced at the same period. In 1869 only four towns out of twenty-three surpassed Empire in aggregate amount of wheat grown, three surpassed her in the average amount per farm, and three in production from given units of improved land. Wheat as a farm crop held its own in Empire during the next decade, as indicated by the production in 1879 of 62,893 bushels from 4309 acres, which gives a yield of 14.3 bushels per acre. With one exception-Bangor-Empire grew more wheat per farm than any other of the twenty-three towns, and Bangor's average farm planting was 40 acres, compared with 25 acres in Empire. The prairie towns which so far surpassed her ten years earlier were far behind, and only the heavily wooded towns near the lake, and the Driftless Area towns, obtained results comparable with those obtained in Empire.

From early times Empire was a large producer of hay, and in 1860, when the farms numbered 119, the count of sheep in that town was 1426 as against 1504 in Brookfield, where the farms numbered 247, and 1711 in Mount Pleasant, which had 252 farms. Only the two Walworth County towns, Whitewater and Sugar Creek, had more sheep per farm than Empire. In cattle, also, Empire stood high, but she was low in swine, the growing of corn not having attained much prominence (only 24 bushels per farm). Ten years later Empire was again third in sheep per farm, Sugar Creek and Whitewater being ahead; and only Whitewater, Mount Pleasant, and Plymouth surpassed her in amount of wool per head of sheep, showing that her sheep were highly improved, with doubtless a high proportion of purebred merinos. In 1880 Empire stood first in number of sheep per farm, having 28. As a town it ranked high in cattle and in butter both in 1870 and in 1880, but low in pork as previously. The 1895 state census credits Empire with 174,865 pounds of cheese and 56,720 pounds of butter, while the 1905 census assigns to her 141,514 gallons of milk, 53,240 pounds of butter, and 200,400 pounds of cheese. There were, at the latter date, five cheese factories in the town whose combined output was 344,939 pounds of cheese. Thus Empire had graduated, agriculturally, into a position of prominence among the dairying towns of the state.

Special Productions.-No doubt one must regard sheep as the agricultural specialty in Empire from the 1850's into the present century. As late as 1895 the town produced more than 25,000 pounds of wool, and ten years later 15,000 pounds. In 1860 a total of 54 out of 119 farms kept sheep, the largest flock being that of Lyman H. Philipps- \(\mathbf{3 8 4}\) head -with Lyman Moore second- 94 head. Ten years later 103 of the 151 farms kept sheep. In 1880 the proportion was very much smaller, though some good-sized flocks remained. The largest flocks, at all three periods, were in the moraine area, the rough land known as the ledge in the western third of the town. There is no doubt that the character of the land contributed greatly to the success of sheep raising in this town, as it did in Whitewater and elsewhere, and it also caused the farmers to persist in sheep raising after that business had been given up on the richer, more easily cultivable prairie land. Those who were heavily interested in the business in 1860, and who may therefore be regarded as its founders, were all New York men, save two who were from Ireland.

Value of Productions.-The production record for the census of 1870 is remarkable in that Empire's 151 farms averaged \(\$ 1003\) in value of products. Only 4 incomes were less than \(\$ 200\), and 17 from \(\$ 200\) to \(\$ 399\). On the other hand, 33 were between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599,47\) between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999\), and 50 over \(\$ 1000\). Ten of the last class overran the \(\$ 2000\) limit. Of these, 5 were above \(\$ 3000\) and 1 above \(\$ 4000\). These figures reveal a high relative state of agricultural prosperity
in the town, for which wheat and sheep appear to have been mainly responsible, though dairying served to swell some incomes and the slaughtering of fat animals helped in some cases. All of the large incomes were derived from the goodsized and large farms. According to the tenth census the figure for the average production per farm was a trifle lower, \(\$ 983\), but the difference in the value of money made that a handsome improvement over the income of ten years earlier. There were 7 incomes under \(\$ \mathbf{2 0 0}\), and 17 between that figure and \(\$ 399\). But 30 were between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599,50\) between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999\), and 50 between \(\$ 1000\) and \(\$ 1999\). Thirteen incomes exceeded \(\$ 2000\) and several of these overran the \(\$ 3000\) limit, but only one was over \(\$ 4000\). Wool was a less important item than in 1870, but it was still significant, as was wheat. The big incomes, however, were in part due to successful cattle feeding, and dairying was maintaining the average on smaller farms. A glance at the chart will show that only one town, Pleasant Springs, had a higher production average than Empire.


Fig. 11. Town of Empire, 1915 After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company

The census of 1905 shows an average farm income of \(\$ 864\) for 1904-a decrease from the high averages of 1869 and 1879. Twelve towns exceeded Empire at this time in total average livestock production per farm. By 1919 average farm incomes had gone up to \(\$ 3316\), an appreciable increase (in spite of high prices) and a return to its early prosperity. Only two towns had a higher total average livestock production per farm for this period. Six towns had a higher average number of cows per farm, and six had a higher
average crop income. Only two towns had a higher total average farm income-New Glarus and Primrose, the two high cheese production towns.

Manufactures.-The first mill in the town, in section 18, was built by Colonel Henry Conklin in 1841-42. \({ }^{\text {. }}\) This became the better known Leonard's Mill. Another mill was in section 31, on de Neveu Creek. Both were in existence in 1874 and remained till the end of the century. Aside from these two flouring mills the most important manufacturing plant was the Empire Woolen Mill on section 17, which furnished a home market for wool, and together with the geographic features of the town doubtless had a large influence in sustaining the average of wool production after the decline in prices following 1870. For some years it was the only institution of its kind in the county, and hence served a large constituency. The woolen mill, like the gristmills, was run by water power. The 1860 census lists one miller, that of 1870 lists four, three of them at least belonging to Leonard's Mill in section 18. There were also a "millwright" and a "mill operative." No detailed description of manufactories in Empire is given.

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches.-Empire has had no villages. At an early day ( 1847 ? \(^{20}\) ) a post office called Alcove was kept at the house of J. Y. Westervelt, who was postmaster. This was probably in the southwestern part of the town. In 1893 the only post office, called Eggersville, was in section 11, where was also a store. Tradition says the first school in the town was held in Charles Ribbles's log house in 1845, and that the second school, 1846, was at the same place-W. S. Cogshall, of New York, a former college instructor, being the teacher. \({ }^{11}\) After some years schoolhouses were erected in sections \(10,11,18,21,31\), and 33 , where schools continued to be held for many years.

There was a Methodist church in section 33, also a cemetery, and in addition there was the large Rienzi Cemetery in sections 18 and 19. Early settlers often attended church at Taycheedah, in the days when that village was prominent, and later many went to Fond du Lac.

Population Changes.-It is said the town of Empire was so named because most of the settlers who were there at the time of its separate organization, 1851, were from the Empire State, New York. In 1860, as we have seen, 159 of the \(\mathbf{2 6 0}\) natives of other American states than Wisconsin were New Yorkers, and men of that nativity continued to dominate throughout that generation. Most of them had arrived in the late 1840's either as young married men or as bachelors; they settled down, improved their farms, some of which were large and valuable, and became men of substance and of social importance, which influence persists down to the present
"The many beautiful springs at that time were the greatest inducements for a settler to drive his stakes." Isaac Adriance, "Eden Reminiscences," in
Fond du Lac Saturday Reporter, Apr. 3, 1886. Fond du Lac Saturday Reporter, Apr. 3, 1886.
10 "Empire Reminiscences," in Fond du Lac Saturday Reporter, Feb. 6, 1886. \({ }^{11}\) Ibid.
time. In a number of cases, the original settlers brought with them money enough to buy ample tracts of land and to begin improving them. In other cases they were poor and had to earn their first farms by the hardest kind of labor. One way was to begin a farm in the timber, near the lake, sell it perhaps to German immigrants, and with the proceeds buy open land in Empire. \({ }^{12}\)

Among the New Yorkers in the town of Empire, the most distinguished was Nathaniel P. Tallmadge, former United States senator from New York, who came to Wisconsin as territorial governor in 1844, and who bought 480 acres of land in section 19, where he made his home and where, in 1864, he died. The Rienzi Cemetery, once a part of his estate, was given by him as a public cemetery and there he lies buried. \({ }^{13}\)

Many immigrants of foreign birth bought farms in Empire at various times. Yet the number of these who were recent arrivals in the United States is comparatively small, and the children of such immigrants are hardly to be distinguished from the children of the New Yorkers. Empire has always been American rather than foreign in its social character, a condition which is reflected also in its politics.
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\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ire- } \\
& \text { land }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Other } \\
& \text { Lands }
\end{aligned}
\] & Total & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Amer- } \\
& \text { ican- }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { For- } \\
& \text { eign }
\end{aligned}
\] & Total \\
\hline 1850 & 88 & 96 & 427 & 523 & 49 & 36 & 74 & 70 & & 263 & 87 & 56 & 143 \\
\hline 1860 & 809 & 259 & 260 & 519 & 14 & 51 & 83 & 105 & 37 & 290 & 57 & 86 & 143 \\
\hline 1870 & 1,055 & 494 & 193 & 687 & 16 & 41 & 194 & \[
89
\] & 28 & 368 & 52 & 136 & 188 \\
\hline 1885 & 1,019 & & & 719 & 11 & 39 & 170 & 73 & & 300 & 44 & 142 & 189 \\
\hline 1895 & 980 & & & 766 & & 27 & 139 & 36 & 12 & 214 & 71 & 110 & 181 \\
\hline 1905 & 870 & 689 & 52 & 741 & & 21 & 82 & 17 & 9 & & 102 & 58 & 160 \\
\hline 1920 & 770 & 693 & 19 & 712 & & 5 & 34 & 8 & 11 & 58 & 133 & 26 & 159 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{SOCIAL HISTORY OF EMPIRE \({ }^{1}\)}

\section*{W. A. Titus}

Of all the towns of Fond du Lac County, Empire is the most completely rural. It is, and has been since its separate organization in 1851, a hundred per cent farming community. It has never contained a village nor even a hamlet. It follows, therefore, that the men of whom we write were products of the pioneer farms of half a century and more ago. The families that settled in Empire prior to the Civil War were hardy, industrious, and above the average in culture and intelligence. This abbreviated township (it contains only thirty sections) has claimed as resident farmers two of the three territorial governors of Wisconsin, one United States senator, four Congressmen, three state senators-including the writer,-a number
\({ }^{12}\) Ibid., Mar. \({ }^{20}{ }^{20}\), 1886. "Eden Reminiscences." Case of Henry J. Carter.
\({ }^{2}\) W. A. Titus, "Historic Spots in Wisconsin," in Wis. Mag. of Hist., iii, 331 (March, 1920)
\({ }^{1}\) Reprinted from Wis. Mag. of Hist, Mar., 1923
of members of the Wisconsin assembly, four sheriffs and four district attorneys of Fond du Lac County. To this list of men who have become more or less conspicuous in the political field should be added a. number of equally prominent farmers, lawyers, physicians, and business men.

The topography of the town was such as gave to men and boys a broad vision, an outlook over the extensive prairies to the westward that seemed world-wide to the restricted view of the early dwellers in the wilderness. From the farms upon the bold escarpment commonly known as "the ledge," Lake Winnebago and the Fond du Lac region lay almost at one's feet, and to the farmer boys the county seat, small though it was, seemed the gateway to a larger life; the infrequent visits to the city were long remembered events. With their inheritance of health and ambition, it is not remarkable that so many of the early settlers achieved a marked success. It is not possible within the limits of this sketch to deal with the careers of all, or even of a majority of the citizens, past and present, of whom Empire is justly proud; but special mention is made of the most prominent, or of those best known to the writer.

Nathaniel P. Tallmadge was probably the most widely known in public life of all the Empire farmers. Before coming to Wisconsin he had served for fourteen years as United States senator from New York. It is said that when William Henry Harrison was nominated for president, the nomination for vice-president was offered to Senator Tallmadge, then at the height of his political power. He declined the doubtful honor, as so many public men have done since, and John Tyler received the nomination. By this narrow margin he failed to become one of the presidents of the United States. He became interested in lands in Wisconsin Territory, resigned from the United States Senate, and was appointed by the president territorial governor. He located in the town of Empire, which was his place of residence thereafter. He died in 1864 at his beautiful farm home "under the ledge," and sleeps on the topmost knoll of the original Rienzi Cemetery, which he had previously donated from his extensive farm. The old Tallmadge farm, now owned and occupied by Fred M. Ingalls, is located in section 19; it consists of land both above and below the ledge.

James Duane Doty was one of the outstanding figures in Wisconsin Territory. As judge, territorial governor, and Congressman in Wisconsin, and later governor of Utah Territory, he occupied the center of the stage in Wisconsin politics for many years. He early noted the desirability of Empire lands, and became in the early forties a resident of the town. The farm on which he lived is probably the most historic in Empire. Since its purchase from the government, it has been owned and occupied by Colonel Henry Conklin, Governor J. D. Doty, Lyman H. Phillips, State Senator Edward Colman, and Congressman Owen A. Wells. The sheep industry, in which Empire long led, and the dairy industry, which has grown steadily to the present time, were both inaugurated on a large scale on this farm. The property is now owned by the Sisters of St. Agnes, and on it is located the creditable educational institution known as St. Mary's Springs Academy.

John B. Macy, an Empire farmer who became a member of Congress, was a native of New York, where he was born in 1799. He settled in Empire in 1850, and was in 1852 elected to Congress. His farm in section 30 was a model country estate, on which he lavished
money for buildings, stone arch bridges, and landscape gardens. It was the best equipped farm in the town, and the buildings he erected still stand after a lapse of seventy years. The farm later became the property of Honorable David Giddings, who resided on it for many years. It is now owned and occupied by Elwood A. Quick. Mr. Macy was very active in interesting New York capital in Wisconsin railroad enterprises; it is said that the present Chicago and Northwestern Railway system was begun largely as a result of his efforts. He was drowned in 1856, when he jumped from the burning steamer Niagara about a mile off Port Washington.

Owen A. Wells, member of Congress from 1893 to 1895, was born in New York and came to Empire when a child. His father, James Wells, was one of the pioneers of Fond du Lac County, having settled in 1850 on the farm in section 34 which is still occupied by a son, Bernard Wells. James Wells was a remarkable man, both intellectually and physically. At a time when educational opportunities were meagre, he personally supervised the education of a large family, nearly all of whom became teachers or entered the professions. Owen A. Wells, now retired from law practice, is a highly respected resident of Fond du Lac.
M. K. Reilly, the fourth resident of Empire to become a member of Congress, is a native of the town where his father settled at an early date. Mr. Reilly was graduated from the Oshkosh Normal School in 1889, University of Wisconsin in 1894, and University Law School in 1895. He was district attorney of Fond du Lac County for one term, and was elected to Congress in 1912 and reelected in 1914. He is now engaged in the practice of law at Fond du Lac.

Among the members of the Wisconsin assembly who were onetime residents of Empire may be mentioned Charles Doty, son of Governor Doty, who was elected in1848 and served in the first session of the legislature after Wisconsin became a state. Isaac S. Tallmadge, a son of Governor Tallmadge, served in the Wisconsin assembly during 1853-54; he resided at the time on Cold Spring Farm, later owned by Frederick Phelps. He was succeeded by M. J. Thomas, a son-in-law of John B. Macy, who served in the assembly from 1854 to 1857, when he was appointed United States marshal. Thomas resided in Empire up to the time of his death, which occurred in 1859 in the railroad wreck at Johnson's Creek, on the occasion of the formal opening of the railroad line between Fond du Lac and Janesville. James Lafferty, a prominent Empire farmer, was a member of the assembly in 1874, and John Meiklejohn in 1882. Empire farmers who have recently been sent to the legislature are Herman Schroeder and Math. Koenigs, the last named being the present representative from the first assembly district of Fond du Lac County.

Colonel Edward Colman, Neil C. Bell, Peter Brucker, and C. W. Keys, all Empire farmers, have served the county in the capacity of sheriff. Isaac S. Tallmadge, John McCrory, H. E. Swett, and M. K. Reilly, all Empire residents, have held the office of district attorney. David Giddings, who resided in Empire for many years, was for two terms, before taking up his residence in the town, a member of the territorial legislature, as well as delegate in 1846 to the first constitutional convention.

Colonel Edward Colman, an officer of the Civil War, was at one time the owner of the old Governor Doty farm in section 7, town of

Empire. He was in 1866-67 superintendent of public property at Madison, was elected sheriff of Fond du Lac County in 1878, and state senator in 1882.

Colonel E. L. Phillips, a native of New York, in 1852 settled in section 7 in Empire. While yet a resident of New York, he was elected sheriff of Onondaga County, a member of the New York legislature, and held a commission as colonel in the New York militia. He was elected to the Wisconsin state senate in 1860; in 1863-64 he was provost marshal of the Fond du Lac district. The quaint and elaborate farmhouse that he built is still standing.

Colonel Henry Conklin, also a native of New York, came to Empire in 1841 and settled on section 7 near the "big spring" just under the ledge. Before coming to Wisconsin, he had been engaged in the Hudson River shipping trade in the same field with Cornelius Vanderbilt, who was his contemporary, neighbor, and friend. During this period he represented his district in the New York legislature for several terms. Financial reverses came to him in 1839-40, and he lost a considerable part of his ample fortune. In 1841 he gathered together the remaining portion of his property and came to Wisconsin, which was thereafter his home. His enterprises here were all on a large scale. He developed several water powers and built mills in different parts of Empire and other towns of the county. The most important of these, now known as "Leonard's Mill," is still in operation. It is the only remaining mill dam and pond in the town. Colonel Conklin was the first to attempt dairying on a large scale, but the lack of transportation and markets prevented a profitable return from the industry at that early day. He died in 1868 in the city of Fond du Lac, at the age of seventy-four years.

Gustave de Neveu was born in Savigny, France, in 1811, and was educated in the College of Vendome. His father, François Joseph de Neveu, when only nineteen years of age, was an ensign in the French fleet under d'Estaing that started from France to aid the Americans in their struggle for independence. The young ensign was wounded in an encounter with a British fleet, in which the French were worsted and obliged to return to the port from which they had started. Before his wounds were healed the fleet had again sailed, leaving him in France. His interest in America did not cease, however, and it was probably because of home influence that Gustave de Neveu, while yet a young man, resolved to visit America. He spent some time in New York as a teacher of the French language, but the interior lured him and in 1837 he joined an expedition to Green Bay. Thence he adventured as far as the Fond du Lac region, where he purchased a large tract of land in section 31, town of Empire, his holdings including the beautiful lake that still bears his name. He was the first settler in Empire and built in 1838 the first house in that town. At that time there were only four other houses in all Fond du Lac County.

On the occasion of Mr. de Neveu's first trip from Green Bay to Fond du Lac, he traveled with Captain Frederick Marryatt, the well known English novelist, and a warm friendship sprang up between them. Mr. de Neveu was a young man of education, culture, and refinement, and it is easy to understand how a person of his type would appeal to Captain Marryatt, especially in a western wilderness where dusky savages or white adventurers were the usual companions. Marryatt urged young de Neveu to accompany him on his journey west of the Mississippi River, but the latter decided that Empire
ended the long trail so far as he was concerned. \({ }^{2}\) Since 1838, the de Neveu home has been noted for its hospitality and social activities. A daughter, Emily de Neveu, still resides on the old farm, which has become a popular summer resort. Throughout his Wisconsin career Gustave de Neveu was a farmer, with occasional excursions into the fields of literature and politics. In 1881, although then seventy years of age, he planned a long trip through the then unsettled regions of the Pacific Northwest. Death overtook him near the close of the year, and his remains lie buried on the banks of the Columbia River within the state of Washington. \({ }^{3}\)

Other early settlers in Empire were David Lyons, George Keys, John Keys, James Wells, M. Reilly, J. McCrory, B. F. Swett, T. Brownsell, B. Kaye, John Meiklejohn, George Meiklejohn, A. T. Germond, John Berry, J. Immel, D. H. Vinton, Hamilton Meekin, John Treleven, J. Isaac, L. H. Jennings, B. White, T. J. Burhyte, J. Menne, C. S. Pray, George Wright, George Shoemaker, the Freund brothers, George Titus, Daniel Graham, and William Edwards. A number of Scottish families early came to Empire, among whom may be mentioned Duncan McGregor, Alexander McGregor, Peter Fergu-
\({ }^{2}\) For Marryatt's account of his meeting with de Neveu, see Wis. Hist. Colls., xiv, 142.- Enrror.
\({ }^{\circ}\) See article by de Neveu in Wis. Hist. Soc. Proceedings, 1910, 153-164, accompanied by his portrait.-EDrror.
son, William Moffatt, and J. Campbell. Before the Civil War period, the people of Empire were from "York State," or else from England, Ireland, or Scotland. The Germans in most instances came in at a later date. One of the early German settlers was J. Immel. A son, John W. Immel, resides in Fond du Lac; as president of the Immel Construction Company, the Vulcan Iron Works, and the Clark Motor Company, he is well known throughout Wisconsin.

Although the population of Empire has never been large, it has been a place of sepulture for hosts who have crossed the "great divide." No other town in the county approaches it in the number of interments. Rienzi Cemetery, four miles from Fond du Lac, is unequaled in Fond du Lac County for size and beauty; it is located in sections 18 and 19. Empire Cemetery, in section 33, has long been a burial place for the residents of portions of Empire, Eden, Osceola, and Forest. \({ }^{4}\)

Of social or quasi social events, the most common were the farm "bees," country dances, singing schools, and church donation parties. The "bees" were the culmination of a sincere desire on the part of the pioneer farmers to help one another, and especially to give assistance to a neighbor who had been ill or otherwise unfortu-
- For a description of Empire Cemetery, see article by the writer, "Two 1921).
nate. Where no such incentive existed, it was common enough to find a neighborhood group alternating the "bees" for the sake of sociability or the advantages of joint effort. Ordinarily there was a little liquor provided; it was not used to excess as a rule, but the workers were kept in a happy mood. Many of the stone-wall fences that still exist were the result of this community teamwork.

The country dances were simple, unconventional, and without any set time for closing, except that the young people must get home in time to feed the stock in the morning, and do the other morning chores. The people came from miles around to these dancing parties, using heavy draft horses and even oxen as a means of rapid transit.

The church donation party, an annual event, was one of the methods employed for maintaining the rural pastor. The net result was a miscellaneous collection of food and clothing, desirable or otherwise, some cash, and a jolly evening for all, from the grandparents to the children. The few roomy homes in the neighborhood were always in demand for these social affairs.

The pioneers who carved the fertile farms out of the wilderness have passed on, and hardly a thought is given to the efforts of these noble men and women who made possible the comforts and the luxuries of today.

FRANKLIN ~MILWAUKEE COUNTY
T5N RZIE
Survered 1836
Elisha DwELL


\section*{F R A N K L I N}

LOCATION.-The town of Franklin, organized in 1839, is a symmetrical town occupying congressional township number 5 , range 21 east. It lies at the southwest corner of Milwaukee County, and is bounded by the towns of Greenfield and Oak Creek (in that county), and by Raymond (Racine County) and Muskego (Waukesha County). The northeast corner of Franklin is four miles from the city limits of Milwaukee on the southwest.

Surface and Drainage.-The topography is characteristic of the territory bordering Lake Michigan in that latitude, which may be described as a series of broad, nearly level (though somewhat rolling) glacial ridges extending north and south parallel to the lake shore, and divided by strips of low ground trending generally north and south also. The first of the ridges, being partly cut back by the lake, is narrow, approximately one and a half to two miles from east to west; the succeeding depression is of about equal breadth, and then comes the second ridge, which stretches westward more than four miles and embraces the easternmost two ranges of sections in Franklin. The second depression is very narrow. It runs through the third range of sections for about five miles from the south boundary of the town, jutting into the second range at certain points, and projecting into the fourth range at section 28 and again at section 4 in the north. Otherwise the lowland strip averages only about half a mile in width through the town. It forms the trough in which flows Root River, the principal drainage system of the town, which enters at section 4, bends east into section 3, then trends nearly south to section 34 , then turns sharply southeast and emerges at section 35. In its lower course the river swings northeast and barely touches the corner of Franklin at its junction with Caledonia, through which town it flows to the lake at Racine. The tributaries of Root River in Franklin are, chiefly, (1) a small stream, the outlet of Muskego Lake, which in its course to join Root River in section 4 crosses 7, the northwest quarter of 8 , and the southwest and northeast quarters of 5 ; (2) another small branch flowing through the west half of section 12, also portions of 11 and 14, and joining Root River in \(15 ;^{1}(3)\) the north flowing branch of Root River, which occupies that part of the topographical depression extending south into Racine County, and which joins the south flowing branch in section 34. The wide ridge occupying the western half of the town has in its southern portion no streams of sufficient importance to appear on the survey, and farther north only the Muskego Lake outlet, as described, together with a few tiny lakes and some marshes suggesting the presence of springs. There are low, marshy tracts in
\({ }^{1}\) According to the surveyor's original plat. This stream does not show in the geological survey of the township (Geneva-Racine Quadrangle), and it may the geological survey of the township (Ge
be simply a dry run or wet season rivulet.
sections 13, 1, and 2 along the line of Root River and its branches, also in sections \(9,28,8,7,18,19\), and 20 . These marshes and swamps appear to have been of small extent, usually, and they doubtless constituted welcome open spaces with promise of grass for pasturage and hay, the rest of the land being originally well wooded with oak, aspen, lynn, sugar maple, ironwood, hickory, etc., with hazel undergrowth. There were only a few small oak openings in the upland sections. One was on sections 20 and 21 , a second on 31 and 32 , and a third on 19 and 20.

Types of Soil.-The surveyor \({ }^{2}\) described only a very small fraction of the land of this township as good or firstrate. Nearly all of it was called second-rate and several tracts poor. Such a record is by no means conclusive evidence of the character of the soil, the surveyor merely expressing a personal, unscientific opinion. A recent soil survey of Milwaukee County \({ }^{3}\) classifies the soils of this township under the following heads: (1) Miami silt clay loam, which covers all of the ridges and higher lying portions-approximately twothirds of the surface; (2) Miami loam, low alluvial lands near the streams and lakes - not a large percentage of the whole, perhaps the equivalent of two sections; (3) Carrington silt loam-perhaps as much more (two sections) ; (4) Clyde clay loam-very small, scattering areas; (5) a number of small patches of peat.

The first of these soils, the Miami silt clay loam, while somewhat stiff to work, is highly productive, yielding under modern tillage 80 to 100 bushels of corn to the acre, 60 to 70 of oats, and 40 to 50 of barley. It also grows heavy crops of hay, roots, potatoes, etc. The type of farming which prevails on these soils now is dairying. The soil of this type is usually well drained by nature. The other types are more or less deficient in natural drainage, but in most cases are usable for some purpose in their natural state, and with artificial drainage become very valuable. Even peat bogs, it has been demonstrated, can be successfully reclaimed under certain conditions. All of these soils are of glacial origin. It is supposed that the covering of soil was derived mainly from the underlying limestone, through weathering and glacial deposition during the late Wisconsin phase of the glacial era. Much of the lime has leached from the upper soil, leaving it neutral or even acid; but the subsoil is calcareous, and so the soil can readily be restored.

Timber.-To put the lands in condition to be cultivated required, first of all, the clearing of the forest growth, which was no light task, for the town was mostly heavily wooded.
\({ }^{2}\) Elisha Dwelle, 1836.
\({ }^{3}\) Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, Bulletin No. 56 A, Soil Series No. 28, Soil Survey of Mikteounkee County, Wisconsin (Madison, 1919).

Tradition speaks of the abundance of wild turkeys, bears, and deer (with panthers, wolves, wildeats, etc.), and of the delight the Indians had in hunting there, by permission, for some years after the cession of their lands to the United States. Settlers were hunters from necessity. \({ }^{*}\)

Beginnings of Settlement.-The earliest entries of land in the town date from 1838 and 1839, which means merely that the lands were purchased from the government after the opening of the land office at Milwaukee. No doubt most of them had been claimed and, to some extent, improved prior to that date. The town history \({ }^{5}\) names William Shehan, from Ireland, as the first settler, in 1834. Two others claimed lands in 1835, four at least in 1836, and by the time of the land sale there were so many claimants that, it is recorded, 112 persons bought lands on the self-same day, March 13, 1839. \({ }^{\circ}\) The northern part of the township was purchased first, which seems to show that nearness to the port was the determining consideration; but virtually the entire township had been entered before the close of the year 1839. The civil town was created by act of legislature December 20, 1839, and the first town meeting was held in 1842. It was attended by thirty-seven persons, presumably all voters. \({ }^{7}\)

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Land.-There was some speculation in farm lands, but it does not appear that speculation affected settlement to an appreciable extent. The heavily timbered character of the land deterred from purchasing those Americans from the northeastern states who were looking for opportunities to become wheat growers on a large scale. Such persons sought out the prairie lands. It would seem that some at least of the American entrymen were persons in poor circumstances who could not afford to farm on the prairies, but who were able to make small clearings in Franklin which sold readily to Germans and others by reason of the favorable location of the town.

Progress of Farm Making.-By the census year 1850 Franklin had 150 farms aggregating 6164 acres of improved land and 10,273 acres of unimproved land, which would give to the average farm 41 acres of the first and 68 of the second type of land. This shows that the progress of improvement had been reasonably rapid, despite the handicap involved in the necessity of clearing away the forest. Mount Pleasant, in Racine County, was far in advance of Franklin, and even Sugar Creek and Whitewater-much farther west-had a larger proportion of improved land. But all three of these
\({ }^{-}\)Memoirs of Mikwoukee County, Wisconsin (Madison, 1909), i, 211-218.
\({ }^{-1}\) Ibid.
on the given day.
on the given day. Milwaukee County, for the names of the first voters and
TSee Memoirs of Milule officers.
towns possessed the very great advantage of having mostly prairie or oak openings to improve. The Franklin farms had a valuation lower than Mount Pleasant, Sugar Creek, Whitewater, Plymouth in Rock County, and Brookfield in Waukesha County. This is in itself a surprising fact, considering the town's location, but when we take into account the low range of productions- 72 bushels of wheat per average farm, 109 of oats, 30 of corn, 57 of potatoes, etc.-in comparison with that of Mount Pleasant, Plymouth, Sugar Creek, Whitewater, and Brookfield, the conviction arises that Franklin's acres did not at that time yield heavily, and doubtless the lands were appraised with reference to their productiveness. With improved implements and modes of tillage the heavy clay soils could be expected to grow more productive, while some of the supposedly better lands would at the same time grow poorer.

The town must have been, in that day, a somewhat struggling community, held back by the difficulty of subduing the soil, by the lack of capital, and possibly the lack of an aggressive, progressive leadership in rural affairs; but there was certainly a genuine democracy which combined uniformity in economic status with equality in social status.

Ten years later the number of farms had increased to 199, the improved acreage to 52 , while the unimproved had declined to 39 acres on the average.

When the census taker visited Franklin in the summer of 1870, he found the people living on farms which had been settled for a generation. The process of improvement, no matter how slow and gradual it had been, must in that time have brought about great changes; and these it might be expected would be accelerated by the strenuous activity just beyond the borders of the town, where the city of Milwaukee was becoming the leading grain port on the Great Lakes. So, we are not surprised to find the lands mostly under cultivation, the valuations largely increased, and other evidences of progress scattered through the statistics.

The number of farms had increased from 199 to 235 , while their total area had gone up from 18,395 to 19,521 , so that the average size had been reduced from 91 acres to 83 acres. The proportion of improved to unimproved, which in 1860 had stood at 52-39, was 63-20. Considering that a good many of the lands scattered through the town were irreclaimable except by drainage processes, the expense of which was as yet prohibitive, it is fair to assume that nearly all cultivable land had been brought under cultivation.

The census for 1880 shows an increase in the number of farms from 235 to 259 , an addition of 24 . The improved acreage was 15,813 as against 14,811 ten years earlier, and the unimproved was placed at 5513 , which, if correct, represents an increase of 803 acres. The total acreage in farms was given as 19,521 in 1870; in 1880 it stood at 21,326-1805 acres more. The inference is that a quantity of poor land, individually owned but not theretofore farmed, had been taken into the farms, and that some lands had been recently placed
on improvement. Possibly, however, the difference is one of bookkeeping merely. There were, on the average, 61 acres of improved land and 21 acres of unimproved to the farm, which is but a slight change from 1870, when the improved was 63 and the unimproved 20 .

The summary of agricultural statistics prepared from the state census of 1885 and published by the state assigns to Franklin 14,141 acres of improved land, 3980 of unimproved, and 1974 of woodland. The census of 1895 assigns to Franklin 2198 acres of improved land, which is so patent a blunder that one is astonished at its passing the proofreader. The value of all the farms, however, seems to be given correctly at \(\$ 1,552,650\). This was the time when the rapid increase in value of farm lands began to be felt. The returns for 1905 are more complete and satisfactory. The number of farms was 278 and the total acreage 22,135 , of which 15,697 acres was improved land and 6438 unimproved.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-Classifying for the different census periods we get the following results: In 1860 there were 5 farms under 20 acres in area and 1 over 500 acres. Forty-nine were between 20 and 49 acres, 77 between 50 and 99,51 between 100 and 174 , and 16 between 175 and 499 acres. In 1870 there were again 5 farms under 20 acres, 79 between 20 and 49 acres, 91 between 50 and 99 acres, 47 between 100 and 174 acres, 12 between 175 and 499 acres, and 1 farm exceeded 500 acres. In 1880 the number of small farms had increased to 12, and there were no farms over 500 acres. The largest farm had only 290 acres. At this period there were 70 farms in the second class, 103 in class three, 59 in class four, and 15 in class five.

A classification of farms by number of acres cleared gives a better picture of the agricultural advance of Franklin than a classification by size of farms. In 1860 there were 103 farms having 40 acres or less of cultivated land; in 1870 there were 96 farms in that class, and in 1880, 98. In the class of 41 to 60 acres of arable land there were, at the three periods, 44,50 , and 56 ; of 61 to \(100,39,69\), and 68 ; and over 100 acres 13,20 , and 37 .

General Productions.-In 1849, according to the census of 1850, Franklin had a record of 10,909 bushels of wheat or an average of 72 bushels per farm. In 1859 the wheat crop amounted to 24,243 bushels, an average of 121 bushels per farm. Five towns reported a lower farm average at this time and eight reported a lower aggregate amount. By 1869 the total amount had gone up to 37,337 bushels and the average to 154.6 bushels. Eleven towns now had a lower total production and seven a lower average. Ten years later the figures had fallen to 30,564 bushels for the town and 118 bushels per farm, and the later census periods showed decided decreases. In 1904, 2279 bushels was produced. Corn production, on the rather heavy soil of the town, made a somewhat better showing. In 1849 only 4506 bushels was produced, but this increased to 12,122 in ten years and to 33,768
bushels in 1869. In 1879, 47,611 bushels was raised; in 1894, 61,347 bushels; and in 1904, 57,395 bushels. Oats also were produced in considerable quantities, the total increasing from 32,782 bushels in 1859 to 139,542 bushels in 1894. In 1904, 114,636 bushels was recorded.

The number of milch cows in 1850 was 495, an average of 3 per farm. Ten years later the number was 751, still an average of 3 per farm. In 1895 the total was 1625 and in 1905 it was 2134. In 1869 the production of butter, on 235 farms, totaled 65,378 pounds or an average of 278 pounds per farm; while in 1879 the average was 410.8 pounds, the total that year being 106,414 pounds. The number of milch cows in 1870 was 885 ; in 1880, 1199; and in 1895, as above, 1625. These figures reveal a decided upward trend in the quality of stock, for the product in 1894 was three and one-half times as large as that of 1869 , while the number of cows had not yet doubled. Still, relatively to Whitewater, Newton, New Glarus, and other towns, the progress of the dairy business in Franklin has not been striking. There were no cheese factories or creameries in the town, so far as we have been able to find. It is worthy of special inquiry why the farmers of Franklin had not attained by 1880 to a plane of coöperation in dairying similar to that attained by German farmers of Newton, for example, or the Swiss of New Glarus, or the Americans of Whitewater. For dairying had clearly become the leading pursuit; the herds seem to have been carefully picked, so that they had become more than commonly productive, and farm management had obviously adapted itself to a dairying régime. Was it, perhaps, that all of the best dairy farms had an established reputation for their butter, sold to special customers in the city? If so, we may say that the very excellence of the market had prevented the growth of coöperative dairying in this town.

Special Productions.-When we seek for special tendencies in the farming of Franklin, one thing that appears from the statistics is the prevalence in 1869 of an elementary kind of market gardening. No one sold much more than \(\$ 100\) worth of garden products, but almost everybody sold some. It is possible, of course, that this means merely the general sale of early potatoes in response to an unusual demand, but it may mean the production of other vegetables for the Milwaukee market. At present much cabbage is grown there. The fact that everybody in 1869 sold forest products, many to the value of \(\$ 250\) or \(\$ 300\), several for \(\$ 1000\), and one for \(\$ 2000\), would seem to show that land clearing was still in progress, or else that the reserved wood lots which existed on most farms were furnishing very profitable harvests of wood to meet the Milwaukee demand. Probably cordwood was the principal item, though railroad ties were much in demand at the time. The total amount derived from that source during the year was \(\$ 33,900\), more by \(\$ 12,750\) than the amount of wages paid out during the same period. \({ }^{8}\)
\({ }^{8}\) All of the towns in Milwaukee County are credited with some forest products. A study, from local sources, would show what the market was in the city.

There was by 1904 a tremendous area producing hay6505 acres. The hay crop amounted to 10,614 tons and was valued at \(\$ 95,573\)-more than all the grains combined. In 1894 it had been 8149 tons valued at \(\$ 65,127\), and in 1884 , 6687 tons valued at \(\$ 33,180\). Thus it would seem that this town was specializing in the production of hay, although that was also an important product of a number of the towns compared. Newton in 1904 produced hay from 4447 acres, Whitewater from 3312 acres, Brookfield from 5151 acres, Mount Pleasant \({ }^{0}\) from 6757, and Norway from 3255 acres. However, Franklin's quota, compared with her total acreage of land, was the highest of the six towns named and, considering the comparative numbers of the animals maintained on the farms, it seems clear that Franklin must have been raising much hay to sell.

Value of Productions.-The total value of all productions in Franklin in 1879 was \(\$ 203,325\). Only three townsBrookfield, Mount Pleasant, and Pleasant Springs-had a higher total. The average per farm for the period was \(\$ 785\) as against an average of \(\$ 1056\) in 1869. The total at this earlier period had been \(\$ 248,265\). Classifying by value of productions of individual farms, we find that according to the ninth census (1870) one farm produced less than \(\$ 200,14\) between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399,37\) between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599,62\) between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999\), and \(121, \$ 1000\) and over. The largest income was \(\$ 4431\), made on a farm of 846 acres, of which 596 acres was improved. Livestock consisted of 8 horses, 11 cows, 7 other cattle, and 15 swine, and was valued at \(\$ 1035\). The value of forest products was \(\$ 460\). There were produced 1200 bushels of wheat, 1200 bushels of oats, 200 bushels of corn, and 90 bushels of rye. Ten years later the lowest class of incomes numbered 8 , the second 24 , the third 56 , the fourth 113 , and the fifth 58 . Nineteen incomes overran \(\$ 2000\). The largest was \(\$ 3500\), made in general farming.

In 1904 the average farm income was \(\$ 835\). The value of dairy productions was \(\$ 342\) and of other livestock income \(\$ 200\). The value of crops was \(\$ 293\), of which \(\$ 130\) was the average value of surplus hay per farm. In 1919 the number of cows was almost the same, but the value of dairy products had gone up to \(\$ 1382\). This was largely due to an inflation of prices at that period, but there was probably an actual increase in value of about \(\$ 200\). Other livestock income came to \(\$ 646\) and total farm incomes to \(\$ 2398\). Both of these figures show actual increases after price inflation is allowed for.

Manuractures.-According to the county map of 1858 there were near the east line of the town, taverns, blacksmiths shops, and stores, and there was a post office at a place later called Paynsville. Hales Corners, located on the great Mil-waukee-Janesville plank road just outside the bounds of Franklin, in Greenfield, seems to have been by that time a place of much local importance. It had two taverns, a store,
- A larger town than the others.


Fig. 12. Town of Franklin, 1915 After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company
three shops, and a school, with a steam sawmill hard by, and a Catholic church, school, and cemetery and another store hardly a mile away. The village of Franklin was platted and seems to have had in it some ten or twelve houses.

The Janesville plank road crossed Franklin, traversing sections 6, 7, and the northwestern part of 18. The Loomis road, another highway reaching the Milwaukee market, entered the town at section 3 , and trending southwestward through sections \(3,9,17\), and 20 , emerged from the town at section 30. By means of laterals and connecting lines, all parts of the town were rendered accessible to those two roads. The land being fairly even, many of the roads followed section lines, as in the prairie country.

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches.-The county map of 1858 and later maps show one village, that of Franklin on section 7, where a post office was doubtless early established. The maps indicate also that there were within the town of Franklin six schools. These were located in sections 12 (on the Oak Creek town line), 20, 23, 25, 27, and 33. Other schools in Oak Creek, near the line, were available, and doubtless the people of the two northern tiers of sections were in large part tributary to two schools in the town of Greenfield. Perhaps some of the dwellers near the western line used schools in Waukesha County. There was a Catholic church, cemetery, and school on the highway northeast of Hales Corners-about one mile-which was doubtless frequented by Franklin people prior to the establishment of their church at Franklin (St. Martin's) in 1847. Other churches,
not distinguished as to denomination, stood at three points along the east line of the town.

Population Changes.-The original entrymen of the land in Franklin, judging from their names, were nearly all English speaking persons. They were in part Americans and in part Irish. Three or four men entered obviously for speculative purposes a large proportion of the subdivisions.

When the United States census of 1850 was taken, the town had been settled just over ten years and was beginning to assume a more or less permanent community aspect. Most of the good lands entered by speculators were already in the hands of cultivators, as well as those - constituting the bulk of the township-which went to settlers in the first instance. Accordingly that census will supply an index to the character of the community in its beginnings. Out of a total population of 1248 there were 672 foreign born and 576 native born. The foreign born were derived mainly from Ireland and Germany, the former being credited with 292 , the latter with 283. In addition there were 26 English, 1 Scot, 1 Welshman, 10 Canadians, 39 Dutch (Hollanders), 6 Swiss, 13 Frenchmen, and 1 Austrian. The Irish and Germans combined, it will be seen, slightly outnumbered the Americans. The population (1248) was arranged under 300 heads of families and individually numbered persons. Of these only 15 were American born, showing that the vast majority of those described as native born (576) must have been the American born children of foreign parents. The 15 native heads of families were distributed as follows: New York, 8; New Jersey, 2; Ohio, 2; and 1 each to Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut. If servants and farm laborers of American birth who were listed with families were added, the number would perhaps be doubled.

The changes which occurred in the next decade were considerable. To begin with, the total number of inhabitants in the town rose from 1248 to 1773, due to the influx of a number of new families, all foreign, as it would seem, and the increase of the families already settled. Also, there must have been added an appreciable number of foreign single persons who took service as laborers and house servants in the established families. For the foreign element increased by 261 , more than twice as many as would be accounted for by the increase in the number of foreign families, which was only 13. The American element increased by 264 , making it stand in 1860 at 840 as against 933 foreign. The total number of heads of families was 313 as against 300 in 1850, but the number of American heads remained static at 15, while the foreign born rose from 285 to 298 . The nativities of the American heads of families were as follows: New York, 8; New Jersey, 2; Connecticut, 2; New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Ohio each 1. The foreign born population was mainly from the three countries Germany, Ireland, and Holland, the first having 528 , the second 204, and the third 109. All other lands combined furnished 92 . The most striking
social fact in the above is the substitution of a large German plurality for the small Irish plurality of 1850. And the German element, in its turn, was strengthened by an addition of 70 to the closely-related Dutch element. From this time forward it is proper to look upon Franklin as a German community, factionalized, however, by the presence of a goodly number of Irish and Dutch families, with too few Americans to give direction to its affairs. Such Americans as there were, doubtless had weight. Twelve of them were farmers, nine of them owners of substantial properties ranging in their valuations from \(\$ 3000\) to \(\$ 14,330\). One of the farms was valued at \(\$ 10,750\), one at \(\$ 8700\), one at \(\$ 5750\), and two at \(\$ 5000\) each.

The changes in the population, shown by the above analysis of census schedules, are confirmed by reference to the history of land transfers during the decade. The total number of forty-acre tracts which changed hands appears to have been 185. The purchasers were in most cases German and Dutch, judging from their names, while the sellers were mostly Irish or American.

By 1870 other changes had taken place, as indicated by the census returns. The total population had reached 2092, the highest figure ever attained in this town. Heads of families and specially numbered individuals counted 331 . The American born element, for the first time, became the majority, it being 1209 as against 888 foreign born persons. Thus in the decade the American element showed a gain of 369 and the foreign a loss of 45. The number of American families had increased from 15 to 25 , the foreign from 298 to 305 . The native increase was all among the Wisconsin born, which stood at 1165 as against 683 in 1860; while those born in other American states were only 44 as against 157 ten years earlier. Germans had increased from 528 to 642 , while the Irish element diminished from 204 to 137, and the Dutch from 109 to 54. Persons belonging to other nationalities had also grown less numerous, being only 55 as against 92 in 1860 . Of the

305 foreign born heads of families, 199 were German, 59 Irish, 8 English, 1 Canadian, 1 Austrian, 1 Norwegian, 3 Swiss, 9 French, and 24 Dutch. We have seen that the foreign born element numbered, all told, 888 and the American born 1209. Of the latter, 1165 were natives of Wisconsin and 44 of other states, as follows: New York, 24; Ohio, 11; Massachusetts, 7; Rhode Island and New Hampshire each 1.

It would seem from the foregoing that the population of the town was somewhat wanting in unity. The Germans were numerous enough to be able to dominate affairs, but the Germans in those times were usually wanting in aggressiveness, which Americans and Irish possessed in ample measure. One would expect to find a community so circumstanced more or less factionalized and, according to reliable tradition, there was a good deal of factionalism in Franklin, politically and otherwise. \({ }^{10}\)

One interesting point about the population of Franklin is the fact of its progressive decline after 1870. In that year it numbered 2092. Fifteen years later the compiler of the state census found only 1963, while in 1895 the total was reduced to 1824, and in 1905 it was 1753 . In 1885 the state enumerators found in the town 357 heads of families. They also found 325 militiamen and 6 ex-soldiers. The nativities of the population were as follows: born in the United States, 1344; in Germany, 542; in Ireland, 45 ; in Holland, 24; in Great Britain, 2; in British America, 3; in Scandinavia, 2 ; elsewhere, 1. The net loss of population since 1870 had been 129. The number of foreign born had decreased from 888 to 619 , or 269 ; while the American born had increased from 1209 to 1344. This suggests that the foreign born were largely old people, among whom the mortality was exceptionally high in the interval considered.

In 1895 the population of Franklin ( 1824 total) was
\({ }^{10}\) The town board of supervisors in 1921 consisted of a descendant of a Dutch family as chairman, and two Germans. The town clerk was a German
also. The first set of town officers, elected in 1842 , was wholly American also. The first set of town officers, elected in 1842, was wholly American.
\(A\) study of the changes in officers from year to year would reveal the growth of A study of the chan
parties in the town.
made up of the following elements: American born-which means Wisconsin born, for the most part-1331; German, 444; British, 3; Irish, 18; French, 2; Scandinavian, 1; Dutch, 21 ; all other countries, 4. It will be seen that the American and German elements combined made up 1775, leaving but 49 for all others, among them 21 Hollanders, who were, of course, quite thoroughly amalgamated with the Germans. It would be a fair generalization to call the town a German town so far as heads of families were concerned, but with a great majority of the population belonging to the new generation born in Wisconsin. The next state census, 1905, is a commentary on this generalization. The total population at that time, as already stated, was 1753 . The total native born were 1389, and of these Wisconsin was the birthplace of 1346 , leaving all other states to account for only 43. The foreign element, totaling 364, was distributed much as before, but the numbers were growing progressively smaller. There were 309 Germans, 26 Hollanders, and 11 Irish, leaving but 18 to be derived from all other countries. Five of these were German Poles and 4 Austrians, which reduced the non-German remainder to 9 .

The census of 1920 continues the general trend still further. Out of a population of 1712 (the smallest since 1850), 1476 were native born and 236 foreign born. Germans had decreased to 104, Irish to 6, and Dutch to 6. There were 34 Poles and 86 from other countries.

Franklin-Population Statistics
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FARMS AND FARMERS OF 1860

\section*{H I G H L A N D}

LaOCATION.-The town of Highland, organized in 1848, occupies township 7, range 1 east, and parts of township 8, range 1 east, also parts of township 6, ranges 1 and 2 east. The total area of the town is equivalent to one and five-sixths townships. The town is bounded north by Pulaski and Clyde, east by Clyde and Dodgeville, south by Eden, and west by Wingville and Castle Rock in Grant County. The old lead mining village of Centerville (at first called Blue River Mines) and the mining village of Highland (at first called either Blue River or Franklin) are the historic villages within the town-the latter having grown in importance during recent years, the former fallen into complete decay. Mineral Point and Muscoda were trading points for the early settlers and miners, and later Avoca was utilized. Highland and Centerville are both in the southwestern part of the town, Centerville being on the line between Iowa and Grant counties.

Surface and Drainage.-The town lies in the Driftless Area, on a spur of the Military Ridge, which extends northward from the main ridge toward the Wisconsin River. The elevation of the land at the village of Highland is over 1200 feet above sea level, a greater elevation than is found anywhere else in that region save at Blue Mounds (fig. 7). Much of the higher land is nearly flat, but where it falls away toward the streams undulations occur. The headwaters of Otter Creek, in several branches, are found in this town, also heads of two branches of Blue River and one of Underwood Creek. But there are no large valleys within the town, which is truly characterized by its name "Highland." There are some large, strong springs, and the streams, having considerable fall, afforded several good mill sites.

Types of Sorl.-The predominant types of soil, technically classified, are the Marshall silt loam, which covers the top of the ridge and extends from its connection in the Military Ridge to the center of township 7, range 1 east; Knox silt loam, which is the characteristic soil of the lower ridges; and Wabash silt loam, in the alluvial portions of the small valleys heading in the town. Connected with the last type are the usual strips of Lintonia silt loam, and there are some areas of rough, stony land. \({ }^{1}\) The United States surveyor Sylvester Sibley found the land of township 7, range 1 east firstrate in many places, second-rate in more places, and also noted some rough, stony areas. On the whole, the surveyor had a favorable opinion of the soil, and inasmuch as some of the land was prairie and much of it very thinly timbered, its fitness for agriculture was promptly seen. A later surveyor, David Dale Owen, recorded a less favorable opinion of it. He \({ }^{1}\) Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, Bulletin No. 3o, Soil Series No. 4, Soil Surrey of Iorwa County, Wisconsin (Madison, 1914).
says of township 7, range 1 east: "The greatest part of this township is broken land with a very thin growth of stunted burr oak. There are only about four or five sections of open rolling prairie, not very well watered. Soil in the prairie, good second rate; in the east, rather sandy; in the west and middle, clayey." \({ }^{\prime 2}\) There is very little sand in this town, and there are no marshes. It has a good, strong limestone soil well adapted to the growth of cereals. Under present-day systems of cultivation corn is said to yield 50 to 75 bushels per acre on the Marshall silt loam, and it can be grown for many years in succession on the same land. The Knox silt loam is an excellent wheat soil, and the narrow belts of alluvial (Wabash silt loam) are natural corn and grass land. The rough, stony lands afford some blue grass pasture and, if permitted to do so, grow wood successfully.

Timber.-The surveyor found the land "very thinly timbered" or "thinly timbered" or "prairie," and the only trees noted were oaks. No doubt other timber existed, but there was so little of every kind save oaks, and the other trees were apparently so insignificant, as to justify his omission to mention them. It was an open town, almost a prairie town, but with accessible supplies of timber-conditions always regarded as very favorable for agriculture.

Beginnings of Settlement.-Highland is one of the towns in our list which was first settled for other than agricultural reasons. \({ }^{3}\) The Galena outcrop, which is prominent in the higher parts of the town, was early prospected for lead, and mines were actually begun, it is said, near Centerville as early as 1828. Under the name of the Blue River Mines, that district soon after the Black Hawk War become prominent in the annals of Wisconsin lead mining and continued to produce largely till near the middle of the century. Meantime, other leads were opened in and near the present village of Highland which drew the miners away from Centerville, in township 6, and resulted in the building up of a permanent community first called Franklin, or Blue River, afterwards Highland. When David Dale Owen conducted his mineral lands survey, in the autumn of 1839, he found the principal diggings in township 7, range 1 east to be "Jones's Diggings" on the northwest quarter of section 28. From those diggings he reported the extraction of from 10,000 to 20,000 pounds of lead in a month, and noted that large quantities of carbonate of zinc were found in connection with the lead ore. \({ }^{4}\) The Centerville mines were in township 6, range 1 east, on sections
\({ }^{2}\) David Dale Owen, Report of a Geological Exploration of Part of Iowa, Wisconsin, and Illinois' in 1839 [revised edition, 1844], 131. (U. S. 28 th Cong 1st sess. Sen. Doc. 407 ).
PPrairie du Chien was a fur trading center early in the eighteenth century. In Sevastopol the first land entries were made by fishing interests.
- David Dale Owen, op. cit.
\(5,6,7\), and 8 . Section 28 , township 7, range 1 east is in the immediate neighborhood of the village of Highland, which may therefore be said to have originated in "Jones's Diggings."

The voting list of the town in 1838 contains the names of 46 persons, many of them doubtless heads of families, so that it is safe to reckon the population thus early at from 100 to 200 persons. Some of those voters bore names which have become very familiar in the local history of Iowa County and neighboring counties. Among them were Moses Meeker, P. C. Underwood-later a settler in Pulaski-and Thomas Waters, perhaps the same who became the first settler in the town of Waters, Grant County. Others remained as permanent settlers of Highland. Practically all of the men were engaged in mining. However, agriculture was beginning. It is reported that in 1836 or 1837 Thomas D. Potts opened the first farm in the town near the south boundary. He also started one of the first orchards in the county. \({ }^{5}\) The village of Highland was begun in 1840 but was not platted until six years later. It flourished greatly, under the stimulus of mining, until about 1850, when the profits of lead mining fell off, the cholera swept away many of the inhabitants and disheartened the rest, and California attracted large numbers. Thereafter the village revived gradually.

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Land.-The land entries for township 7, range 1 east, which is the portion of the town of Highland covered by our plat, may be classed as early and later. Regarding all entries to the end of 1850 as early entries, we find that these are distributed rather widely and that they subdivide again into those of the years 1835 to 1837 and those between 1846 and 1850. The second of these subdivisions contains the more numerous class, these entries covering most of sections \(10,15,22,23,24\), and 26 , together with parts of \(9,12,13,14,18,35\), and 36 . The earliest entries are grouped in section 4 and in sections 18 to 21 and 28 to 35 . Section 4 may have shown mineral signs, or it may have been absorbed for other speculative reasons, possibly because it contained one of the springs of the Six-Mile branch of Blue River. The other sections taken together constitute the area in the southwestern portion of the township (including several heads of Blue River), which was known to be mineral bearing and adjoined the Centerville district. Doubtless all of those claims were mineral prospects.

It appears, therefore, that farming claims strictly socalled were not made prior to 1846 when, within a few years, they occurred in large numbers in sections \(9,10,12,14,15,22\), 23,24 , and 26 . The greater part of the sections indicated is covered with Knox silt loam soil. The entrymen apparently
\({ }^{5}\) History of Iowea County, Wisconsin (Chicago, 1881), 797.
kept to the less elevated ridges and to the neighborhoods of the existing roads. Very little of the land entered thus early lay in the valleys. The object being to raise wheat to supply the mining camps, open ridge land was a good choice. There is little evidence of speculation in the farm lands of this town, mining speculation being more attractive. A large proportion of the farm lands was taken up during the fifties and a small proportion in the sixties. While most of the earlier farm makers were originally miners, the later entrymen were in many cases Irish immigrants who had been engaged in railway labor on the Milwaukee and Mississippi Railroad. Many others were German immigrants.

Progress of Farm Making.-The census of 1860 credits Highland with 280 farms. These included an area of 33,520 acres, making an average of 119 acres to the farm. However, 23,005 acres was of uncultivated lands, and only 10,515 acres cultivated, giving the farms an average of 37 cultivated acres and 82 uncultivated acres. Ten years later the number of farms was 360 and the aggregate land in them 52,842 acres, or 146 acres per farm, of which 65 was cultivated and 81 uncultivated. As in the case of Pulaski, great progress in farm making occurred in the next decade, 1870 to 1880. For the tenth census (1880) assigns to the town (now obviously much reduced in area) 261 farms averaging 136 acres, with an improved acreage of 73 acres against an unimproved of 63 acres.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-In 1860 only one of Highland's farms was of less than 20 acres and only two over 500 acres. The largest was W. S. Adams's farm containing 626 acres. There were 49 farms of 20 to 49 acres, 86 of 50 to 99,102 of 100 to 174 , and 40 of 175 to 499. But 209 of the 280 farms had 40 acres or less of cultivated land, 25 had between 41 and 60 acres, 34 between 61 and 100, and 12 over 100. One farm had 200 cultivated acres, one 170 acres, five 160 acres each, one 140 acres, one 130 acres, and three 120 acres each.

Ten years later 7 farms were under 20 acres and 3 over 500 acres. In class two were 32 farms, in class three, 86 , in class four, 136, and in class five, 96 . The largest farm, 790 acres, belonged to Joseph Johnson. One hundred and fiftyfive farms had each less than 40 acres improved, 70 had from 41 to 60 acres, 84 from 61 to 100 acres, and 51 over 100 acres. One farm had 480 improved acres, two had 320 , one had 260 , one 250 , and five 240 acres each.

In 1880 there was a drop in the number of farms to 261, which is doubtless explained by a change in the boundaries of the town. Two of the farms were under 20 acres, 24 from 20 to 49,74 from 50 to 99,101 from 100 to 174, and 59 from 175 to 500 . Only one was larger than 500 acres, that farm containing 1161 acres-the property of Daniel Jones. Eighty-two farmers cultivated 40 acres or less; 51,41 to 60 acres; 83,60 to 100 acres; and 45, over 100 acres. On the
largest farm 761 acres was under cultivation. It had the second largest income- \(\$ 2300\).

General Productions.-From the plat it will be seen that the farms of Highland (at least that part of the town included in township 7, range 1 east) were not as heavy producers of wheat in ' 59 and ' 69 as were those of some other towns. Still, the aggregate amount of wheat produced in this large town was considerable. The 1860 census gives the total as 47,922 bushels, which is more than was produced in any of the other towns except Pleasant Springs and Sugar Creek. These produced more on a much smaller area. Highland's average per farm was only 171 bushels, twelve towns surpassing it in this item. Relatively to the amount of land under cultivation, Highland ranked much higher. In 1869 the crop amounted to 100,414 bushels, and at that time the total area under cultivation was 23,470 acres. Only one other town, Mount Pleasant, had that much cultivated land, and the wheat crop there was only 29,576 bushels. Highland's average per farm was 278 bushels, ranking the town number ten in our list. In 1879 the farm average was 250 bushels, which was more than was produced in any of the other towns save only Empire and Bangor. The Knox silt loam soil and the Marshall silt loam of Highland were demonstrating their excellence for wheat. In point of yield, Highland stood first with 16 bushels per acre, while Empire produced 15 and Bangor 10. In 1884, 2400 acres yielded 36,700 bushels, and in 1894, 1374 acres produced 22,121 bushels. Both of these yields were very good, yet the area devoted to wheat was shrinking fast, and in 1904 Highland had but 293 acres of wheat.

Meantime, the corn crop was advancing apace. In 1859 it was 164 bushels per farm, in 1869 it was 281 bushels, while in 1879 it was up to 501 bushels. The yield in the last named year was 38.5 bushels per acre. Corresponding to the growth of the corn crop, the number of hogs advanced from 7 per farm in 1860 and 11.9 in 1870 to 21 in 1880. This was the largest number found in any of the towns at that census period except Plymouth, which had 25.

The dairy interest made at first a poor showing. In 1859 the butter product amounted to 87 pounds per farm, in 1869 to 159 pounds, and in 1879 to 208 pounds. The aggregate was 54,310 pounds. No cheese was made up to that time. In 1884 butter was still the sole dairy product and it had not increased in amount, but in 1895 there is a record of 175,860 pounds of cheese worth \(\$ 12,949\), in addition to 128,600 pounds of butter worth \(\$ 17,517\). Dairying, therefore, was coming to the fore. The state census for 1905 assigns to the 246 farms of Highland an average income from dairy products of \(\$ 306.60\). At that time the average number of cows per farm was 11.2 and the unit income per cow was \(\$ 27.37\). In 1919 the number of cows was 14.1 , the unit production \(\$ 74.32\) per cow, and the dairy income per farm \(\$ 1044\). Among the towns compared, Highland ranked tenth in number of cows
per farm, sixteenth in aggregate dairy income per farm, and twentieth in unit production per cow. Some attention was paid to sheep raising until after 1880.

Special Productions.-With the single exception of flaxseed, of which this town produced an appreciable amount in 1869 and again in 1879, there was no agricultural specialty. A good many cattle were slaughtered on the farms, but the same was true of other towns. Forest products were of little account, though some were listed as late as 1879.

Value of Productions.-In 1879 the average value of productions per farm was \(\$ 562\). Twenty-five years later it was \(\$ 624\), and in 1919, with greatly enhanced prices, \(\$ 2006\). In that year Highland ranked nineteenth in the list of twenty-three towns-Castle Rock, Prairie du Chien, Sevastopol, and Sparta being lower in income. Classifying the farms according to incomes we find, in 1870, 22 with incomes of \(\$ 200\) or less, 61 with \(\$ 200\) to \(\$ 399,68\) with \(\$ 400\) to \(\$ 599,84\) with \(\$ 600\) to \(\$ 999\), and 125 with \(\$ 1000\) or over. Of the last class, 96 farms produced between \(\$ 1000\) and \(\$ 1999,18\) between \(\$ 2000\) and \(\$ 2999,7\) between \(\$ 3000\) and \(\$ 3999,3\) between \(\$ 4000\) and \(\$ 4999\). One farm of 440 acres, with 320 acres under cultivation, produced \(\$ 6035\). It was the property of John Holman and was valued at \(\$ 16,000\). The livestock was valued at \(\$ 1850\), slaughtered animals \(\$ 1120\). The wheat crop was 1900 bushels, corn 1200, barley 10,000 bushels, and there was flaxseed to the amount of 1400 bushels. According to the tenth census (1880) Highland had 23 incomes of the first class (under \$200), 73 of the second, 68 of the third, 65 of the fourth, and 32 of the fifth. The largest income was \(\$ 2350\), made by Bridget Kennedy on a farm of 400 acres valued at \(\$ 8000\). It had \(\$ 1400\) worth of livestock, and produced from 10 cows 800 pounds of butter. There were 31 other cattle and 14 hogs. The crops included 1400 bushels of corn, 2000 bushels of oats, 400 of wheat, and 900 of flax. The second largest income was that of Daniel Jones, whose farm of 1161 acres was valued at \(\$ 10,000\), with livestock valued at \(\$ 2000\). There were 12 cows, 23 other cattle, and 40 hogs. Crops included 500 pounds of butter, 3000 bushels of corn, 1000 bushels of oats, and 650 bushels of wheat.

Manufactures.-In addition to the lead smelters and zinc works growing out of the mining activity, Highland had a brewery located in the village, and there were two gristmills in different parts of the town. Particular interest attaches to the project for a windmill which was erected about 1870 by Thomas Dering. It was thought that, on account of the elevation and the unimpeded sweep of wind at Highland, power sufficient for grinding could be generated in that way, but the mill was soon abandoned. \({ }^{\circ}\) Iron and wood working shops suitable for the service of the farmers were located in the village.
- History of Iorva County, 799.


Fig. 13. Town of Highland, 1915 After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches.-The old mining village of Centerville and the village of Highland belong to this town. The first of these is extinct. Highland is the actual social and business center of the town and of the southwestern portion of the county of Iowa. In 1881 the village of Highland was described as having a population of 686, with two hotels, two law offices, two physicians, one ore buyer, six general stores, two drug stores, three hardware stores, one furniture store, two harness shops, one jeweler's shop, two meat markets, three wagon shops, four blacksmith shops, three carpenter shops, three shoe shops, two millinery stores, one brewery, and seven saloons. In 1900 there was a population of 1642 , an increase of only 65 over the 1890 count. So it appears the principal growth had occurred in the years 1880 to 1890 , during which decade the population more than doubled. In 1910 it had only 1096, and in 1920 the figure stood 1024. The prosperity of Highland varied with the activity of the mining industry.

In some respects, Highland has had a more interesting history than any other village in the towns discussed. The mining character of the early population gave it distinctive traits which persist, to some extent, to the present. In pioneer days-and, indeed, for a good many years-hard drinking,
fisticuffs, and like social practices were sufficiently common to give the place notoriety through the surrounding country. There is no doubt that its influence affected the characters of the young men on the near-by farms. Fortunately one of the Catholic priests, Reverend Stephen Trent of Highland, became a strong promoter of the temperance movement, which proved of enormous benefit to many outside his parish as well as to all those within. Under such impulses public education was fostered, the Highland free high school ranking well in that region and serving the rural community as well as the village. Among the early principals of the school was Charles Egan, a graduate of the University of Wisconsin, who for many years has been a practicing physician in the place.

Highland has had four churches: (1) a Methodist, which was the first to start, about 1845; this church became extinct about 1880. (2) A Presbyterian, organized before 1850 but later merged with the German Presbyterian church which was organized in 1856. (3) St. Philip's, an Irish Catholic society, was formed in 1846; it has a fine stone church erected in 1871. (4) St. John's Church, a German Catholic society, was organized in 1860 out of St. Philip's congregation, and built a stone church in 1861 and the years following. Some of the most notable priests of the German church were Fathers F. X. Weinhart, V. Rademacher, and F. A. Wambold. We have already mentioned the social influence of Father Trent, of the Irish church, who was a powerful leader. He was responsible for the erection in 1871 of the fine stone church edifice which is Highland's chief architectural ornament. There is a Norwegian Lutheran church in section 29, township 7, range 2 east. The building was erected in 1872.

Aside from the schools of the village, there are district schools to the number of seven distributed over the town. One is south of Centerville post office, in section 7, township 6, range 1 east; another in section 7, township 7, range 1 east; a third in section 35 ; and a fourth in section 10. There are three in that part of the town lying in township 7, range 2 east, one in section 18 , one in section 22 , and another in section 33. Highland and Centerville (sometimes called Dry Bone) are the only post offices.

Population Changes.-The history of churches affords a good commentary upon the population character of the town and on its changes during the earlier period. The fact that the two Protestant churches using the English servicethe Methodist and the Presbyterian-failed to survive, while a German Presbyterian and a Norwegian Lutheran church flourished alongside of an Irish Catholic church and a German

Catholic church, tells the story in institutional terms. Father Wambold reported in 1898 that his congregation (St. John's) contained 150 families, of which five-sixths were German, the rest Bohemian. Occupationally, two-thirds were engaged in farming, one-third in mining.

From the statistical point of view, we note that, while the number of Americans in 1850 (756) was larger than the number of foreign born (419), even then the families having foreign born heads exceeded in number those having native born heads, the figures being 134 and 107 . Ten years later they were 353 to 85 , and in 1870 they were 355 to 71. After the separation of the village from the town, 1874, the town's population declined to 1588 in 1885. At that time the American families numbered 64 , the foreign 244 ; in 1895 the relative numbers were 87 and 181, in 1905 they were 183 and 98 , and in 1920, 252 and 37 . As to nativity of the foreign born, Ireland came first (1850) with 165, as against 105 from England and 98 from Germany, 30 from Wales, and about 20 from five other countries. By 1860 the Germans were ahead with 334 , the Irish second with 270 , the Scandinavians (Norwegians) third with 208, and the English fourth with 175. Of Welsh, Canadians, Swiss, Scotch, and Bohemians there were 91. All of these racial stocks began to decline after 1870, due to the death and removal from the country of the older immigrants; so that, by 1920, there were left only 37 German born, 3 Irish born, and 20 Norwegian born settlers. There were also 7 Bohemians and a few scattering representatives of other European nationalities. On the other hand, 1241 out of the aggregate population in 1920 (1363) were born in Wisconsin and 37 in other American states.


\section*{Survey Notes}
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\section*{L O D I}

LOCATION.-The town of Lodi, organized in 1846, occupies township 10, range 8 east, in the southwestern part of Columbia County. It is bounded north by Dekorra, east by Arlington, south by Dane (Dane County), and west by West Point. At the northwest corner the town touches the Wisconsin River. The earliest markets were Columbus, Portage, and Madison. The cities and villages in the county are now markets and also shipping points to more distant markets for much of the agricultural produce. Livestock and creamery products are shipped mainly to Milwaukee, Chicago, and other places outside of the county. It is 158 miles from Lodi village to Chicago via the main line of the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad, which passes through Lodi.

Surface and Drainage.-The surface of the town varies from level to gently rolling on the prairies, and from rolling to hilly on the upland timbered portions. Except on some of the more level lands the natural drainage is excellent. The town is crossed from south to north by Spring Creek, one of the main affluents of the Wisconsin River, in the valley of


Fig. 14. Topographic Map, Town of Lodi Reproduced from United States Geological Survey Baraboo Sheet
which the town lies. Along the valley of Spring Creek are some marshy land and peat. A great deal of the town is high, upland, rolling prairie, its irregularity caused by the broken upper surface of the underlying magnesian limestone. There are many high bluffs in the town. Upper Cambrian sandstone forms the lower portions of these as well as of lower levels. Above the upper Cambrian, the bluffs include Mendota and Madison sandstone and lower magnesian limestone. On section 27, near the southeast corner, the road is cut into Madison sandstone, exposing it twènty-five feet in thickness. There are limestone quarries on sections 7, 10, 18, 20, 31, 32, and 34. Gibraltar Bluff, on sections 17 and 18, is one of the high hills of the state. Its summit has an elevation of about 1240 feet above sea level. Other high altitudes of over 1000 feet above sea level in the town are the bluff on the southwest quarter of section 7, the south line of the southwest quarter of section 14, the north half of section 14, the southwest corner of section 20 , the northeast quarter of section 23 , the bluff on the northwest quarter of section 24, the southwest quarter of section 28 , the middle of the west line of the southwest quarter of section 28 , and the bluff on the north half of section 31.

Types of Soll.-The map in the soil survey of Columbia County shows Miami silt loam to be the most important type of soil in Lodi. It is one of the leading agricultural soils of southeastern Wisconsin, and in Columbia County is devoted chiefly to general farming. There is a small amount of Carrington silt loam, a rich prairie soil, highly improved. Special crops, in addition to general farming, are grown on it. Tobacco is one of the most important special crops. There are scattered areas also of Miami fine sandy loam, Miami fine sand, Plainfield fine sand, and Clyde loam. Patches of unimproved marsh and peat are found in the northwest part of the town. \({ }^{1}\)

Timber.-The government surveyor John Mullett in 1833 noted oak as the prevailing timber in Lodi. There were also some maple and elm, and hazel, thorn, etc., undergrowth The town was not heavily timbered but was made up mainly of oak openings and some prairie.

Beginnings of Settlement.-The first land entries in Lodi were in 1836 by speculators, but no settlers arrived before 1845. Marston C. and George M. Bartholomew had explored the valley of Spring Creek in 1844, and in 1845 they settled there with their families, as did also Reverend H. Maynard and his family and James McCloud. In 1845 or 1846 Isaac H. Palmer, on an exploring trip, discovered that the water power site on section 27, on Spring Creek, through an error in the location of Spring Creek on government plats,
\({ }^{1}\) Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, Bulletin No. 49, So Series No. 14, Soil Survey of Cohumbia County, Wisconsin (Madison, 1916).
had not been entered. \({ }^{2}\) Early in 1846 he entered the south east quarter of the northeast quarter, the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, and the south half of the southeast quarter of section 27. In April of that year he began to build here the first sawmill of the town. The Bartholomews were from Illinois, and in 1846 and 1847 other settlers from Illinois followed them to Lodi. Among these were Joseph Brown, Jacob Hurley, Adam and Nathan Bowman, John Foote, Amos and John Stroud, John Chance, Horace An drews, Johnson Sowards, and John Newberry. Other early settlers were William G. Joseph, G. T. Simons, James M Steel, Ira Polley, H. M. Ayer, and Alonzo Waterbury Among the early settlers, those who had made farms by 1860 were Peter Hart, section 1; the Bartholomews-George M., J. M., William M., and Marston C.-on sections 23, 26, 15, 22, and 14; Joseph Brown, on section 31; William G. Simons, on section 33; and Aaron Chalfont, on section 21.

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Land.-The preference among the earliest entrants of land seems on the whole to have been for locations in the valley of the creekon sections 7, 8, 17, 20, 21, 22, 27, 33, and 34. Actual settlers of 1845 and 1846 also kept to the valley. Some of the best farms were later developed on these early tracts. William M Bartholomew, in 1859, on sections 15 and 22 raised 1100 bushels of wheat on 150 improved acres. A great many claims were made after 1850 , and by 1860 all the land in the town had been entered. A comparison of the first entries with the soil map seems to indicate that they were more often made on oak openings, but that was probably because there was a good deal less prairie than timbered land in Lodi to begin with. Entries on prairies were made as early, though not as frequently, as on the timbered soils.

Progress of Farm Making.-The town of Lodi in 1860 ranked eleventh among the towns compared in average number of improved acres in its farms; it had 55 acres improved on the average farm of 131 acres. Nineteen farms had 100 acres or more improved land, but only one had as much as 160 improved acres. The total area in farms at this period was 16,385 acres, considerably more than half the acreage of the town, of which 6938 acres was cleared. Ten years later the number of farms had gone up from 124 in 1860 to 170, and the total area in farms was 20,985 acres, practically the entire area of the town. This acreage fell in 1880 to 16,584 acres, in 1885 it rose a little to 18,512 acres, in 1895 it fell again to 15,381 , and in 1905 there was a farm area of only 14,992 acres. The number of farms also fell from 170 in 1870 to 115 in 1880. In 1905 there were only 104. The size of farms in-

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{2}\) History of Columbia County, Wisconsin (Chicago, 1880), 768
}
creased from an average of 131 acres in 1860 and about the same size in 1870, to 144 in 1880 and 1905.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-The several classes of farms at the different census periods stood as follows in regard to size: in 1860, under 20 acres, 4 ; between 20 and 49,21 ; from 50 to 99,26 ; from 100 to 174,48 ; and from 175 to 499, 25. In 1870, 2 farms had over 400 acres and 5 under 20 acres. There were 27 of 20 to 49 acres each, 45 of 50 to 99,56 of 100 to 174 , and 35 of 175 to 499. Ten years later there were \(\mathbf{3}\) farms under 20 acres, 13 farms of 20 to 49 acres, 34 farms of 50 to 99 acres, and 31 farms of 100 to 174 acres. The farms of 175 to 499 acres numbered 32 , and 2 overran that limit, reaching 600 and 605 acres respectively. The tendency was toward moderate-sized and goodsized farms.

General Productions.-According to the 1860 census, Lodi in 1859 produced 41,872 bushels of wheat or an average of 337 bushels per farm. This was among the highest productions of the towns studied. The 1870 census records a wheat production for the town of 56,739 bushels or 333 bushels per farm. This placed Lodi as a wheat producer fifth among the towns compared. Ten years later only four of the towns were below Lodi in that item. In 1884 Lodi was credited with 363 acres of wheat yielding 9049 bushels. The area was about one-third that of 1879 and the product almost 3000 bushels less. The yield per acre was twice as large. In 1894 the acreage had shrunk to one-fourth that of 1884, and in 1904 no wheat was grown in the town.

In corn growing, Lodi averaged below the highest production per farm in 1879, ranking sixth among the twentythree towns. In the actual aggregate her crop stood tenth. In 1859 and again in 1869 nine of the towns exceeded Lodi in amount grown per farm.

In 1860 in the number of stock cattle Lodi ranked tenth in total number and tied with Mount Pleasant for eighth place in average per farm. Eleven towns had a higher farm average of swine. Stock raising and dairying gradually became more important. In 1880 there were 2207 swine, 798 cows, and a butter production amounting to 51,035 pounds. The 1895 census recorded 2847 swine, 767 cows, and a butter production of 107,450 pounds. Presumably the dairy product of 1894 included a large amount of cheese of which no record is given. In the same year corn amounted to \(\mathbf{7 9 , 4 8 0}\) bushels and oats to 109,330 bushels.

Throughout its history Lodi presents the picture of a well-to-do community, not conspicuously prosperous from one highly developed line, as New Glarus and Primrose from cheese manufacture, or Pleasant Springs from tobacco production, nor ranking quite with such generally prosperous towns as Sugar Creek and Whitewater in Walworth County. According to the census of 1905 we find recorded for Lodi, at that period, 89,118 bushels of oats, 51,280 bushels of corn, 5065 bushels of rye, and 2349 tons of hay. Cattle and calves
sold and consumed on the farm numbered 732 and were valued at \(\$ 20,849\). Milch cows numbered 713 and were valued at \(\$ 18,060\). Milk sold and consumed on the farm came to 11,434 gallons, and the butter production to 46,680 pounds. In Lodi village \(1,852,800\) pounds of milk was received in creameries, from which 91,685 pounds of butter was produced. Large amounts of this were undoubtedly from the town of Lodi itself. We get, therefore, the impression of a real prosperity and also of a latent prosperity-for any of the general farming activities which have been so successfully pursued could be more highly developed, and with its special productions of tobacco, sugar beets, and truck crops, for all of which it has excellent soil, Lodi could easily rank near the top of the list of towns studied.

Special Productions.-Special crops are not raised as extensively on Miami silt loam, typical phase, the predominating soil in Lodi, as they are on the deep phase, or on Carrington silt loam. There is a small amount of Carrington silt loam in the town, and 196,275 pounds of tobacco valued at \(\$ 12,188\) was grown in 1904. Sugar beets are another special crop in the county, but only 139 tons was grown in Lodi in 1904. Potatoes, beans, peas, cucumbers, and cabbage are also raised in considerable quantities.


Fig. 15. Town of Lodi, 1915 After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company
Sheep have been of some interest to Lodi farmers, but the town has never equaled, either in numbers or in quality, towns like Sugar Creek, where wool growing was a special industry. The 1860 census recorded for Lodi 223 sheep with an average wool production of 2.8 pounds. Ten years later this had
gone up to 3.6 pounds and by 1880 to 4.7 pounds. In 1870 there were 2384 sheep, an average of 14 per farm. The industry had practically disappeared by 1884.

Value of Productions.-In 1869 the value of all farm productions in the town was \(\$ 169,000\), which was equivalent to \(\$ 994\) per farm on the average. Ten years later the average per farm was \(\$ 764\). At the first period there were 71 incomes of \(\$ 1000\) or over, the maximum being \(\$ 4625\), made out of general farming, especially wheat, corn, oats, and stock raising. Other incomes in this class were: \(\mathbf{3}\) between \(\$ 3000\) and \(\$ 3999,13\) between \(\$ 2000\) and \(\$ 2999,10\) between \(\$ 1000\) and \(\$ 1999\), the rest under \(\$ 1000\). Thirty-three were between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999\), 19 between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599\), and 29 between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399\). There were 12 incomes of less than \(\$ 200\). Eight farms reported no incomes. In 1879 the maximum income was \(\$ 4000\), made largely out of livestock and dairying, and there were 35 others of \(\$ 1000\) or more. There were 23 of the second class ( \(\$ 600\) to \(\$ 999\) ), 30 of the third class ( \(\$ 400\) to \(\$ 599\) ), and 18 of the fourth class ( \(\$ 200\) to \(\$ 399\) ). Seven incomes fell below \(\$ 200\).

In 1904 the average farm income in Lodi was \(\$ 881\), and in 1919 (with much higher prices) it was \(\$ 2393\). The aggregate number of cows had decreased somewhat by 1905, and dairy products amounted to only \(\$ 252\) per farm. By 1920 the number of cows had more than doubled and dairy products were valued at \(\$ 1000\) per farm. The total average livestock production per farm was \(\$ 1888\) at this period, against \(\$ 720\) in 1904. The average production of livestock other than dairy cattle was valued at \(\$ 237\) in 1904, and at \(\$ 888\) in 1919. Average crop incomes increased in these periods from \(\$ 161\) in 1904 to \(\$ 505\) in 1919. Although there was decided development in general farming, the increase was most marked in the dairy industry.

Manufactures.-In April, 1846, Isaac H. Palmer started to build the first sawmill, which was opened in the fall of that year. In 1847 a post office and a ferry were established. \({ }^{3}\) In the same year Samuel Ring put up a sawmill in the village of Okee. A gristmill was built and began operating in the village of Lodi in 1848, and a blacksmith shop was built by Reuben Ring. There were no stores nearer than Columbus, Portage, and Madison. By the end of the year 1848 a store building was completed by Mr. Palmer and occupied by Thomas and Pinney. In 1850 Mr. Palmer put up a flour mill. In 1852 there were two flour mills, a sawmill, and many mechanics. In 1856 there were also two general stores in the village of Lodi, a drug store, the "Capital Store," a blacksmith shop, and about a dozen houses. In 1860 there were four flour mills and a sawmill, a cabinet maker, a wheelwright, a tin manufactory, and a boot and shoe manufactory. In 1871 the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad was built through the town, passing through sections \(8,17,16,21,27\), and 34.
\({ }^{3}\) History of Columbia County (1880), 777.

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches.There are two villages in the town of Lodi-Okee on section 8, and Lodi village on section 27. A post office was established in 1847 in what was later the village of Lodi, and I. H. Palmer was appointed the first postmaster.

In the summer of 1846 a \(\log\) house was built on section 27, where the first school was taught in the summer of that year by Mary Yockey. \({ }^{4}\) In 1851 a frame building was erected in its place. In 1864 school districts 1, 2, 6, 7, and a part of 3 were consolidated into a union district in order to make possible the establishment of a union school. In 1866 three buildings for housing the grades were moved onto one site, and the upper classes were taught in the basement of the Methodist church. Before this, private schools had been taught by Mr. Himebaugh and Dr. A. G. Riley. In 1869 a new \(\$ 9475\) school building was erected. In 1898 the first high school was built.
\({ }^{4}\) History of Columbia County, Wisconsin (Chicago, 1914), i, 270.

In 1850 there was no church in the town, but services were held in private houses. The first church built was the Methodist in 1857, in the village of Lodi. In the early sixties a Presbyterian church was built there, and in 1867 a Baptist church was dedicated.

Population Changes.-The population of the town has been largely American from the beginning. In every census from 1860 until 1920 foreigners made up only about 17 per cent of the total population. In 1920 they were about 10 per cent of the total. In 1860 there were 277 families in the town, of whom 179 were American and 98 foreign born. The proportion of foreign born heads of families was practically the same in 1870 , but in 1885 it was about 10 per cent larger. In 1920, however, it shrank to less than half, proportionally, of what it had been in 1860. Of the foreigners the largest proportion through all the census periods were Norwegians. The next largest groups were English, Irish,

Scotch, and Germans. Settlers from states other than Wisconsin numbered 742 in 1860. Most of these were from New York and New England. The next largest groups were from Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois.
M. A. K.
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\section*{MOUNT PLEASANT}

LOCATION.-The town of Mount Pleasant is unsymmetrical. Its boundaries have changed several times since the original organization of a town of that name, which occurred in 1838. At present it occupies all of township 3 north, range 22 east, which is the portion covered by the plat printed herewith, and so much of fractional township 3 north, range 23 east as is not included within the city limits of Racine. In the beginning Mount Pleasant occupied townships 3 and 4 , range 21 east and the west halves of 3 and 4 , range 22 east, leaving the balance of 3 and 4 , range 22 , also fractional townships 3 and 4 , range 23 , to form the town of Racine. Later, Mount Pleasant, Racine, and Caledonia divided longitudinally the territory embraced in townships 3 and 4, range 22 , and fractional townships 3 and 4, range 23, each of the three towns being four sections wide from south to north. The "town of Racine" remained on the county map some years after the incorporation of the city (1848), but eventually the four sections in breadth occupied by it were divided between Mount Pleasant and Caledonia, giving to each its present boundaries save that the territory of Mount Pleasant has been contracted with every expansion of the city limits of Racine. Of fractional township 3, range 23 , the city now occupies all save one full range and two fractional ranges of sections, the lake cutting off portions of sections \(4,9,16,21\), and 28 , also a corner of 29 and about one-fourth of 32 . The city's manufactories extend considerably beyond the city limits into the town of Mount Pleasant, which makes difficult a population count of farmers.

Mount Pleasant is bounded north by Caledonia, east by the city of Racine and the lake, south by Somers in Kenosha County, and west by Yorkville.

Surface and Drainage.-The surface has the usual physical characteristics of the lake front-a succession of nearly parallel wide, low, and comparatively level ridges separated by narrower and gentle depressions. The terrain is all glaciated, the soil having been created from the limestone of the environs by the action of the glacier. The easternmost of the ridges has been cut back by the lake, affording a high, commanding situation for the city overlooking the lake and that part of Root River which, breaking through the ridge, enters the lake within the city and forms the port. Low ground succeeds this for a breadth of perhaps half a mile, when a second ridge paralleling the coast begins. This ridge, which in breadth extends approximately three miles, is succeeded by another depression averaging about half a mile in breadth, which reaches from north to south quite through the town and, in the southern part of the town, forms the trough through which Pike River flows. This depression lies wholly
within the second and third ranges of sections in township 3 north, range 22. Beyond it, within the town, is another ridge some two miles wide on the average, with a third depression, this one trending northeast and southwest. The northwesternmost portion of the town is ridge land. The principal streams are the lower course of Root River (in township 3 north, range 23) and the branch of Pike River mentioned above. A small branch of Root River rises in section \(\mathbf{3}\) and flows east through 2, then north. Township 3 north, range 22 east, was surveyed by Joshua Hathaway in 1836. The surveyor described most of the land as either level or rolling prairie, and usually characterized these types as first-rate. Occasionally his line ran through a swamp or marsh (in the depressions), and these lands would be called second-rate or sometimes, third-rate

Types of Soil.-The percentage of first-rate land was extraordinarily high, the swamps and marshes few and small. On the whole, if we can rely upon the surveyor's judgment, this is physically one of the very best townships covered in the present study. Its position on the lake shore, with a prominent port within a few miles, gives it unusual agricultural as well as social advantages. There is as yet no soil survey of Racine County, but doubtless the general results obtained for Milwaukee County would be applicable here also to a considerable extent, so that we may regard the broad ridges as covered deeply with a rich clayey loam of limestone glacial formation, and the depressions with an alluvial deposit of similar origin. The prevailingly treeless, prairie character of Mount Pleasant would modify the soil conditions to some extent.

Timber.-The timber, of which there was little, was of those hardwood varieties which persist best in regions often scourged by fire-white, burr, and black oak, ash, hickory and walnut. No oak openings are mentioned, and the technical term "prairie," so generally used in description by surveyors, means fairly even ground mostly unencumbered with forest growth. The prairies were either level or rolling, mostly the latter.

Beginnings of Settlement. \({ }^{1}\) - The entries of lands in township 3, range 22, began in the years 1838-39-that is, with the first land sale at the Milwaukee land office. At that time were entered all of the lands in the easternmost range of sections, also all except five quarter-sections in the second range of sections, and other tracts partly in the northern, partly in the southern sections of the township. All of the western and interior parts of the township were purchased

\footnotetext{
1. History of Agriculture in Wisconsin, 33-35.
}
ater, mostly in the years 1841 to 1844, although several pieces were taken in 1845 and a number of others in 1846. Nine whole sections, one-fourth of the township, were shunned in this manner by the first comers-together with fractions of ten others aggregating at least five sections more.

Many of those, in Mount Pleasant, who bought their land in 1838-39 had been living in the town for one or two years, the influx being very large in 1836 and 1837. By good fortune we have in the pioneer newspaper, the Racine Argus, published irregularly from February to October, 1838, a unique aid to glimpsing the beginnings of this community. "The back-country, for farming," says one writer, \({ }^{2}\) "taking into consideration its rich soil, pure water and healthy climate is not surpassed by any part of the United States. There is a fair proportion of prairie and timber land to make good farms, without the labor of years to bring it into a good state of cultivation. A number of farmers in the immediate vicinity of this place, who struck the first blow on their farms two years ago, have in the past season [1837] raised from one to two thousand bushels of grain. No finer beef cattle can be found than those that graze on our prairies." And the editor a few days later said: "Our farmers have gone on prosperously through the year without feeling any of the effects of the pressure [hard times]. Their farms have produced bountifully, and everything they have raised has brought them a good price. The country is rapidly settling. . . ." By the end of March he reports "our enterprising farmers are all ploughing up their fields for another abundant harvest."" In June the editor says: "We hear from every part of our county and of the two counties west of us, Walworth and Rock, that there will be much more raised than sufficient to sustain our present population. The season thus far has been favorable, and we are told that the prospects are that the crops will be very abundant. There are flour mills building in each of the three counties, and our citizens will no longer depend upon foreign [sic] states for bread stuffs." \({ }^{5}\)

In midsummer of 1838 the settlers all through the Milwaukee land district were startled by the public advertisement of the lands which were to be sold by the government in the months of October, November, and December. \({ }^{\text {b }}\) This announcement, which was printed in the Racine Argus for July 25, evoked an editorial discussion of the land situation which is highly revealing. The editor says \({ }^{7}\) the proposed sale is "contrary to expectations," but urges every one having
\({ }_{3}^{2}\) Racine Argus, Mar. 10, 1838 .
\({ }^{*}\) Mar. 31, 1838. Fine description of a beautiful early spring.
\({ }^{-}\)- June 9, 1838 .
- Ultimately, through persistent petitioning, a postponement was secured till following Febru
a claim who lacks the money to pay for it, to rest not a single moment till he acquires the wherewithal to secure his land. Most of the older settlers will have cattle and surplus grain which they will be able to sell to newly arriving immigrants for cash; \({ }^{8}\) some will part with portions of their claims in order to obtain money to buy the rest; and some will mortgage their land for the same purpose. Probably few were prepared at the moment, but he hopes that all will so bestir themselves in the interim, that the day of sale will find them in position to save their homes.

Later reports indicated that a goodly number of new settlers arrived that fall, that the crops were excellent, and that many of the bachelor claim holders were finding helpmates for themselves. We know from other sources \({ }^{9}\) that capitalists attended the land sale for the purpose of lending money on the security of the lands, which argues that even those who were unable to assemble the necessary funds before the time of the sale were still not compelled to see their homes sold to others. \({ }^{10}\) Tradition says there were but three men left in Racine during the land sale; all the rest were in Milwaukee. \({ }^{11}\)

An examination of the Racine Advocate for the year 1846 reveals the fact that new settlers were still "pouring in, enquiring for improved farms or uncultivated lands, and the proximity to market, the excellence of the soil, the cheapness of lumber, all contribute to offer to the agriculturist all the advantages he can ask."

That the reference to incoming settlers was not merely promotion publicity is shown by the number of tracts of prairie land, in the western and central portions of township 3 , range 22 , which were purchased of the government in 1846 and 1847 , and by the very considerable number of land transfers recorded for the same years. The aggregate of the two types of purchases was about forty. Thereafter no more government land was to be had, but the transfers continued year after year, showing that new people were coming in.

The business of breaking prairie sod was still going on, ox teams being the chief reliance for that purpose, four or five yoke making a team. The amount of land which could be turned in a day with such a team and breaking plow probably varied a good deal. At a "plowing-bee" to help their minister some of the men of Mount Pleasant, on June 25, 1846, turned twelve acres of prairie sod with eight teams-thirty-five yoke of oxen-and separated very early in the evening. \({ }^{12}\) That would be one and one-half acres per plow. Doubtless much more than that amount often was turned in a day.

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Land.-The peculiarities of the way the lands \({ }^{13}\) of this township were taken
\({ }^{8}\) Immigrants made the market in the first years of settlement, prior to the beginning of shipments of grain east, which in Racine was in 1842 .
- See the discussion on Whitewater, post.

Society harles E. Dyer, Historical Address Delivered before the Old Settlers' Society of Racine County, Wisconsin (Racine, 1871).
" See Dyer, supra, for an account of a plan to borrow \(\$ 50,000\) in the East,
which failed.
\({ }_{12}\) Racine
Racine Advocate, July 14, 1846.
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up call for some explanation. Two facts, aside from nearness to the port, influenced men to acquire promptly the lands in the eastern sections. They were, first, that the Chicago-Green Bay road passed through that part of the township and connected at the rapids of Root River with roads to the port; second, that these lands lay on the second prominent prairieridge. The third ridge could be attained only by crossing the depression occupied in the south by Pike River and northwardly, nearly to the northern boundary, by swampy tracts which were not easy to negotiate in wet seasons. The barrier was formidable in the absence of passable roads. The early purchase of the lands in the southern tier of sections seems to have been due to the accessibility to them of the ChicagoGreen Bay road, while in the north was another United States road connecting with the Chicago-Green Bay road.

Ultimately, this east-and-west road was carried through the county to Fox River at Rochester, but several years were required for this work, and meantime there seems to have been nothing better than Indian trails connecting the settlements on the lake front in what are now Racine and Kenosha counties, with those along the Fox River and farther back on the prairies of Walworth and Rock counties, all of which began to settle up about the same time.

In making a detailed examination of the land entries in township 3 north, range 22 east, we observe that the timbered character of the land had its effect upon settlement, as well as roads and barrier marshes. In that township, which was prevailingly high prairie and mostly rolling land, were only a few timbered tracts. In the southeast, section 36 was wholly timbered \(; 35,25,24,13,12\), and 1, partially. All of these were taken up at the earliest opportunity. In the north was one grove, covering considerable portions of \(3,4,10\), and 9 , which extended northward into the adjoining township. It is a striking fact that the earliest entries absorbed all of this forested land, together with some contiguous prairie. In the west and northwest, sections 6 and 7, was a tract which was partly wooded and which abutted on a larger wooded tract (the later "Ives Grove") in the adjoining township (3 north, 21 east). Here an isolated narrow strip was entered early. Only one other timbered tract appears, in the southwest portion, sections 31 and 32 . This was taken also.

Progress of Farm Making.-When we reach the year 1850 the schedules of the seventh census, division of "productions of agriculture," afford definite information respecting conditions and shed a good deal of light upon the course of the community's history. The census shows that the town, as then organized, contained 139 farms. The total acreage of improved land in these farms was 14,073 and of unimproved 3442 acres, making the gross amount of land in the farms 17,515 acres, which is less than a normal township. The astonishing fact is the proportion of improved land, which is vastly higher than in any of the other towns compared. The closest rival was Sugar Creek, in Walworth County, and
there the unimproved acreage exceeded the improved in the ratio of 64 to 56 . In Franklin it was 68 to 41, in Whitewater 101 to 44, and in Brookfield 57 to 35. Plymouth, in Rock County, showed a ratio of 82 to 37 . Even Norway, in Racine County, a neighbor town, showed 74 to 26 . This one fact puts Mount Pleasant in the forefront agriculturally among the nine towns statistically treated in 1850 .

In 1860 the census reports 252 farms with an improved acreage of 22,690 acres and unimproved 2924 acres. This was again the largest improved area and almost twice that of Sugar Creek, still its nearest rival but one. The average improved acreage was 90 acres, unimproved 11 acres.

In 1870 there were 259 farms having 28,034 acres of improved land and 2382 acres of unimproved, or 108 and 9 acres respectively. Ten years later there were 301 farms with 24,868 acres improved or 83 acres to the farm, while 1930 acres or 6 acres to the farm remained unimproved. In 1905 there were 337 farms and the improved acreage had gone down to 22,643 acres, an average of 67 acres per farm.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-The classes of farms stood in the different census periods as follows: As early as 1850 there were 26 farms with areas of between 175 and 499 acres. One farm had 500 acres. There were 53 farms of 100 to 174 acres, 43 farms of 50 to 99 acres, 12 of 20 to 49 acres, and 4 farms had under 20 acres. In 1860 there were 28 small farms under 20 acres, while 34 were between 20 and 49 acres, 77 between 50 and 99 acres, 81 between 100 and 174 acres, and 30 between 175 and 499 acres. Two farms had more than 500 acres. The largest had 1440 acres and was owned by Orville Barnes. In 1870 there were 20 under 20 acres, 45 between 20 and 49 acres, 72 between 50 and 99 acres, 82 between 100 and 174 acres, and 35 between 175 and 499 acres. Five farms exceeded the 500 -acre limit. The largest of these was 1600 acres and belonged to O . W. Barnes, the bonanza farmer of 1860 .

In 1880 the smallest-sized farms numbered 54 . There were 48 in class two, 82 in class three, 79 in class four, and 38 in class five. There were no farms with more than 500 acres. The largest farm had 480 acres and belonged to Richard Richards.

General Productions.-Mount Pleasant in 1849 was the leader among the nine towns in cash value of farm landswhich averaged approximately \(\$ 19.60\) per acre,-in value of farm implements and machinery, in value of livestock per farm, in bushels of oats per farm, in butter, and in hay. Plymouth produced more corn per farm, Sugar Creek produced more wheat, and Plymouth, Norway, and Sugar Creek each produced more wool. Horses were displacing oxen, being more numerous by 329 to 190 . There were on the average more than 3 milch cows to the farm, and the production averaged just over 100 pounds of butter per cow, which is a phenomenally high yield and argues both the relative excellence of the cows and the adequacy of their feed and care.

In Franklin, the yield was just about half as great, and in the other towns usually less, showing probably that little real dairying was done elsewhere than in Mount Pleasant. There were 780 other cattle-aside from cows and working oxenin the town, again the largest number found among the nine towns. This seems to indicate that beef raising went hand in hand with butter making. The number of swine was less, proportionally, than in Empire, New Glarus, or Plymouth.

The decade 1850 to 1860 was a period of rapid development in the agriculture of the settled portions of the state. Our statistical table, based on the census of 1860, accordingly shows many changes in the relative positions of the twentyone towns compared. Mount Pleasant was the leader, by a wide margin, in valuation of farm lands, her lands being held at \(\$ 40\) per acre, while her nearest rival, Brookfield in Waukesha County, showed a valuation of \(\$ 32\) per acre. The other towns lying near the lake shore-Franklin in Milwaukee County and Newton in Manitowoc-showed valuations of \(\$ 30\) and \(\$ 9.00\) respectively, while Empire in Fond du Lac County showed \(\$ 24\), Bangor in La Crosse \(\$ 24\), Whitewater in Walworth County and Plymouth in Rock, each \$22.

In this respect the relative position of Mount Pleasant was about the same as it had been ten years earlier. But the reasons for it are not so clear from these statistics. For, two other towns were better equipped with machinery, six showed a higher valuation of livestock to the average farm, eleven had higher records of wheat production, and three produced more butter per farm. In fact, the farms of Mount Pleasant were first only in the amount of hay produced, which averaged 26 tons as against 24 in Norway, the nearest rival. This shows that the tendency toward hay culture had progressed markedly. Doubtless some of the hay crop, aggregating 6562 tons, was exported, although the total of livestock, big and little-including horses, oxen, cows, and other cattle-was over 3000 head, and there were 1711 sheep in addition, making a large home demand for hay as winter feed.

The agriculture of Mount Pleasant seems to have been on the rocks, so far as these figures reveal conditions. The crops of cereals were all small, and wheat especially, which had been the principal reliance for a money income, was distressingly short. From other sources we learn that the lake shore counties suff ered especially from intense heat and prolonged drought in the summer of 1859. Wheat was affected by both rust and blight; pastures were dried up. In a word, it was an abnormal year for crops, and yet it is the report of that year's crops which the census, coming once in ten years, gives us. Thus our means of determining the progress made during the decade are far less perfect than could be desired. Moreover, conditions varied in degree of adversity in different portions of the state, so that our comparisons are wanting in conclusiveness. Yet, when we couple these production
reports with the absence of any evidence to show that Mount Pleasant farmers were finding their way to a permanent type of agriculture, it becomes difficult to avoid the conclusion that the town had fallen from the proud eminence it occupied about 1850. The high valuation of the lands may mean that the advantages of location, the beauty and natural fertility of the region, together with its splendid agricultural record in the past, had been made to yield returns mainly in higher prices for farm lands. There were hundreds of transfers of land in the town during the years 1851 to 1860 , which fact is probably significant. It helps, of course, to explain the reduction in the average size of all farms and the increasing number of very small places. But it doubtless represents also an exodus to cheaper lands of many small farmers, and the migration of some of the large farmers to new wheat areas in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa. \({ }^{14}\)

With the completion of the decade 1860 to 1870 Mount Pleasant's primacy in farm land values had passed. Its lands, 30,416 acres, were valued at \(\$ 1,649,700\) or at the rate of \(\$ 54\) per acre; while Brookfield, which stood second ten years earlier-one of the originally wooded towns situated about twelve miles directly west from Milwaukee-had 20,878 acres valued at \(\$ 1,394,550\) or at the rate of \(\$ 67\) per acre.

The chief explanation of the higher valuation of Brookfield farm land, so far as the statistics reveal the facts, is that the farms there were much smaller on the average, only 65 acres ( 42 improved and 23 unimproved), while those of Mount Pleasant contained on the average 117 acres (108 improved and 9 unimproved). With their smaller acreage the Brookfield farms appear to have enjoyed a more intensive tillage; at least the aggregate of the productions was higher than in Mount Pleasant in proportion to the quantity of land. A striking case is wheat, of which the average farm in Brookfield, having 42 improved acres, produced 149 bushels; while the average farm in Mount Pleasant, with 108 improved acres, had 110 bushels. It seems probable that the more gradual process of opening new lands in the wooded town of Brookfield had its effect in this, that the wheat sown each year could be restricted to comparatively new soil, leaving the older ground to produce corn and other grains, and crops like clover, which tended to rejuvenate it. Also, Brookfield's average farm dairy record, from 3 cows, was 251 pounds of butter and 250 pounds of cheese; while Mount Pleasant's record, from 4 cows, was 356 pounds of butter and no cheese, leaving a marked differential in favor of Brookfield. Norway was making 421 pounds of butter from nearly 5 cows, and New Glarus, the Swiss town in Green County, had an average per farm of 638 pounds from 8 cows. The wool clip of Mount Pleasant put the town third in that line, Whitewater being first and Sugar Creek second. Empire stood number four.
\({ }^{4}\) There is plenty of testimony to show that new land was considered far
e productive and hence profitable to cultivate for wheat, than farms which more productive and hence profitable to cultivate for wheat, than farms which
had been cropped ten or twelve years. See Wisconsin State Agricultural Society, Transactions, 1853, 151 -152.

Evidently, specialization had been postponed. Farming, with the exceptions of wool growing and hay growing, was still general. At the time of the tenth census, 1880, Mount Pleasant stood first in the aggregate value of livestock, which totaled the enormous sum of \(\$ 158,230\). That town was first in the number of horses and third in the number of cows, New Glarus being first, and Brookfield second. Mount Pleasant was fourth in the number of other cattle, Highland being first. The dairying interest in Mount Pleasant still expressed itself mainly in butter making on the farm. The amount of butter made gave an average of 303 pounds per farm or an average of 70.5 pounds per cow, in addition to the milk sold-which amounted to 78,649 gallons or 60.5 gallons per cow and 261 gallons per farm, and 1500 pounds of cheese. In comparison with New Glarus this production record is light. Dairying by the factory method had barely begun in Mount Pleasant. The few herds of purebred cattle and the stock of high-class horses, while raising the aggregate of the town's livestock valuation, materially affected the incomes of but few farmers. Considering the high average value of cows in Mount Pleasant as compared with the other towns, and the low production record, it may be inferred that dairying there was still more or less definitely subsidiary to beef raising, and that the stock was not distinctively of the dairying strains. Or, possibly, the rearing of purebred calves cost an appreciable portion of the milk, leaving less for butter and cheese. By 1894 wool growing had virtually dropped out of consideration, as in Whitewater and elsewhere; the dairy business, on the other hand, had advanced, though less strikingly than in Newton, Franklin, Whitewater, New Glarus, and some other towns. \({ }^{15}\)

In 1904 the crops of wheat, barley, and rye were negligible; oats raised amounted to \(\mathbf{1 0 0 , 0 1 2}\) bushels from 2753 acres; corn, 109,025 bushels from 2719 acres. There were 6757 acres of hay producing 7428 tons valued at \(\$ 72,111\). This was the leading field crop. Of livestock, horses were still prominent, and 1256 animals were valued at \(\$ 95,975\). There were 716 cattle and calves on hand,value \(\$ 11,192\), while 1961 head, valued at \(\$ 18,010\), had been slaughtered or sold. Hogs on hand were 1403, worth \(\$ 7272\); hogs sold, 1613 , or \(\$ 15,391\) worth. There were only 549 sheep on hand. There were 16,627 bushels of apples. The number of milch cows was 2555 , value \(\$ 84,775\). Their product consisted of 972,471 gallons of milk valued at \(\$ 102,784 ; 41,841\) pounds of butter worth \(\$ 9105\); also 75,600 pounds of creamery-made butter valued at \(\$ 17,900\), making a grand total of \(\$ 129,789\) or an average of \(\$ 50.80\) per cow, as compared with \(\$ 24\) for Franklin, Whitewater nearly \(\$ 46\), Newton \(\$ 40.16\), and New Glarus nearly \(\$ 49\).

If these figures are correct, they show that a great change had occurred in ten years in the character of Mount Pleasant's dairy business, particularly in the quality of the dairy cows.

SSee Racine Advooate, June 27,1868 , for statistics of chesese production for
year 1867. The same paper for Aug. 29, 1868, gives a description of one of the year 1867. The same paper for Aug. 29, 1868, gives a description of one of
for the leap from fifth place to first can hardly have been an accident.

Special Productions.-During the 1860's there was much interest in Racine County in the development of wool growing, for which the county was well adapted. Several farmers were buying large numbers of sheep. The county had three woolen factories-two at Burlington, one at Waterford (both on Fox River) - and the port of Racine was shipping great quantities of wool raised in the counties to the west. But, as yet, the county was producing only about enough for the home consumption of its people. The wool business there, as elsewhere, encountered vicissitudes which led to its abandonment about twenty years later.

Mount Pleasant also paid considerable attention to the rearing of good horses, having the largest number in proportion to the number of farms of all the towns compared. The industry was successful enough to attract the notice of horse thieves. So a society was organized in 1869 for protection against these marauders, and other towns were invited to take similar steps. It is not stated just how, under the constitution adopted, they proposed to manage the business. Perhaps that was kept secret intentionally.

Value of Productions.-In total value of farm productions Mount Pleasant in 1879 stood second only to Pleasant Springs in Dane County, Brookfield being a very close third. The discrepancy between these three towns and all the others in our list, in value of productions, is so wide as to call for comment. The explanation seems to be partly in the livestock items variously combined. Mount Pleasant had several great horse-breeding farms, from which fine animals were sold in considerable numbers, and its farmers also fattened cattle for the market, buying some for that purpose and raising a good beef strain. The wool clip in that town was among the highest, though not the highest, and the hay crop was the peak of all. The average farm income at this time for the town was \(\$ 740\). In 1869 the average farm income had been \$1108. At this period no farms produced less than \(\$ 200,35\) produced between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399,39\) between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599\), 69 between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999\), and \(116, \$ 1000\) and over. Of these, 3 were over \(\$ 5000,3\) between \(\$ 4000\) and \(\$ 4999,4\) between \(\$ 3000\) and \(\$ 3999,27\) between \(\$ 2000\) and \(\$ 2999\), and 79 between \(\$ 1000\) and \(\$ 1999\). The largest income was \(\$ 12,000\), made by George Murray evidently from the sale of purebred cattle, not from the customary farm productions. This must be regarded as exceptional. \({ }^{18}\) Ten years later the lowest class of incomes (under \$200) numbered 31, the second 59, the third 47 , the fourth 86 , the fifth 70. Fifty-eight ran from \(\$ 1000\) to \(\$ 1999,10\) from \(\$ 2000\) to \(\$ 2999\), and 2 were over \(\$ 3000\). The highest was \(\$ 4500\) on a farm of 300 acres, of
\({ }^{10}\) For a description of this farm and its stock, see Racine Advocate, Sept. 28, 1867. Both Mr. Murray and Richard Richards, of Mount Pleasant, took prizes
on shorthorns at the state fair in 1867. See Wis. State Agric. Soc., Transs, 1861-68, \({ }_{816}{ }_{81}^{\text {on sh }}\)


Fig. 16. Town of Mount Pleasant, 1915
After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company
which 295 acres was improved. Livestock was valued at \$2900. Eight farms reported no incomes.

In 1904 the average farm income in Mount Pleasant was \$612. There were at this time 2555 cows in the town, an increase of 730 in ten years. Only two towns-New Glarus and Highland-had a greater number in 1904. The value of dairy products at this time was \(\$ 325\), of other livestock \(\$ 103\), and of crops \(\$ 183\). Of the last item hay was the main element, amounting to \(\$ 107\). In 1919 farm products averaged \(\$ 2156\), dairy products \(\$ 986\), other livestock \(\$ 604\), and crops \(\$ 566\). The number of cows had decreased to 1644 .

Manufactures.-As early as 1835 supplies were sold at a store in Port Gilbert (now Racine). Three settlements -Mygatts Corners (on section 13), Parkerville (on section 21), and Horlicksville (on section 6)-also served the needs of the community. The plat book of 1887 shows a cheese factory on section 30. In the plat book of 1908 this does not appear, but a creamery is given on section 31. This survey takes no account of the extensive and numerous fac-
tories belonging to Racine even if they happen to be technically located within the boundaries of Mount Pleasant.

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches.-The three villages of Parkerville, Mygatts Corners, and Horlicksville are represented in the plat book of 1887. The plat book of 1908 gives also Corliss, next to Parkerville. The first post office was established in 1835 at the Rapids of Root River. This was soon discontinued and in 1836 another one was established in Racine. The plat book of 1887 for the town shows schools on sections 8,16 , between sections 16 and 17 , 32 and 10, of range 22 ; the Taylor Orphan Asylum on section 30 ; and churches on sections 21,3 , and 32 of the same range.

Population Changes.-The population of Mount Pleasant was largely American to begin with. The census of 1850 reports 192 heads of families, of whom only 48 were foreign born. Ten years later this proportion had changed to 160 American born and 185 foreign born, and in 1870 it was 184 American and 446 foreign. This high proportion of foreigners persisted through the census of 1920. In 1885
it was 69 per cent of the total population, in 1895 it was 63.5 per cent, in 1905, 60.3 per cent, and in 1920, 57.9 per cent. The largest group of foreigners was Scandinavian, the next largest was German, and the next English. There were also considerable numbers of Welsh, Irish, and Scotch, and scattered numbers from other lands. The total population of
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Mount Pleasant as early as 1850 was 1101. In 1870 it was 3379. The next two decades saw decreases probably with the expansion of the city of Racine, but by 1905 the total had gone up to 3592 and in 1920 to 4070 .

\section*{RECOLLECTIONS OF MYGATTS CORNERS}

\section*{M. E. Walker}

My memory of the town of Mount Pleasant, where I lived on a farm until I was twenty-one years of age, is that the resident farmers were Easterners or descendants of those who had come there from the eastern states. My father's father came from Vermont, my mother's father from New York. The section I knew best was adjacent to Mygatts Corners, which is the east central part of the township, and my acquaintance with the people who lived in the town was gained from meeting them at the church at Mygatts Corners. This was practically the only town center or meeting place; the annual town meeting for election of officers attracted only a passing interest.

Many of the children of these men-and I always thought they were typical Yankees-were sent to Racine high school and afterwards went away to college or to the University. Most of the chil-
dren of my generation are now engaged in business or professional pursuits away from the farm, and the places have been taken in a large measure by foreigners-I mean people who came from Europe, principally Germans and Scandinavians. My older brother lives on our father's farm, but he is an exception to the general rule. There are perhaps not over four or five sons of the old settlers-and I know of approximately twenty-five families of the type referred towho have remained on the farm.

At Mygatts Corners, at one time, was established a circulating library supported by residents of the town, who contributed to the fund required to purchase the books. We were required to pay, as I recall, for drawing out the books. The library was kept by Mrs. Nathaniel Lytle in a house opposite the church grounds, and indicates what I believe to have been the general sentiment of that day toward the advantages of education.

Temperance and literary societies were organized and meetings were held at Mygatts Corners from time to time, but the chief interest was in the church and its activities. There were revival meetings, and the religious and moral tone in the community was very high and quite like that of a New England settlement.

The character of the community seems decidedly changed now, but I shall always think of my boyhood days as spent in most pleasant surroundings. In fact it seems to me, as I look back upon it, that the settlement around Mygatts Corners was an ideal community.

\section*{Survey Notes}
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\section*{" level, poor, timber same}

First \(1 / 2\) mile level \& poor, oak, \(2^{\text {nd }} 1 / 2\) mile flat, \(2^{\text {nd }}\) rate first \(1 / 4\) of last \(1 / 2\) yery thinly timbered tas \(1 / 4\) well timber with oak, ash, elm, lynn, maple.

Dote = Year owner Explanatory
*Date = Year owner entered the land at the land office

\section*{Dala fron \(7^{\text {th }}, 8^{\text {Number }}\) and \(9^{\text {th }}\) censuses. \(1^{\text {s/ }}\) line \(=1850,2^{\text {nd }}=1860,3^{\text {rd }}=187\)}

\section*{\(2^{\text {si }}\) number \(=\) acres of cullivaled land}
```

= vatuation in dollars of the land
Bu. ". machinery and livesloch
Bu. of wheal groun last year

```
- THE WISCONSIN DOMESDAY BOOK

\section*{FARMS AND FARMERS OF 1860 \\ \section*{Prepared from United States, State and county records for the}}

STATE HISTORICALSOCIETY OF WISCONSIN
Under the direction of Joseph Schafer, Superintendent

The 1880 census shows 14 incomes under \(\$ 200\), some of them from plats of ground hardly to be dignified by the name of farms. There were 28 in the second class, \(\$ 200\) to \(\$ 399,17\) of \(\$ 400\) to \(\$ 599,15\) of \(\$ 600\) to \(\$ 999\), and 17 over \(\$ 1000\). That is to say, 42 incomes were below \(\$ 400,49\) were above that figure; or, 59 were below \(\$ 600\), and 32 above \(\$ 600\). One farm reported no income. The largest income in 1879 was \(\$ 1700\). It was derived from a farm of 550 acres, mostly good bottom land in Blue River valley (sections 28 and 29), of which 150 acres was under cultivation. The farmer \({ }^{10}\) was a cattle feeder, buying cattle and also raising them, feeding his crops of corn and hay in fattening.

The proportion of small incomes was high. It reveals the fact that many farms were too small and others too poor to enable their owners to make a good living. An interesting study, to one who knows the town (as the writer does), is to check the quality of the lands against the record of incomes. Taking the list of generous incomes-over \$1000-in 1869, we find that all pertained to large or fairly large farms. A bare majority of those farms embraced much river bottom or alluvial (Wabash silt loam) soil, while most of the remainder were on the ridge, where the soil was Knox silt loam. In 1879 a similar condition prevailed, although a smaller proportion of the incomes above \(\$ 1000\) were made on the ridge farms. Corn land, which then meant bottom land, was by that time the favored type, although several of the upland farmers, with the aid of clover stimulated with gypsum, succeeded in raising enough wheat to swell their incomes above \(\$ 1000\).

The time was ripe for a change in the agricultural system, and almost immediately after 1880 began the movement for coöperative dairying which brought to the town all the prosperity to which, considering the quality of its lands, it was entitled. \({ }^{11}\) This change was indicated by the increase in number of milch cows from 384 in 1880 to 895 in 1905 and to 1099 in 1920. Incomes increased in these periods to \(\$ 689\) in 1904 and to \(\$ 2057\) in 1919. Dairy products increased in value from \(\$ 330\) per farm in 1904 to \(\$ 1106\) in 1919, crop incomes per farm from \(\$ 76\) to \(\$ 198\).

Manufactures.-Outside of the village of Muscoda there was no manufacturing save that a small flouring mill existed for a few years on Sand Branch. In the village some wood manufacturing has been carried on continuously from the earliest time. A steam sawmill was there for some years from 1837. At a later time the manufacture of staves and hoops was carried on to a considerable extent, the raw material, however, coming mainly from the neighboring towns in Richland County, especially Eagle and Orion, not from the town of Muscoda. A brewery existed in Muscoda for many years.

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches.-The old village of Muscoda, dating from early fur trading days,
\({ }^{23}\) John B. McIntyre, a native of Ohio.
\({ }^{n}\) See History of Agriculture in Wisconsin, chap. \(\mathbf{x}\).


Fig. 17. Town of Muscoda, 1915 After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company
is the only village the town has ever had. It was a notable place in the years following the completion of the railwaythe era of wheat growing-as a lumber and wheat market. Later, it was an important shipping point for hogs and cattle, and more recently a cheese market. Until the early eighties, most of the lumber sold from that point was brought down from the Wisconsin River pineries in rafts. It was carried back by wheat teams, ten, fifteen, even twenty or twentyfive miles from the river. Droves of fat hogs and herds of cattle were driven in to Muscoda from fully as far, especially those that came from the high prairie on or beyond the Military Ridge. There were at all times several enterprising firms that shared the business of this active trade center. The better known firms were those of McIntyre, Elston, and Company, and Graham and Bremmer. Each conducted a general merchandising establishment, and added to that business grain buying and stock buying. Both have long since disappeared. The Muscoda post office was almost always associated with one or the other of the general stores. There was no other post office in the town.

From the seventies, the village school included a high school department. Except in the village, the schools have always been one-room, one-teacher schools. One of them was located near Sand Branch, in section 22, and has always been known as the Sand Branch School. Another was for many years located in section 29, but more recently in section 32 ; a third was in section 25, and a fourth in section 9. The advanced school at Muscoda enjoyed a high reputation as early
as the seventies and eighties of last century, on account of the relative excellence of the instruction imparted by its principals. Two men who stand out in the history of the school are H. W. Glazier and H. R. Smith. Both were strong characters, good teachers, and each of them remained long enough to leave a distinct impression on the community. Some of the teachers of the one-room schools were able personalities also, and generally there were spelling schools, lyceums, and singing schools to stimulate the social life of the districts.

The town of Muscoda has a large Catholic element, composed mainly of Germans, Irish, and Bohemians, which worships in St. John's Church in the village. The parish was organized in 1859 by a priest fom Mineral Point, and the first church was built that year. The present building, a handsome stone structure, dates from 1884. Father F. X. Weinhart and Father J. Soberle are specially well remembered as notable influences in the religious history of the community. There has been a Lutheran church in the village, and also a Methodist church. An Evangelical Reformed church, located on the boundary line between Muscoda and Castle Rock, in Blue River valley, has been the place of worship for many of the non-Catholic people of both towns, especially the Bohemians. A German Presbyterian church, which stands near the east line of the town, in Pulaski, served a number of the German families living on Hickory Flat. Some others worshiped in the churches of Highland. The Catholics and Lutherans both conducted parochial schools in the village.

Population Changes.-The schedule of population changes, printed herewith, shows that in point of numbers native Americans at first had a large majority- 497 to 180. The count of families, however, gives a different complexion to the population, proving that in 1860 nearly one-half were of foreign extraction. In 1870 the foreigners had a large majority of the families, a condition which changed once more in 1885. From that time native American families had a slight preponderance till 1920, when only 14 families had foreign born heads and 68 American. That means, to be sure, that foreign born persons did not continue to come into the town in considerable numbers, that the original settlers of those stocks were dying out, and their American born descendants are now the heads of families.

the earliest visitors to the township, may perhaps symbolize the hope which existed until some years later, that mineral would be found in that region. \({ }^{6}\) But these entries, covering as they do the first good soil in the vicinity of the steamboat landing, may also be accounted for as good speculations in farm land. At the forks of Blue River (or junction with the Fennimore), in sections 32 and 29, were entries dating from 1837, in the form of a parallelogram embracing 440 acres. This was selected as a future town site and was named Lafayette. \({ }^{7}\) The site included the east three-fourths of the south half of 29 and the east three-fourths of the north half of 32. The entrymen were Stephen Taylor, Hugh Russell Hunter, Hunter and Gray, M. V. Burris, and Sheldon and Eneix. The land was afterwards made into good farms, but the projectors of Lafayette evidently expected a town might grow up between Wingville on the Military Ridge and English Prairie in the valley, and the forks would be the logical place for it.

Other speculative purchases apparently were all of farm land. Most of them were made shortly before the completion of the railroad, at the time of the rapid settlement of the town. The land taken included both Congress land and state school land. Nearly all of the latter went to one firm of speculators. No doubt the location of the town, with reference first to the steamboat landing on the Wisconsin and second to the railway, was a dominant factor in creating the speculative interest in Muscoda land. Actual settlers were later obliged to pay tribute to the speculators. Fortunately, the town site speculations, except the site of Lafayette, did not affect agricultural purchasers, because the sand prairie was practically worthless for farming purposes.

Progress of Farm Making.-The plat for 1860 shows that, aside from speculator land, which was still in many cases in the hands of the original purchasers, the farms were principally in possession of the entrymen. Some good clearings were already made. Two farms had each 100 acres of improved land, while the remainder seem to have ranged from 90 acres to 25 acres improved. The figures for 1870 are more certain. At that time the number of farms was 70, and the aggregate of improved land 4247 acres. There was a total of 11,579 acres within the farms. That total had risen, by 1880, to 17,536 , of which 8556 was improved land.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-In 1870 there were 3 farms having less than 20 acres. Three had between 20 and 49 acres, 13 from 50 to 99 acres, 28 between 100 and 174 acres, 21 between 175 and 500 acres, and 2 over 500 . Ten years later, out of 92 farms, 3 were under 20 acres, 7 over 20 and under 50, 16 over 50 and under 100, 26 over 100 and under 175,33 from 175 to 499 , and 7 over 500. This shows that there was a tendency toward the large farm
\({ }^{-}\)The survey by David Dale Owen, of the lead region, in 1839, excluded from that region all of Blue River valley save the portion of it near the source, in townships 6 and 7 , range 1 east.
of more than 175 acres, and that the two types, large farms and good-sized farms ( 100 to 174, and 175 to 500 ), constituted by 1880 a large majority of the farms. As in the case of Castle Rock, which adjoined Muscoda on the south, some increase took place in the number of very small farms, but considering the total increase the proportion of farms varying in area from 50 to 99 acres remained practically unchanged.

This town, however, contained much waste land which never came into cultivation, and the record of gross acreage is not an adequate test of farming conditions. In 1870 the number of farms having under 40 acres of cultivated land was 22 ; the number having 40 and under 100 acres was 34 ; and the number having over 100 acres, 14. The 1880 census shows 26 having under 40, 53 having 40 and under 100, and 13 having 100 and over. The largest acreage under cultivation on any farm was 180 acres, and there were two farms having 150 acres; the rest were smaller. It is clear, therefore, that gross size of farms was not the true test of their value for production. In three cases farms embracing more than 500 acres had 100 acres or less under cultivation.

General Productions.-In 1859, according to the plat, several farms yielded over 400 bushels of wheat. Ten years later the average per farm was 317 bushels, which by 1879 had dropped to 200 bushels. In 1869 the largest wheat crop produced on any farm was 960 bushels. In 1879, though the average had declined seriously and most farms were growing little wheat, two farms nevertheless produced each 1000 bushels. These were both located on the "ridge," in the area of Knox silt loam, and both were growing clover freely. We have in this an illustration of the fact that in the Driftless Area it was the ridges that prolonged the life of the wheat crop, due partly to the better adaptation of their soils to the needs of the wheat plant, and partly to the circumstance that those lands were often cleared and broken up later than the valley lands. Since Muscoda had a large area of ridge land, her standing as a wheat producer among the twenty-three towns listed was relatively high, the town occupying sixth place. Highland, an all-ridge town in the Driftless, and Pulaski, mostly ridge land, stood higher, as did Bangor, also in the Driftless, and Empire and Newton in the glaciated area. The large increase of the cultivated area in the preceding decade was in the upland portions of the town. But the aggregate production of wheat, despite the enlargement of area, was approximately 20 per cent below the production of 1869. Wheat farming was on the decline.

Other market crops in 1870 were corn, marketed principally in the form of pork and beef; a small amount of wool; and some butter. In 1880 beef cattle were proportionally as numerous as ten years earlier, while hogs had increased one-third, butter somewhat, and wool had fallen away. The corn crop had increased more than 8000 bushels, which explains the advance in pork raising.

In this town, as in Castle Rock and some others, we
have the spectacle of a decline in the proportion of improved land after 1880. The state census of 1885 gives the figure as 7483.5 acres, against 8556 in 1880 . The reason, again, was the withdrawal of the less productive or less easily cultivated lands on the ridges and steep slopes from cultivation, and their utilization for pasture. The tendency of the steep hill slopes to form gullies when broken up was halted by leaving them in grass. Also, the flood bottoms along the streams, once broken up for crops, were found to be of maximum value as pasture for dairy cows. The improved acreage in 1895 was 6385 . Ten years later it was 6778 . By 1885 the wheat crop had dwindled to one-half the production of 1879, and in the next ten years it declined 50 per cent. But, in the meantime, pork and dairy products had taken the place of wheat as money crops. Muscoda in 1885 is credited with 26,550 pounds of cheese and 21,800 pounds of butter. For 1895 the figures are 186,582 pounds of cheese and 14,140 pounds of butter. Thus the transition had been made from general farming based on wheat growing as the major interest, with some livestock and a little dairying, to the more intensive system of dairying under the principle of coöperation and the stimulus of sharp competition. For many years cheese of the American brand was the staple dairy product, and it is so yet.

Spectal Productions.-There was little to qualify the description "general farming." However, some barley was produced, which was sold to the local brewery, and on the sand prairie some rye was grown, as also elsewhere on the lighter soils, but not to a large extent. Forest products, as one would expect from the lightly timbered character of the town, amounted to very little. Watermelons were grown plentifully on the sand, but the market for them was chiefly local; on the ridges were a number of thriving apple orchards. Beginning about 1880, clover seed was produced to a considerable extent.

Value of Productions.-According to the tenth census (1880) the value of all productions was \(\$ 51,054\), which gives an average per farm of \(\$ 554\). In that respect thirteen of the twenty-three towns surpassed Muscoda. In 1870 there were 19 incomes which exceeded \(\$ 1000\). One of these, the income of a 600 -acre farm having 200 acres improved, was \(\$ 2700 .^{8}\) Much of the income came from animals slaughtered on the farm, though there were 500 bushels of wheat, 1000 of corn, 600 pounds of wool, and 300 pounds of butter. The second highest income was \(\$ 1900\), from a farm of 320 acres having 140 acres improved. \({ }^{\circ}\) In this case, likewise, slaughtered animals made a large proportion of the income. The summary of production records for 1870 includes 4 under \(\$ 200\), 12 between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399,10\) of \(\$ 400\) to \(\$ 599,25\) of \(\$ 600\) to \(\$ 999\), and 19 over \(\$ 1000\). It will be seen that the most numerous classification is the fourth, \(\$ 600\) to \(\$ 999\).
\({ }^{8}\) It was owned by D. Clinginsmith.
- Owned by John Kolar, a native of Bohemia.

The 1880 census shows 14 incomes under \(\$ 200\), some of them from plats of ground hardly to be dignified by the name of farms. There were 28 in the second class, \(\$ 200\) to \(\$ 399,17\) of \(\$ 400\) to \(\$ 599,15\) of \(\$ 600\) to \(\$ 999\), and 17 over \(\$ 1000\). That is to say, 42 incomes were below \(\$ 400,49\) were above that figure; or, 59 were below \(\$ 600\), and 32 above \(\$ 600\). One farm reported no income. The largest income in 1879 was \(\$ 1700\). It was derived from a farm of 550 acres, mostly good bottom land in Blue River valley (sections 28 and 29), of which 150 acres was under cultivation. The farmer \({ }^{10}\) was a cattle feeder, buying cattle and also raising them, feeding his crops of corn and hay in fattening.

The proportion of small incomes was high. It reveals the fact that many farms were too small and others too poor to enable their owners to make a good living. An interesting study, to one who knows the town (as the writer does), is to check the quality of the lands against the record of incomes. Taking the list of generous incomes-over \(\$ 1000\)-in 1869, we find that all pertained to large or fairly large farms. A bare majority of those farms embraced much river bottom or alluvial (Wabash silt loam) soil, while most of the remainder were on the ridge, where the soil was Knox silt loam. In 1879 a similar condition prevailed, although a smaller proportion of the incomes above \(\$ 1000\) were made on the ridge farms. Corn land, which then meant bottom land, was by that time the favored type, although several of the upland farmers, with the aid of clover stimulated with gypsum, succeeded in raising enough wheat to swell their incomes above \(\$ 1000\).

The time was ripe for a change in the agricultural system, and almost immediately after 1880 began the movement for coöperative dairying which brought to the town all the prosperity to which, considering the quality of its lands, it was entitled. \({ }^{11}\) This change was indicated by the increase in number of milch cows from 384 in 1880 to 895 in 1905 and to 1099 in 1920. Incomes increased in these periods to \(\$ 689\) in 1904 and to \(\$ 2057\) in 1919. Dairy products increased in value from \(\$ 330\) per farm in 1904 to \(\$ 1106\) in 1919, crop incomes per farm from \(\$ 76\) to \(\$ 198\).

Manufactures.-Outside of the village of Muscoda there was no manufacturing save that a small flouring mill existed for a few years on Sand Branch. In the village some wood manufacturing has been carried on continuously from the earliest time. A steam sawmill was there for some years from 1837. At a later time the manufacture of staves and hoops was carried on to a considerable extent, the raw material, however, coming mainly from the neighboring towns in Richland County, especially Eagle and Orion, not from the town of Muscoda. A brewery existed in Muscoda for many years.

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches.-The old village of Muscoda, dating from early fur trading days,

30 John B. McIntyre, a native of Ohio.
\({ }^{n}\) See History of Agriculture in Wisconsin, chap. \(\mathbf{x}\).


Fig. 17. Town of Muscoda, 1915
After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company
is the only village the town has ever had. It was a notable place in the years following the completion of the railwaythe era of wheat growing-as a lumber and wheat market. Later, it was an important shipping point for hogs and cattle, and more recently a cheese market. Until the early eighties, most of the lumber sold from that point was brought down from the Wisconsin River pineries in rafts. It was carried back by wheat teams, ten, fifteen, even twenty or twentyfive miles from the river. Droves of fat hogs and herds of cattle were driven in to Muscoda from fully as far, especially those that came from the high prairie on or beyond the Military Ridge. There were at all times several enterprising firms that shared the business of this active trade center. The better known firms were those of McIntyre, Elston, and Company, and Graham and Bremmer. Each conducted a general merchandising establishment, and added to that business grain buying and stock buying. Both have long since disappeared. The Muscoda post office was almost always associated with one or the other of the general stores. There was no other post office in the town.

From the seventies, the village school included a high school department. Except in the village, the schools have always been one-room, one-teacher schools. One of them was located near Sand Branch, in section 22, and has always been known as the Sand Branch School. Another was for many years located in section 29, but more recently in section 32; a third was in section 25 , and a fourth in section 9 . The advanced school at Muscoda enjoyed a high reputation as early
as the seventies and eighties of last century, on account of the relative excellence of the instruction imparted by its principals. Two men who stand out in the history of the school are H. W. Glazier and H. R. Smith. Both were strong characters, good teachers, and each of them remained long enough to leave a distinct impression on the community. Some of the teachers of the one-room schools were able personalities also, and generally there were spelling schools, lyceums, and singing schools to stimulate the social life of the districts.

The town of Muscoda has a large Catholic element, composed mainly of Germans, Irish, and Bohemians, which worships in St. John's Church in the village. The parish was organized in 1859 by a priest fom Mineral Point, and the first church was built that year. The present building, a handsome stone structure, dates from 1884. Father F. X. Weinhart and Father J. Soberle are specially well remembered as notable influences in the religious history of the community. There has been a Lutheran church in the village, and also a Methodist church. An Evangelical Reformed church, located on the boundary line between Muscoda and Castle Rock, in Blue River valley, has been the place of worship for many of the non-Catholic people of both towns, especially the Bohemians. A German Presbyterian church, which stands near the east line of the town, in Pulaski, served a number of the German families living on Hickory Flat. Some others worshiped in the churches of Highland. The Catholics and Lutherans both conducted parochial schools in the village.

Population Changes.-The schedule of population changes, printed herewith, shows that in point of numbers native Americans at first had a large majority-497 to 180. The count of families, however, gives a different complexion to the population, proving that in 1860 nearly one-half were of foreign extraction. In 1870 the foreigners had a large majority of the families, a condition which changed once more in 1885. From that time native American families had a slight preponderance till 1920, when only 14 families had foreign born heads and 68 American. That means, to be sure, that foreign born persons did not continue to come into the town in considerable numbers, that the original settlers of those stocks were dying out, and their American born descendants are now the heads of families.

Muscoda-Population Statistics
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Year} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Torat} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Amertican} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Forzios} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Famiurs} \\
\hline & & \(\underset{\substack{\text { Wis- } \\ \text { consin }}}{\text { a }}\) & Other & Total & Bo- & France & Ger- & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Scan- } \\
& \text { dina- } \\
& \text { via }
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Other \\
Lands \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & Total & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Amer- } \\
\text { ican }
\end{gathered}
\] & For- & tal \\
\hline 1850
1880 & 677 & 20 & 277 & 497 & 20 & & 9 & & & 180 & 67 & \({ }^{83}\) & 130 \\
\hline & & S & 230 & & 0 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 1885 & \({ }_{\text {1.122 }}^{1.122}\) & & & \({ }^{847}\) & & 6 & 88 & & 181 & \({ }^{275}\) & 118 & 110 & \({ }_{228}^{128}\) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
1895 \\
1905 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \({ }^{5448}\) & 340 & 22 & \({ }_{362}^{401}\) & 69 & & \({ }_{16}^{37}\) & 1 & 100 & \({ }^{139}\) & \({ }_{63}^{63}\) & \({ }^{60}\) & 123 \\
\hline 1920 & 396 & \({ }_{349}\) & 14 & \({ }_{363}\) & 32 & & 16 & & 1 & \({ }_{33}^{86}\) & \({ }_{68}^{44}\) & 14 & \({ }_{82}^{83}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Of the American heads of families other than natives of Wisconsin in 1860, 15 were from Pennsylvania, 12 from New York, and 10 from Ohio. Indiana claimed 4, Vermont 4, and Connecticut 3. Four other states had 2 each, and six had 1 each. This count included the villagers as well as the farmers, and it may have included a few who were not living in the town of Muscoda. Among the foreign heads of families Germany claimed 35, Bohemia 5, France 4, Switzerland 4, Ireland, England, and Scandinavia 2 each, and Poland 1.

It was, indeed, a mixed-almost a heterogeneous-population, suggesting problems of social organization and adjustment as a condition of progress. The two leading elements were the native Americans and the Germans. For more than a quarter of a century after the organization of the town, the American element remained in virtual control of the town's public business. Thereafter, till about 1900, Germans took the leading part in affairs, giving place more recently to Bohemians.

The community has never been thoroughly unified and harmonious-unless it has achieved that desirable state very recently. Yet, on the whole, the difficulties have been rather less than might be inferred from the complexity and diversity of racial stocks and the wide divergencies in religious beliefs and practices. A good measure of tolerance, and a wide-spread indifference to social affairs, probably help to explain the comparatively peaceful history of the town.
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Survey Notes
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\hline 3334 & barren, burrand white oak \\
\hline 2734 & - . . " " \\
\hline 2728 & " . " . \\
\hline 2227 & ame \\
\hline 2122 & Same. \\
\hline 1322 & \\
\hline 1516 & - \\
\hline 1015 & \\
\hline 910 & - \\
\hline 310 & \\
\hline 34 & * \\
\hline 3233 & . \\
\hline 2833 & - \\
\hline 2829 & " \\
\hline 2128 & " \\
\hline 2021 & \\
\hline 1621 & " \\
\hline 1117 & * \\
\hline 911 & * \\
\hline 89 & \\
\hline 49 & - \\
\hline 45 & " \\
\hline 3132 & \& black oah \\
\hline 2932 S & Sam \\
\hline 3031 & \\
\hline 2930 & \\
\hline 2029 & \\
\hline 1930 & " \\
\hline 1920 & * \\
\hline 1720 & * \\
\hline 1819 & " \\
\hline 1718 & \\
\hline 817 & . \\
\hline 718 & " \\
\hline 78 & " \\
\hline 58 & * \\
\hline 67 & " \\
\hline 56 & " \\
\hline -.. & - Explanato \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Date \(=\) \\
- Date
\end{tabular} & = year onner bought the farm of private party entered land at land office \\
\hline Data fr & \begin{tabular}{l}
Number series 3 lines. [ 3 " \(=1870\) \\
from \(7^{"!} .8^{=\&} 9^{\text {" }}\) censuses. \(1^{\text {st }}\) line \(\cdot 1850,2^{\text {nd }}=1860\). \(1^{\text {st }}\) number \(=\) acres of land cultivated
\end{tabular} \\
\hline &  \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3^{\text {red }} \\
& 4 \text { th }=\text { valuation of land } \\
&= \text { machinery }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline & livestoch. \\
\hline & 5 th - = bu of wheat raised last year \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\(L^{\text {cic }}\)OCATION.-The town of New Glarus, organized in 1850, occupies township 4, range 7 east, in the northern part of Green County. It is bounded north by Primrose (Dane County), east by Exeter, south by Washington, and west by York. Exeter, the nearest market when the first settlement was made in 1845, was eight miles away. Mineral Point was thirty-five miles distant. Monroe, the county seat, is sixteen miles south of the village of New Glarus, and Madison is twenty-five miles northeast.

Surface and Drainage.-The town lies almost wholly in the Driftless Area, only three or four sections in the southeast portion being glaciated. It is very well watered, almost every farm having springs and running streams. The main stream is the Little Sugar River, formed by the confluence of a number of brooks which have their heads in the town of Primrose. Its main branches enter the town of New Glarus


Fig. 18. Topographic Map, Town of New Glarus eproduced from United States Geological Survey New Glarus Quadrangle at the northwest corner of section 4 , at section 2 , and section 3. They flow in a southeasterly direction and the combined stream flows out from section 24. The valley of Little Sugar River varies in width from one-fourth mile to a mile and three-fourths. The valleys of the branch creeks are usually

\section*{NEW GLARUS}
narrow, but occasionally, at junction points, there is a considerable breadth of lowland. By means of the topographic chart \({ }^{1}\) one can estimate the valley land at not to exceed onefifth of the area of the town. The balance is upland. But the upland in New Glarus is largely a gently rolling terrain, rough, steep, and rocky in spots, but mainly susceptible of cultivation. Considerable portions of it are essentially prairie lands. The ridges are elevated from 100 to 250 feet above the valley floors. They everywhere vary in elevation sufficiently to afford good natural drainage toward the streams, but there is not under cultivation, as in some Driftless Area towns, an excessive proportion of steep land subject to gullying. The town is hilly enough to suggest the gentler phases of Swiss scenery and thus to appeal to Swiss immigrants, as it did partly on physical grounds. The village of New Glarus lies at the western base of a high ridge of hills, and there are gentler hills to the west. In appearance the town is alternating fields, timber, and hills. There is some swampy land along the streams, which, under artificial drainage, makes excellent hay land.

Types of Soil.-The soil in New Glarus, according to the soil map for the town, is mainly Knox silt loam, shallow phase, an unglaciated, upland, timbered soil. In the valleys of the Little Sugar River and its tributaries it is Wabash silt loam. There is also a certain amount of Marshall silt loam, shallow phase. \({ }^{2}\) On the whole, the soil is not particularly good in quality, and much of the surface is rocky. As in the case of Primrose, dairying is most profitably followed, and the cool uplands, with their abundance of blue grass pasture, are especially favorable for the production of cheese.

Timber.-Burr, white, and black oak was the timber noted by the surveyor. A great part of the entire town was lightly forested, much of it being called barren. There was some "wet prairie" along the streams, showing that the marshes were not in all cases wooded. On the whole, New Glarus must be classified as an open town, but timber for home and farm use was well distributed throughout.

Beginnings of Settlement. \({ }^{\text {s }}\) - In 1845, because of over-population, crop failures, and the pressure of excessive poverty in their canton, the Council of Glarus in \({ }^{1}\) United States Geological Survey, Topographical Map, Wisconsin, New Glarus \({ }^{2}\) Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, Soil Survey of Green County, Wisconsin (unpublished).
\({ }^{3}\) John Luchsinger, "The Planting of the Swiss Colony at New Glarus, Wis consin," in Wis. Hist. Colls., xii, \(335-382\). A careful treatment of the early history of New Glarus.


Marshall loam, Marshall silt loam, Marshall silt loam (shallow), Marshall loam, Marshall silt loam, Marshall silt loam (shallow),
Marshall fine sandy loam, Carrington loam, Carrington silt loam, Waukesha loam, Waukesha sand, Waukesha silt loam, Waukesha sandy loam, Waukesha fine sandy loam-dark colored, upland, prairie soils

Clyde loam, Clyde silt loam, Clyde clay loam, Wabash loam, Wabash silt loam, Wabash silt loam (upland), Wabash fine sandy oam, Genesee silt loam, Maumee silt loam, Maumee fine sandy oam-low, poorly drained, mineral soils.

Kiox (shallow), Knox silt loam (steep and shallow phases)ight colored, timbered, unglaciated, upland soils.

\section*{Rough, stony soil}

Boone loam, B imbered, upland soils derived largely from sandstone rocks.

\section*{\(\square\) Peat.}

Fig. 19. Soil Map, Town of New Glarus
Prepared from map made by the Soils Division, Wisconsin Geological and

Switzerland appropriated 1500 florins ( \(\$ 600\) ) to send two men to America to select a suitable tract of land for a colony. An Emigration Association was formed and the fund was increased by subscription to \(\$ 2000\). The two men selected to buy land in the United States were Judge Nicholas Duerst and Fridolin Streiff, a blacksmith. They started March 8, 1845, with drafts for about \(\$ 2600\) for the purchase of land, and written instructions from the associa-
tion. After looking at a good deal of land in Illinois, Missouri, and Wisconsin, they finally, on July 17, 1845, bought 1200 acres-part valley land and part upland-and also 80 acres of timber on sections \(14,15,22,23\), and 27 , in township 4, range 7 east, in Green County, Wisconsin. Too impatient to wait until the next year, when preparations for them could have been completed, the colonists in the meantime left Switzerland, April 16, and arrived in America on June 30. They traveled as far as St. Louis, expecting there to hear from their agents; but learning nothing of their movements, the immigrants sent two men to make inquiries. Again too impatient to wait, the colonists followed closely after these messengers, and in Galena, Illinois, were accidentally found by Judge Duerst, who had come back to guide them, on learning from the colonists' scouts that they had arrived. Eighteen of the colonists pushed forward on foot, to make what preparations they could for the remainder, who followed in wagons and on foot. Two huts had already been built, another was hastily erected, and shortly thereafter sixteen more were built as temporary shelters for the 108 immigrants. One hundred and ninety-three had originally left Switzerland, but some dropped out at Baltimore, others at Pittsburgh and Cincinnati, attracted by the wage of \(\$ 2.00\) a day to be earned in the cities.

The settlers in New Glarus experienced a difficult winter, which was bridged by another advance of \(\$ 1000\) from the Emigration Association. Fortunately for their comfort, kitchen utensils, tools, and some furniture had been brought from Switzerland; for they were too poor for a long time to purchase any of these articles in the United States. In the spring they drew lots, according to the rules of the society, for 20 -acre tracts of land. The 80 acres of timber in section 27 they used in common for about a year. Then it was divided into lots of 2.5 acres each to go with each 20 -acre tract. According to the arrangements of the association, the cost of the land and all other advances were to be repaid by the colonists without interest in ten years. Since they had no money, after the expenditure of the \(\$ 1000\) which had been advanced to them, the colonists went to work in the lead mines at Exeter and at Mineral Point, or on the farms of settlers in the neighborhood. Some of the women went out as house servants. Wages for men on the farms averaged fifty cents a day and were paid in flour, potatoes, etc.

The names of the heads of families among the colonists of 1845 were Fridolin Babler, Oswald Babler, Caspar Becker, Fridolin Becker, Jost Becker, Balthasar Duerst, Mathias Duerst, Fridolin Hefti, Fridolin Hoesli, Henry Hoesli, Marcus Hoesli, Mathew Hoesli, Fridolin Legler, Sr., Fridolin Legler, Jr., George Legler, J. Caspar Legler, Abraham Schindler, Balthasar Schindler, David Schindler, Mathias Schmidt, Anton Stauff acher, Henry Stauff acher, Jacob Stauffacher, Rudolph Stauffacher, Fridolin Streiff, and Hilarius Wild.

During the first two years practically all of the work was
done in common. Four yoke of oxen were bought out of the company's fund and used in turn by each settler. Gradually the Swiss learned American methods from near-by settlers. By 1856 all the immigrants had paid for their land, and such of the colonists as had drawn rocky and poor soil had bought good government land in the town. With the building of the railroad as far as Janesville in 1850, settlement increased rapidly. By 1856 all of the land in the town had been entered.

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Lands.-The agents of the Emigration Association probably selected the hilly town of New Glarus because of its similarity to the canton of Glarus in Switzerland. Since by the rules of the association the land was required to be in one tract of 1200 acres, much rough, stony land was necessarily included. The objects which the pioneers had in mind in the selection of the tract were good agricultural soil, water power, climate, springs, and timber. Other settlers, who came after the first colonists, chose their tracts over widely scattered areas, as did the Swiss themselves as soon as they were in a position to do so. None of the land was bought by speculators.

Progress of Farm Making.-In 1850, a little over four years after the arrival of the first settlers in the town, there was a total acreage of 4242 acres in 44 farms. Of this total, 1330 acres was improved. In 1860 the farm acreage had gone up to 18,849 , very nearly the total area of the town, and the number of farms had increased from 44 to 149. At this period New Glarus ranked sixth among the towns studied in the average number of improved acres in its farms. This average was 69 , while 57 acres remained unimproved. The largest number of acres of improved land in any farm was 280. Ten years later the number of farms was 119, the total improved area 17,133 acres or an average of 143 acres per farm; the total unimproved 3534 acres or an average of 29 acres. At this period 82 farms or 69 per cent of the total number had 100 acres or more improved land, the largest amount being 400 acres. In 1880 there were 130 farms and the improved acreage had fallen to 11,471 . The amount of unimproved land was 10,678 acres, the total farm area 22,149 acres. New Glarus had practically its entire area in farms, but thirteen of the towns studied had a higher aggregate number of improved acres. In 1885 the improved area had gone up to 13,183 acres and in 1895 to 16,946 acres. The dairy industry was now well established.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-The several classes of farms in the census periods (omitting 1850) stood as follows: in 1860, under 20 acres, 5 ; between 20 and 49,25 ; from 50 to 99,28 ; from 100 to 174,55 ; and from 175 to 499, 36. Over half of the farms had 100 acres or more. The maximum was 356 acres. Five other farms had 300 acres or more. In 1870 there were no farms under 20 acres. There were 7 of 20 to 49 acres each, 20 of 50 to 99 , 44 of 100 to 174 , and 48 of 175 to 499 . All but 27 of the 119
farms had 100 or more acres at this period. In 1880 there were 13 farms under 20 acres, 9 farms of 20 to 49 acres, 10 farms of 50 to 99 acres, 45 farms from 100 to 174 acres, and 51 farms of 175 to 499 acres. The largest farm had 600 acres and one other 525 acres.

The amount of rough land kept in pasture is brought out in the following classification of cultivated acres. In 1860 there were 54 farms having 40 acres or less of improved land, in 1870 there were only 10 farms in that class, and in 1880 (at which time there was a decided decrease in number of improved acres) there were 27 farms of that size. In the class of 41 to 60 acres of improved land there were at the three periods 28,5 , and 15 ; of 61 to 100 acres, 44,35 , and 43 ; and over 100 acres, 23, 69, and 45 . The greatest amount of cultivated land in the town was found in the census period of 1870. Of farms having more than 200 acres improved, there were at the three periods 5, 21, and 8 .

General Productions.-In 1849 New Glarus produced 4191 bushels of wheat, an average of 95 bushels per farm. In 1859 it produced 35,066 bushels, an average of 235 bushels. This was about the same aggregate but a lower average than that of Primrose, in Dane County, a town similar in physical features. At this period New Glarus ranked eighth among the towns in total production and seventh in average per farm. Ten years later its total had gone up only to 39,089 bushels, but its average was 328 bushels. In 1879 it had fallen to 20,330 bushels, an average of 156 bushels, and in 1884 to 11,031 bushels. In 1894 only 4462 bushels was produced, and in 1904, 430 bushels.

When wheat failed, New Glarus, like other southwestern towns, devoted more attention to corn growing. Both in 1859 and in 1869 the town ranked fourteenth among the towns compared, in total yield. In 1879 the corn production was higher proportionally. Nine towns exceeded New Glarus in number of bushels per farm, and thirteen fell below her average. The yield per acre was 32 bushels. The acreage and the aggregate of the corn crop increased steadily thereafter.

In 1846 the settlers bought their first cows, providing one for each family, from herds brought up to Exeter by Ohio drovers. In 1847, according to early accounts, there were in the colony 2 horses, 1 bull, 16 oxen and steers, 37 cows, 15 heifers, 25 calves, and 13 hogs. \({ }^{4}\) For 1850 the census records for the entire town 16 horses, 119 cows, 86 oxen, 167 other cattle, 41 sheep, and 478 hogs. Ten years later New Glarus had the largest number of cows and of stock cattle of all the towns compared, with the exception of Mount Pleasant. Nine of the towns had a larger number of swine both in \(\mathbf{1 8 6 0}\) and in 1870. In the latter year three towns had a larger number of cows and one town had more stock cattle. In butter production New Glarus was in 1859 behind Brookfield, Franklin, Mount Pleasant, Whitewater, Plymouth, and Sugar Creek,

\footnotetext{
4 "Planting of Swiss Colony in New Glarus," 364, 366.
}
and in 1869 behind Brookfield and Mount Pleasant. In 1880 New Glarus had 2080 milch cows-more than any of the other towns; in stock cattle it stood twenty-second, in swine thirteenth. In gallons of milk and in cheese produced it far exceeded any other town, while it stood nineteenth in butter production. New Glarus was becoming essentially a cheese producing town, its total of 68,850 pounds exceeding the next highest production by 50,000 pounds.

Both by training in their old homes and because of the physical conditions of New Glarus, the Swiss were inclined to dairying. The census of 1850 records the making of Swiss cheese by New Glarus farmers on their farms. The first cheese factory was built in 1870. "Up to 1870," says Mr. Luchsinger, " "each cheese dairy used only the milk produced on the farm. Of course a spirit of emulation arose, and it became a matter of pride to produce better cheese than others. A little incident witnessed by the writer illustrates the feeling then prevailing. Two settlers named Rudy and George met. Rudy said to George: 'I have had splendid cheese this season; I have sold two loads at Madison for twelve cents a pound and am going to Freeport next week with another load, for which I expect thirteen cents a pound. I have but a very few inferior cheeses.' George listened and smoked, and said nothing until Rudy closed his talk by saying: 'How is it with you, George? Have you hauled off any of your cheese?' George slowly took his pipe from his mouth and said, 'No.' 'Why what is the matter; ain't your cheese ripe?' 'Nothing is the matter,' said George. 'I have no cheese to haul away; I have sold them all as fast as they have ripened, right at home, for fourteen cents a pound.'
"Cheese making by dairy farmers continued to increase but wheat growing was, until 1870, the principal business of the farmer. Then came the chinch bugs in such swarms as to ruin not only the wheat crops but also barley, oats, and corn Wheat farmers realized that a change must be made in their business, or the insect pests would devour their farms. Those in debt became more deeply involved. The young men were leaving the country for the farther West, preferring the hardships of a frontier life to being debt ridden here. Then it was that the cheese factory came. Two small factories were built by farmers in the roughest parts of the county; but inexperienced and timid as they were, it required no small amount of argument and persuasion to get them to invest the necessary labor and money. Modest and inexpensive as the original venture was, the first year showed that climate, soil, grass, and people were well adapted to the profitable production of cheese in factories. So, year after year, more factories, in ever widening circles, were put up; more kinds of cheese began to be made; better methods of making were used; the result was a uniformity in quality and an increasing market not attained under the old system, which was very soon abandoned."
\({ }^{5}\) John Luchsinger, "The History of a Great Industry," in State Historical Society Proceedings, 1898, 226ff.


Fig. 20. Town of New Glarus, 1915 After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company

The factories were built by farmers and leased to cheese makers, who paid a fixed price for the milk. The first cheese to be shipped away was sent to Milwaukee, Chicago, and St. Louis, but even before 1880 it was being exported to England and also to Switzerland. \({ }^{\text {® }}\) The census of 1885 reported 949,288 pounds of cheese for the town; in 1895 the state census recorded 2751 milch cows, a butter and cheese production of 93,750 pounds and 749,100 pounds respectively; the census of 1905 reported \(1,395,712\) pounds of cheese. There were twenty-one cheese factories in the town at this period; \(13,577,661\) pounds of milk was received by them, and the number of cows whose milk was used was 3051.

Value of Productions.-In 1869 the value of all farm productions in New Glarus was \(\$ 128,607\), or \(\$ 1080\) per farm on the average. In 1879 the average per farm was \(\$ 680\). At the first period there were 52 incomes of \(\$ 1000\) or over, the maximum being \(\$ 3290\), made out of general farming and dairying; 44 incomes were between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999,14\) between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599\), and 9 between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399\). There were no incomes under \(\$ 200\). In 1879 there were 24 incomes under \(\$ 200\), and 34 of \(\$ 1000\) or more. The largest was \(\$ 2200\), made chiefly out of dairying, with some general farming. There were 32 between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999,18\) between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599\), and 21 between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399\). One farm reported no income.

In 1904 the average farm income in New Glarus was \(\$ 1642\), the largest of any of the towns studied. The num-
- History of Green County, Wisconsin (Springfield, ml., 1884), 1031.
ber of cows was slightly smaller than it had been ten years before. The value of dairy productions alone per farm was \(\$ 1075\). Other livestock productions averaged \(\$ 511\) per farm. Crop incomes averaged only \(\$ 56\) per farm in 1904 and only \(\$ 9.00\) in 1919. Total farm incomes averaged \(\$ 5338\) in 1919, by far the highest of any of the towns studied. The next largest income was in Primrose, the other important dairying and cheese producing town. The value of dairy productions in New Glarus was \(\$ \mathbf{3 9 0 1}\), the highest income from that source of any of the towns. There were 3166 cows in the town.

Manufactures.-The first store was opened and the first sawmill put up in 1851. A gristmill was built in 1862 by David Klassey. A barley hulling machine was connected with this mill. In 1867 a brewery was built. \({ }^{7}\) Cheese factories increased rapidly, beginning with the first about 1870. In 1907 there were 22 cheese factories in New Glarus and 293 in Green County. \({ }^{8}\)

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches. The village of New Glarus was laid out and platted in 1851, and a post office established there. The first church was a \(\log\) house built in 1849 and used also as a school. The denomination was the Swiss Reformed, with Reverend William Streissguth as first minister. In 1858 a stone church was built. A German Evangelical church was erected on section 22 in 1859, and was moved into the village about \(1865 .{ }^{\circ}\)

The first school was taught in 1847 by Mr. Cowan in the \(\log\) house of Balthasar Schindler. The next was taught in 1848 by James Kilroy at the home of Mathias Schmidt. Beginning in 1849 Peter Jenny taught for six years in the Swiss Reformed church built that year. German had been taught practically since the first settlement. \({ }^{10}\) The plat book for 1873 shows five schools-two on section 14, in the village, and one each on sections 1,9 , and 33 .

Population Changes.-In 1850, out of 65 heads of families in New Glarus, 8 were American and 57 foreign born. Out of a total population of 311 at that time, 226 were foreign born. One hundred and ninety-six of these for-

New Glarue-Population Statistics
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Year} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Total} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{American} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Foreion} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Families} \\
\hline & & Wis- & Other States & Total & France & \[
\left|\begin{array}{c}
\text { Ger- } \\
\text { many }
\end{array}\right|
\] & \[
\left|\begin{array}{c}
\text { Scan- } \\
\text { dina- } \\
\text { via }
\end{array}\right|
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Swit- } \\
& \text { zer- } \\
& \text { land }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Other } \\
& \text { Lands }
\end{aligned}
\] & Total & \[
\begin{array}{|}
\text { Amer- } \\
\text { ican }
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
\text { For- } \\
\text { eign }
\end{array}
\] & Total \\
\hline 1850 & 311 & 45 & 40 & 85 & & & & 196 & & 226 & & 57 & 65 \\
\hline 1860 & 960 & 324 & 52 & 376 & 7 & 7 & 80 & 446 & 44 & 584 & 9 & 186 & 195 \\
\hline 1870 & 958 & 480 & 12 & 492 & 6 & 7 & 45 & 402 & & 466 & & 168 & 174 \\
\hline 1885 & 1,136 & & & 714 & 4 & 12 & 18 & & \({ }^{388}\) & \({ }^{422}\) & 23 & 149 & 172 \\
\hline 1895 & 1,202 & & & 818 & 4 & \({ }_{7}^{6}\) & 11 & & \({ }^{363}\) & 384 & \({ }_{83}^{63}\) & 208 & \({ }_{12}^{271}\) \\
\hline 1905
1920 & 685
554 & & & & & \({ }^{7}\) & 4 & 131
119 & 1 & 143
126 & \({ }_{84}^{82}\) & \({ }_{35}^{41}\) & 11 \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{\imath}\) Wis. Hist. Colls., viii, 437.
\({ }^{8}\) N New. York Evening Post, Nov. 30, 1907.
- New York Evenisg Hist Colls., xii, 370 .
\({ }^{10}\) Ibid., viii, 432 .
}
eigners were Swiss, 15 were English, 7 Norwegian, and 4
German. As the success of the New Glarus colony became known in Switzerland, the number of Swiss increased from 196 in 1850 to 446 in 1860. The proportion to the total number of foreign born had fallen, however, from 86.7 per cent to 78 per cent. In the next ten years it went up again to 86 per cent of the foreign born. The proportion of foreign born to
total population was highest in 1850, when it was 72 per cent. In successive ten-year periods it fell to 60 per cent, to 48 per cent, and to 87 per cent. In 1885 it was \(\mathbf{3 2}\) per cent, in 1895 and 1905 it was about 22 per cent. In 1850 there were 40 residents of states other than Wisconsin. In 1860 this number had gone up to 52 . The largest number were from New York. In other parts of Wisconsin, settlers from New York
were the element which provided leadership in introducing new dairying methods. In New Glarus, however, the first cheese factories were built by Swiss, though New Yorkers had previously opened a number of factories in other parts of the state and there can hardly be a doubt that their example was followed by the Swiss in New Glarus.
M. A. K.
Survey Notes
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\section*{N E W T O N}

LCATION.-The town of Newton, organized in 1850, occupies township 18 north, range 23 east, in the southeastern part of Manitowoc County, five miles southwest of Manitowoc. It lies in part on the shore of Lake Michigan, the lake cutting off portions of sections 36, 25, and 24 , grazing also the southeast corner of section 13. The great road to Green Bay entered the town of Newton at section 30, and running northeast emerged at section 3 near Silver Lake. A branch of this road led east to Manitowoc, and other roads reached the town from the south. From early times there were piers near where later the village of Northeim grew up, and stores at that point (with later a creamery) made it a great convenience to the farmers living in the southeastern and southern portions of the town.

Surface and Drainage.-The surface is undulating and it is well watered throughout, the principal streams being Silver Creek, Yellow Creek, and Point Creek, all flowing southeast into Lake Michigan. Swamps were rather extensive while the country was still forest covered, as shown by the surveyor's notes. \({ }^{1}\) Much of the wet land was automatically reclaimed by the removal of the timber.

Types of Soll.-The town averages high in first-class land, in spite of extensive swamps, and none of it was described as poorer than second-class. The soil near the lake is light, but fertile, while most of the balance is heavier and very productive when cleared. No regular soil survey of Manitowoc County has yet been made.

Timber.-Originally the town was practically covered with a dense forest growth which included birch, lynn, sugar maple, ash, cedar, elm, alder, beech, with some pine and tamarack in the swamps, also some oak, especially on the higher parts. There were no prairies or openings, the whole requiring the heavy labor and expense of clearing, which helps to explain the comparative slowness of agricultural development in the town.

Beginnings of Settlement,-Newton is known as one of the most distinctively German towns of Wisconsin. Among the original entrymen of the land was a goodly proportion of Americans. But some of these were speculators taking up numerous tracts for resale to settlers. The earliest entries, numbering ten, in 1836 were all by Americans. After that no more entries were recorded until the year 1847, when 36 were made by Americans, but a larger number-41by persons with foreign names. In the year 1848 the number of entries was 77, mostly made by foreigners. The latest
\({ }^{1}\) The township was surveyed in 1834 by Byron Kilbourn, who became famous
one of the founders of Milwaukee and president of the Milwaukee and as one of the founders of Milwaukee and president of the Milwaukee and
Mississippi Railroad Company.
date of entry for any of the land in the township is 1858. It is noticeable that, while Americans frequently took up scattered tracts, showing that they were taken for speculation, the foreigners generally bought one, two, or three forties in compact form for home making. In the total, foreigners entered 110 tracts as against 81 entered by Americans. Among the early settlers, according to local histories, were Peter Lonsdorf, Fred Truettner, August Eberhardt, Carl and Peter Dumke. \({ }^{2}\) Among the entrants of 1836 John H. Foster and William B. Long on section 1 were the only ones still holding their land in 1860. Of the entrants of 1847 the names of Heinrich Meyer, section 9, Peter Lonsdorf, section 13, Walter Scott, section 19, Peter Brachmann, section 27, and John Fetherspel, section 30, appear on the 1860 plat.

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Lands.-The first entries of land in Newton were on sections 1, 2, 3, 25, 35, and 36 , and were obviously considered desirable for water power facilities and for transportation purposes on account of nearness to Lake Michigan. The entries of 1847 were fairly well scattered, but again were near Lake Michigan, near an Indian trail (now the Lake Shore Road), near the Green Bay Road, and near water power sites. The town was heavily forested; and except for the road in the western part of Newton, and Lake Michigan in the east, which helped solve difficulties, transportation problems were about equally heavy throughout the town. Much of the land was bought from speculators or other private individuals by the first settlers.

Progress of Farm Making.-In 1860 Newton had 228 farms containing a total of 5150 acres improved land and 8749 acres unimproved land. In other words, the average farm had 22 acres improved and 38 acres unimproved. In 1870 the number of farms was 298 , an increase of 70 . The improved land amounted to 8401 acres, the unimproved to 6813 acres, showing that more wild land was now included in the farms. The average farm now contained 29 improved and 22 unimproved acres. By 1880 the number of farms had decreased to 292, but the total acreage in farms had increased. This was the decade of local railway construction, the Milwaukee, Lake Shore, and Western being completed to Manitowoc in 1873. The amount of improved land is given as 13,991 acres, the unimproved as 9508 acres. The average farm now had 47 acres improved land to 32 acres unimproved. Averaging only 79 acres, the farms of this town were smaller on the whole than those of any of the twenty-two towns compared with it. But the average of improved land was greater than in Prairie du Chien or Sevastopol, though less than in the
\({ }^{2}\) History of Manitorwoc County, Wisconsin (Chicago, 1912), 326.
other twenty. In 1885 Newton was credited with 13,374 acres improved land and 8080 unimproved and woodland. By 1895 the improved acreage had risen to 17,539 , and the unimproved had fallen to \(445 \%\). In 1905 Newton had 304 farms, only 12 more than in 1880 . The total acreage was 21,114-improved, 17,299; unimproved, 3815.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-According to the census of 1860 there were at that time \(\mathbf{3}\) farms under 20 acres in area and 5 farms of from 175 to 499 acres. The largest number, 119, were from 20 to 49 acres; the next largest, 77 , from 50 to 99 . Twenty-four farms were from 100 to 174 acres. In 1870 there were 16 under 20 acres, 79 between 20 and 49 acres, 155 between 50 and 99 acres, 45 between 100 and 174 acres, and 3 between 175 and 499 acres. At both census periods no farm had more than 200 acres. In 1880 the smallest-sized farms numbered 4 ; there were 57 in the second class, 169 in the third class, 55 in the fourth class, and 7 in the fifth class. There were no farms over 500 acres. The largest farm had 270 acres and was owned by August Teitgen.

In as heavily forested a town as Newton the amount of actually cleared land is of importance in measuring its agricultural development. While most of the land was purchased as early as 1848, in which year 77 entries were made, the census of 1860 shows that few of the farms were opened to more than half of their acreage by that time, and that many were only well begun. At this period only 1 farm had over 100 acres cleared. Three farms had from 61 to 100 acres cleared, 10 had from 41 to 60 acres, and 214 farms had 40 or less acres improved. In 1870 there were 193 farms with 40 or less acres of cultivated land; in 1880 there were 138 in that class. In the class of 41 to 60 acres of cleared land there were at the two periods 84 and 87 ; of 61 to 100 acres, 20 and 64 ; and over 100 acres, 1 and 3.

General Productions.-Newton in 1859, according to the census of 1860 , produced only 3845 bushels of wheat, an average per farm of 16 bushels. Only one town, Sevastopol, produced less. Corn amounted to only 3 bushels for the entire town, oats to 10,564 bushels. There were 398 cows in the town, 268 other cattle, and 513 swine. In 1869 wheat production amounted to 24,030 bushels, an average per farm of 80 bushels; in 1879 it had further advanced to 63,309 bushels, an average of 216 bushels; and in 1884 to 68,556 bushels. As in other heavily forested towns, wheat as a leading crop persisted more than a decade beyond its period in more easily cleared sections. Corn during this period advanced very slowly. In 1879, 910 bushels, an average of 3 bushels per farm, was reported, and as late as 1904 only 645 bushels was
grown for the entire town. Oats were an important crop and advanced from 23,785 bushels in 1869 to 53,942 bushels in 1879 , and to 82,491 in 1904. The dairy industry showed a decided development in the increase in number of cows from 542 in 1870 to 1155 in 1880, and to 2039 in 1905. Other cattle also increased from 356 in 1870 to 693 in 1880, and to 2938 in 1905. Swine, a profitable livestock production in forested towns, which had increased from 600 in 1870 to 793 in 1880, showed a decrease in the next fifteen years, but by 1905 they had gone up to 1058. In the state census of 1885 cheese appeared as a new production, amounting to 564,781 pounds. The butter record was missed at this period, the town being accidentally omitted from the schedule exhibiting that item. The 1895 census reported only 141,661 pounds of cheese manufactured in eleven factories located within the town, which drew milk from 928 cows. The production of butter totaled 85,050 pounds. There was one creamery. The combined value of the butter and cheese was less than that of the cheese produced in 1884, so that one suspects errors in reporting or printing the returns. In 1904 the chief wealth of the town was in its cows. It produced 78,739 gallons of milk, 63,914 pounds of butter on the farm, 146,059 pounds of butter in its four creameries, and 349,170 pounds of cheese in its five cheese factories.

Special Productions.-No considerable specialization had occurred by 1879 except in the growing of peas. This town led all in that particular, the total production amounting to over 9000 bushels, or 30 bushels to the average farm. Peas were grown in Newton as early as 1868, and from 1875 to 1910 were a leading crop. After 1900, pea canning factories were established in Manitowoc, with a branch at Newton. The census of 1905 reported 23,551 bushels valued at \(\$ 22,997\). After 1910 the industry declined, and it is at present no more extensive than in other towns where it is incidental.

Barley increased from 2190 bushels in 1869 to 62,163 bushels in 1904, at which time it was a leading crop in the town. This was due largely to the good market for it in Manitowoc and other near-by brewing centers. Apples and potatoes are minor special crops. Potatoes in 1904 amounted to 21,677 bushels valued at \(\$ 4647\), and apples to 13,013 bushels valued at \(\$ 3848\).

The forested condition of the town, while a distinct hindrance to the agricultural subjection of the land, afforded opportunity to the settlers not merely to obtain fuel, which for many years was over-abundant, but also to add to their limited incomes by supplying for the market saw logs, hoop poles, cordwood, and railroad ties. The presence of sawmills in the town or on its borders also made building material cheap to those owning saw timber. "Persons engaged in clearing," said the editor of the Manitorooc County Herald, January 11, 1851, "always find more or less valuable timber which has a ready market and is thus made a valuable source of assistance in promoting early improvements." As late as

1869, and doubtless for some years thereafter, the majority of the farmers were still marketing forest products-some of them to the extent of \(\$ 200\) to \(\$ 300\), and from these figures down to \(\$ 10\) or \(\$ 15\).

Value of Productions.-The annual value of productions in 1879 was the lowest of the towns compared, with the single exception of Prairie du Chien, and one is forced to look upon the community as made up at that time of families who were generally in very moderate circumstances. The average value of farm productions was only \(\$ 342\). In 1869 it had been \(\$ 431\). At this period 24 farms produced less than \(\$ 200\), 129 produced between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399,98\) between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599,41\) between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999\), and only 6 produced \(\$ 1000\) and over. The largest income was \(\$ 1461\), made on a farm of 120 acres, all of which was cleared. The value of livestock was \(\$ 700\), the stock consisting of 4 horses, 9 cows, 5 other cattle, and 4 swine. Four hundred and fifty bushels of wheat, 500 bushels of oats, 40 bushels of barley, and 30 bushels of rye were produced. The value of orchard products was \(\$ 120\) and the value of animals slaughtered \(\$ 105\). Ten years later the lowest class of incomes numbered 31, the second 150 , the third 92 , the fourth 15 , and the fifth 4 . The largest income was \(\$ 1100\) and was made in general farming on the largest farm in the town, which contained 270 acres.

In 1904 the average farm income had gone up to \(\$ 680\). There were at that time 2039 cows in the town, almost double the number in 1879. The value of dairy products was \(\$ 280\) and of other livestock \(\$ 100\). Crops averaged \(\$ 300\) per farm. By 1919, with the greater development of the dairy industry, crops produced only \(\$ 124\) and the average of dairy products was \(\$ 1399\). Other livestock came to \(\$ 623\) and total farm incomes to \(\$ 2146\).

Manufactures.-The rail line of the Milwaukee, Lake Shore, and Western Railroad enters from the south of section 34 and leaves the town at the northeastern corner of section 1. Its station of Newport is in section 34. This line was completed to Manitowoc in 1873. Mills were built in the late forties and early fifties-one on section 7, one at Silver Lake, one at Manitowoc Rapids, two miles from the northern line of the town, and of course others at Manitowoc about five miles away. Flour milling was carried on at one of the early sawmills at the same time with lumbering. In the middle fifties another flour mill was built on section 16, and about 1866 the lumber mill on section 26 was converted into a gristmill. All of these mills, with the exception of one lumber mill, closed down before 1885. \({ }^{3}\) Blacksmiths and wagon makers were located within the town. By 1878 the town had two cheese factories-one in section 5 and another in section 28. From that time factory dairying gradually developed until it became the dominant industry of the people.
\({ }^{\circ}\) Carl F. Wehrwein, A History of Agriculture in the Toren of Nerwon, Manitorvooc County, Wisconsin. MS. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1915 .

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches. From the year 1855 there was a post office at Newtonburg in section 8, and later one at Northeim in section 35.

The first church in Newton was of the German Reformed faith. The census of 1860 noted, among the families, that of John A. Salzer, thirty-seven years of age, clergyman. He had a wife and four children, the eldest being a boy of ten. Mr. Salzer was a native of Württemberg, but since all the children were born in this country-in Illinois and Iowa-he must have come to America a number of years before. Presumably, Salzer was pastor of the church in Newton. Later he established an extensive seed business at La Crosse. A few years later we find Reverend E. Wagner described as pastor of the Newtonburg church, and for at least ten years1874 to 1884-Reverend E. Strube occupied that post.

By the year 1878, according to the town plat of that year, there were five churches. We know from the Catholic History that St. Casimer's Congregation (Catholic) was organized in 1868 and a church built at Northeim the same year, followed by a parochial school in 1874.


Fig. 21. Town of Newton, 1915 After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company
The plat book of 1878 for Manitowoc County shows schools in the town of Newton on sections 4, 9, 12, 23, 26, 27, and 30.

Population Changes.-The facts which emerge from a census study of nativities are rather astonishing. In 1860 only two heads of families were of American origin, all the rest being foreign and, with few exceptions, German. Many of the children of German parents, of course, were of Ameri-
can nativity, which gave the town its total of 458 natives as against 933 foreign born. The census of 1850 shows 472 foreign born and 79 native born, or only 16 per cent native. By 1870 a decided change had come about, the native element being then slightly in the majority. From this point we rely on the state census, which was taken at the middle of the decade, and we find in Newton in 1885 a total of 1892, of which 597 were foreign born, or 31.5 per cent of the whole number, while 1295, or 68.5 per cent, were American born. Ten years later, 1895, the figures stood; 1607 American and 532 foreign, or a fraction under 25 per cent foreign.

The census of 1905 shows a reduction in the total population of the town from 2139 (in 1895) to 1741. This is doubtless due to the high mortality rate among the older generation and the partial dispersion of families through the withdrawal of adult young persons, the trend to the city having set in strongly. The proportion of native and foreign stood: 1451 native to 290 foreign. In other words, only 16.6 per cent of the population were of foreign birth, while the native element made up 83.4 per cent of the whole. Inasmuch as the entire state, in 1905, showed a native element which was only 77.34 per cent of the whole, it is clear that this town had been "Americanizing" at an exceptional rate, as compared with other communities.

The federal census of 1920 shows a further reduction in total population to 1515 , with the proportion of native and foreign as 1367 to 148 . This makes the foreign born 10.2 per cent of the total as against 89.8 per cent American born.

A comparative study of nativities of twenty-three towns, including Newton, from the state census of 1895 and 1905 yields this result: In 1895 the town of Newton stood number fourteen on the list arranged to show the smallness of the percentage of foreign born in the population, while in 1905 this town stood number eight. This proves that the process of change from foreign to native, as it proceeded in the town of Newton, was exceptionally rapid both positively and comparatively. To understand how this came about, it is only necessary to contemplate the permanent occupation of the farms by the original German entrymen of the land, or the German immigrant purchasers of privately owned wild land. These immigrants, coming in the forties and fifties of the last century, were, as the census record shows, mainly young adults. Their children, so far as they were born in Wisconsin, would be natives and some of these children would inherit the lands on the death of the parents. When the older generation had passed away, the population would be entirely native, save for that comparatively small number of the younger generation who were born in Germany prior to the emigration of their parents.

That the above is essentially the process which changed the town of Newton in fifty years from an almost purely German to an almost purely American community is nearly, if not quite, demonstrable from documentary sources. It is noteworthy that, out of the 1451 American born in 1905,

1434 (or all but 17) were natives of Wisconsin. Doubtless nearly all of them were born in the town of Newton itself. This view is strengthened by a comparison of the names of landowners in 1860 with those of later dates, as shown by the county maps. On the map of the year 1903 we identify 82 names of persons who owned land in the township in 1860. In most cases the land held was in the same sections and constituted in part or in whole the original farms. Recalling that the number of farm owners in 1860, according to the census, was 228, we see that the proportion of persisting families must have been very large. The biographies in the county history include the names of 18 persons who resided in the town of Newton in 1910. In all cases they were then living on the farms on which they were born.

We implied above that the farms of Newton could hardly be said to be "made" until about 1880. And no doubt there was for a number of years some shifting about-some buying, mortgaging, and selling-among those holding inferior or small tracts. It would be more normal, therefore, to compare the owners of about 1880 with those of 1903 . We have a county plat book for 1878 , on which we identify 140 names appearing on the plat of 1903 , twenty-five years later. \({ }^{4}\) This shows that nearly one-half of the original farm makers' names cling to the soil of the township. Were we able to determine the cases where men from outside married daughters of the old families and substituted their own names, it would increase still further the roll of the permanent families. No comparisons with other towns have yet been made on this head, but one risks little in asserting that Newton has been socially one of the most stable farming communities in the state.

Printed biographies of men and women who are natives of Newton tell us something about the early settlers-what manner of folk they were, what their worldly condition, their training, and the mode of their entry into the community's life, with facts about their achievements. The History of Manitorwoc County presents about forty such sketches. We have in them accounts of families settling on the heavily timbered wild land, usually beginning home life in a \(\log\) hutin one case, in a temporary shelter of bark-and gradually working their way to independence; of sons and grandsons who became business men, professional men, teachers, scientific farmers, inventors; of daughters and granddaughters who were the partners of successful men in all these pursuits. References to the pioneer ancestors reveal that the town of Newton was served by men of special training-that some who settled there were blacksmiths and worked at their trade, others were wagon makers, others millers, others carpenters, and so on. We learn that, while most of the immigrants were poor to begin with, a few came with appreciable sums of money, and these built gristmills, sawmills, taverns, and stores, and helped during the time of begin-

\footnotetext{
- Many names are badly misspelled, but can be identified under their disguises.
}
nings in promoting the construction of churches and schools, as well as in other public improvements.

The Civil War record of Newton is expressed mainly in the soldiers the town furnished. These apparently numbered \(42,{ }^{5}\) as given in the Roster, of whom two were killed in action, two died of wounds received in battle, three others were discharged on account of wounds and disability, and six died of disease. Four earned the unenviable title of deserters. But it seems clear that these must have been "floaters," for their names-all non-German-are alien to the list of family names of the town in 1860. The amount raised by tax for bounties in the year ending May 31, 1865, was \(\$ 2100\). \(^{\circ}\)

When the vast labor of compiling the records of soldiers of the World War shall have been completed in the form in which it has been begun by the Adjutant General of Wisconsin, it will be possible to give the results with measurable completeness.

Politically, the town of Newton was for many years overwhelmingly Democratic, which is normal for the period up to 1860 , considering the prevailing nationality of its people. So nearly unanimous were the voters in the gubernatorial election of 1859, that Randall (Republican) received but a single vote, while his Democratic opponent, Hobart, polled 72 votes. Nevertheless, the next year, in the presidential contest, Lincoln was given a majority, 128, against 77 for Douglas and none for either Breckenridge or Bell. This was due, no doubt, to the powerful free-soil and antislavery sentiment which prevailed among the Germans. Manitowoc County gave Lincoln 2041, Douglas 1947, a result which astonished both Democrats and Republicans. \({ }^{7}\)

Thereafter the county again voted regularly for the Democratic presidential ticket until 1896. The town of Newton, on the other hand, shifted from Republican to Democratic and back again in a most eccentric fashion, the causes of which call for investigation. McClellan received a majority of 44 in 1864, while Grant won by 36 votes in ' 68 and Greeley by 46 in '72. Tilden had a majority of 27 in '76, Garfield 25 in 1880, and Blaine 3 in '84. In 1888 Harrison and Cleveland each received 173 votes, as did the gubernatorial candidates also. \({ }^{8}\) But in '92 Cleveland received 165 as against 98 for Harrison, the state ticket polling identically the same numbers. McKinley defeated Bryan 214 to 147 in ' 96 , and 182 to 123 in 1900; while Roosevelt in 1904 received 207 against Parker's 109. At that election 7 votes were cast for Swallow (Prohibitionist) and 3 for Debs (Socialist). In 1908 Bryan obtained 132, Taft 182, Debs 8. Taft was leader in the town again in 1912, with 101; while Wilson received 77, Roosevelt 47, Debs 2, and Chafin 2. Newton
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was strongly Republican in 1916, giving Hughes 219 and Wilson 90, with no scattering votes, Philipp for governor running even with Hughes. The 1920 vote stood: Harding, 287; Cox, 27; Watkins, 3; Debs, 54.

Newton-Population Statistics
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\section*{PIONEERS OF NEWTON}
(From Manitowoc Post, June 9, June 16, and December 29, 1921. Translated by Emil Baensch)

In the several issues in which we have discussed the settlement of Newton, we have confined ourselves to facts, without reference to the fortunes, hardships, and troubles of the first settlers of the town. But a settlement in the midst of the wilderness presented unheard-of obstacles, as many of our readers know from experience and others from the stories of parents and grandparents-and especially when the necessary finances for equipment were lacking, as was generally the case. The immigrants came with strong arms and a willingness to work, but, as a general rule, they brought no money. After they had made partial payments for the purchase of their land and had acquired the absolutely necessary tools, their means were exhausted. Then they faced the problem of how to build a shelter in the primeval forest, to clear the woodland, and to plant foodstuffs between the stumps. What they endured and suffered until the harvest made these foodstuffs available and usable, the present generation would find it difficult to imagine. Work, unceasing work, from early morn to evening, every day of the year, coupled with meager diet, was the lot of the first settlers of this community. Some of them probably were often discouraged. We know of many who, despairing of success, gave up, but most of them persevered and then enjoyed the satisfaction of seeing their labor crowned with success.

The vicissitudes of the settlers of Newton were similar to those of pioneers in other towns. Many of them can tell stories of their experiences in pioneer days that would outshadow the imagination of famous authors. In former articles relating to the settlement of the town of Newton we stated that we would welcome information as to the personal experiences of the first settlers of the town, and it affords us much satisfaction that the descendants of one of those pioneers, Herman Carstens, who died December, 1907, have responded to our request and have given us a sketch of his life which he dictated in 1874 to his son-in-law, Carl Diederichs, he being unable to write on account of total blindness. This dictation was not intended for the public; it was only for the information and edification of his descendants, but we have been permitted to copy some extracts referring to the more important of his experiences as a pioneer.

Mr. Carstens began his dictation by stating that he, Johan Herman Carstens, was born June 10, 1824, in the then kingdom of Hanover, and was reared by his parents in a Christian life. This Christian spirit he retained, in spite of all hardship and affliction, until his death. Up to 1851 he remained with his parents, and in that year married. His wife, born June 17, 1825, in the city of Hanover, was a devoted companion and helpmate to him until her death.

On June 21, 1852, the young couple left their home and journeyed in a sailing vessel to America, arriving in Manitowoc on August 4. Mr. Carstens says:

We went to my brother Henry, who had purchased 40 acres in the town of Newton, the payment for which he had to work off, since he was without means. Half of the land was already cleared. We remained with him until October, 1853, and I helped him clear the other half, which work was finished by September 1, so that he could sow wheat. He then received the deed and the land became his property. During the winter we cleared 2 to 3 acres of the land, planted some potatoes thereon in the spring and some oats for the next winter, besides some vegetables. All this work had to be done with a hoe between the stumps. Our sustenance we had to earn by making shingles, at which work our wives faithfully helped us. For nearly an entire year we were without meat or butter, a great privation. It required much labor and exertion to haul and pile the logs in order to burn them, but our wives helped us as much as they could. After 15 months we left my brother, who honorably divided the products of our mutual work-potatoes, vegetables, and some oats. The separation was hard for both of us.

Our livestock consisted at the time of one cow, one calf, four chickens, one dog, and one cat, but it gradually increased. Outside of butter and meat, we had plenty of food during the winter. Our bread and meat and other necessaries we had to obtain by making shingles. Our cow proved to be a real blessing to our household. During the winter I cleared 3 to 4 acres, which were cleaned and planted in the spring and summer. In this way we succeeded through labor and industry, after several years of privation, in raising sufficient food for us and feed for our cattle. I often think of those hard yet happy days, how contented we were in spite of all privation, and how delicious our simple meal tasted.

My greatest blessing was my wife Marie. Mirth and mourning, grief and sorrow, labor and privation, sickness and distress, all she shared with me, so that I found my happiness in my house and my family.

In 1858 my parents and my other brothers and sisters arrived. My father bought 80 acres next to my property. My brother Henry and I helped him build his house, and to clear and clean 3 acres of land, which he sowed with rye in the fall so that the family had their own bread the following year. We helped each other whenever necessary, and in this way secured small farms with oxen, cows, hogs, wagons, and farm implements, which made our work easier. After several years we could bring produce to market and be paid in cash, and were thus no longer dependent upon barter.

In addition to bearing the hardships incident to pioneering, Mr. Carstens fell ill with inflammation of the lungs, from the effects of which he suffered for over a year. Then, in 1871, he lost his eyesight. After that time, although undergoing frequent operations, he passed his days in total blindness. It is pathetic to read in his dictation with what humble resignation he bore this terrible blow.

As to his family, Mr. Carstens reports that his marriage was blessed with eleven children, five of whom died in infancy; the other six, through industry and economy, have obtained a comfortable competence.

In spite of his blindness he continued the management of his farm, with the help of his wife and children, until 1880, when he turned the same over to his son Ernst, and with his wife retired to a small house which he had built for this purpose. There his wife, as she had for years, did her utmost to cheer his darkened days, and
cared for him in faithful self-denial, until her death, January 18, 1884. The blow was hard, but he bore it in humble submission to the dispensation of Providence. Thus isolated, he removed to the home of the above-mentioned son, Ernst, in whose family he found loving care. In 1887 he was again seized with a serious illness which brought him near to death, but which he finally overcame, yet the resulting physical weakness never again left him. For twenty-four long years after his wife's death he lived a lonely, and by blindness darkened, but devout life, until on December 19, 1907, he closed his tired eyes for his last, long sleep.

This, in short, is the life career of one of the old settlers who devoted his whole strength and energy to help transform the wilderness into a prosperous community. The life of the pioneer was hard, but unbending force of will finally overcame all difficulties.

The Brachman family came from Weiskirchen, a village near the famous city of Trier. In 1844 the family bade good-bye to the valley of the Mosel and settled down in Milwaukee. There were three sons-Peter, then eighteen years of age; John, sixteen years; and Mathias.

For several years the members of the family kept themselves employed in Milwaukee. Then, in 1847, they purchased 160 acres in section 27 in the town of Newton, which was divided between the father and the two sons, Peter and John. They worked together harmoniously and made a fine farm out of the wilderness.

Peter married Mary Thielen, of Mequon, who predeceased him. He died in 1892, leaving five children, three of whom have since died The two survivors are John Brachman, of Manitowoc, and Elizabeth Specht of Abbotsford. The elder John Brachman died in 1871. Some years later his widow married John P. Pitsch, who was then a farme and later managed a hotel on South Main Street in Manitowoc. John Brachman left surviving seven children, all of whom are still living: Anna Simon, of Algoma; Helen Gierksen and Mary Schmidt, of Milwaukee; Peter, residing in Oregon; and Angela Klein, John Brachman, and Nic J. Brachman, of Manitowoc. The last-named was born in Milwaukee, the others on the farm.

We are indebted to Nic J. Brachman for the following details He relates that when his father came to look at his land he found that Wenzel Zych occupied it with a shack. Mr. Zych had bought some land in the same section, but had made a mistake in locating it. The matter was investigated, the lines correctly run, and Mr. Zych found the land that was his and moved his house thereon. Both were good-natured about it, and in later years Mr. Zych always enjoyed telling the story as a joke on both of them.

Nic J. Brachman can also tell some interesting stories about the pioneer school days. He had as school teachers the pioneer farmers Abraham Hecker, Fred Schmitz, and Carl Schmitz. These pioneers had a varied experience, being required not only to cut down the forest, remove the stumps, farm the land, make roads, but, in addition, to see to it that their children and the children of their neighbors did not grow up in ignorance.

\section*{EXTRACT FROM THE JOURNAL OF WILLIAM HEIMAN,} A PIONEER OF NEWTON, IN THE YEAR 1848
On the 14th day of August, 1848, we left Orsoy on the Rhine, arriving at Sheboygan at \(2: 30\) of the morning of October 10th. The 11th we remained in Sheboygan. We boarded with Christman, the innkeeper near the bridge. We had to pay a 4 -shilling bridge toll
for each of our boxes. The boat did not stop at Manitowoc, otherwise we would have disembarked there. In Sheboygan we saw the remnants of the steamer which had burned there last year.

The 12 th of October we still had to remain in Sheboygan. On the 13 th we rode to Manitowoc on a propeller, which was heated with wood. The sparks scattered over the boat and holes were burned in many beds. We left at 4 o'clock in the morning and reached Manitowoc at 8 o'clock. We first met Mrs. Dressler, who lives with Klingholz, of Wesel. In the afternoon we took a walk through the woods.

The 14th of October we went to P. Kremers and later to F. Weihe and Diederichs in the woods. The 15th of October, Sunday, divine services were held at Weihe's; there were 30 of us together.

The 16 th of October. Now we want to return again to Manitowoc. Bierhaus wants to remain in the woods. Frederich Weihe asked \(\$ 450\) for 80 acres with blockhouse, 1 cow, half of the provisions, and 4 acres cleared land. Since Bierhaus has many small children it looked good to him and he bought it at once. The 17th of October we went to Kremer's and remained until the following morning; Barnstein and Pannebaecker were also there.

18th of October. We had left our baggage at Barthels and had our clothing cleaned.

The 19th of October. Here in Manitowoc all things are still in their beginning. We are considering whether we ought to make shingles.

20th of October. Here at Klingholz everything is to be had. It is good, but dear. An ax costs 10 shilling and a hand-saw 6 shilling. The nails are poor, wire nails not being used here

\section*{21st of October we divided our baggage.}

22nd of October, Sunday. We again went to Ebenezer at Weihe's and Bierhaus.

The 23 rd of October we bought 80 acres from B. Phlipsen (Lohman) in sections 28-29, township 18, range 23, for \(\$ 120\).

26 th of October. I arranged my carpenter tools.
27th of October. Phlipsen, Bruckschen and I went to Green Bay, 38 miles from Manitowoc, and I claimed there 40 acres. It is a poor road.

The 28th of October we arrived at Green Bay and I took out my first citizenship papers. They cost 6 shilling. We remained there until the 29th and lodged at A. Weisse, a German, who is acquainted with the land office

On the 30th of October we are again in Manitowoc.
On the 31st of October we prepared our ax-handles and the 1st of November my brother John and I went into the woods, there to begin the work. On the way we met Tillman Grosshuesch, Bruckschen, Bernhardt and Peter Tendrick. We again returned to Manitowoc and the friends received the articles we had brought along for them.

The 2nd of November we began work and helped Phlipsen complete his blockhouse, also on the 3rd, and on the 4th they moved in.

The 5th of November, Sunday, Bruckschen, Peter and Bernhardt Tendick called on us and in the afternoon Mrs. Tillman Grosshuesch. Then we sang "Hallelujah, the Lord be Praised," and we are glad that we are now together in the New World.

6th of November. In the morning Bruckschen, Bernhardt and Peter Tendrick bought some land. (Huesch has claimed some more land for \(\$ 1.25\) [per acre]. Peter and Bernhardt Tendick will be our nearest neighbors. The neighborhood consists of Germans, and most of them we knew in the old country, namely, Diederichs, Phlipsen, Dressler, Hecker, Weihe, Bruckschen, Tendicks, Bruecker, Grauman, and Gaterman.

The 7th of November there was an election for president of the United States as well as for men who will have charge of the roads.

The 9th, 10th and 11th of November, we helped Phlipsen at his work. We board with Phlipsen and can work ourselves tired. If we are blessed with luck we can pull through. This winter we intend, so God wills, to make shingles and to clear. One can make as many shingles as he pleases and always get rid of them. For one thousand shingles we receive 12 shilling, two Prussian dollars. The land that we bought my brother and I will divide, each receiving 40 acres; at one end a creek courses through it and a fine meadow can be made there. Thus far we have been well and cheerful.

\section*{NORWAY RACINE COUNTY \\ T4N R2OE Surveyed May 16, 1836
L4 E. Dwelle}

Survey Notes
3536 Land good 2 nd rate (except marsh), oak.
2536 poor
536 "poor
2225 . rolling,
2324 Mostly marsh.
\(3242^{\text {nd }}\) rate (except marsh), oah
314
1213 Land rolling, 2 nd rate, oak
1213 L
1112
112
2 Rather wet
3435 Land rolling,
2635
2326 Land level, wet, poor \(2^{\text {nd }}\) rate, oak
2223 Marsh
1423
1415
11142 nd rate (except marsh), oah
10 Marsh.
211 Mostly marsh, small islands of oak
3334 2nd \({ }^{2}\) rate, oak
2734 .
2728 .
2122 Marsh
522
1516
1015
10
\(3102^{\text {nd }}\) rate (except marsh) . oak
4 Marsh.
3233 Land rolling, \(2^{\text {nd }}\) rate, oak
2833
2128
2021 Mostly marsh
621 Marsh
1621
916
49
45 Land rolling, 2 nd rate (marsh swails), oak
3132 ". " " " (except marsh),

2029
1930
1920
1920
1720
1730
1819
17
8
1

\section*{\(\begin{array}{ll}7 & 18 \\ 1 & 8 \\ 5 & 8\end{array}\)}

\section*{67
56}

Explanatory
bought the farm from a private party
entered the land at the land office.
Number series 3 lines \(=\)
from 7: 8: 89"censuses. \(1^{\text {d }}\) line \(-1850,2^{\text {nd }}=1860,3^{\text {nd }}=1870\) 1st number \(=\) acres of improved land
3th: \(\quad=\) valuation of farm.
\(5^{\text {th }}\). \(\quad\) bu.of wheat raised last year.

\section*{State Land}

DDate - incomplete title
ADate aincomplete title assigned
poate \(=\) patented
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\section*{N O R W AY}

LOCATION.-The town of Norway, organized in 1848, occupies township 4, range 20 east, in Racine County. It is bounded north by Muskego (Waukesha County), east by Raymond, south by Dover, and west by Waterford. Milwaukee, Racine, and Kenosha have been markets from the earliest days.

Surface and Drainage.-Norway is a region of broad, low, timbered uplands, prairies, and considerable lowland areas of peat and swamp. The natural drainage is poor Wind Lake covers parts of sections \(3,4,8,9,10,16\), and 17 , Minister Lake parts of sections 7, 8, 17, and 18, and Long Lake parts of sections 5, 6, and 7. Goose Laké, smaller than the others, is partly in section 33 and partly in 34 . The town is also watered by Muskego Creek and its tributaries.

Types of Soil.-The soil map of Racine County shows about one-third of the town of Norway to be peat, partly re-


Fig. 22. Topographic Map, Town of Norway Reproduced from United States Geological Survey Muskego Quadrangle
claimed. This prevails in the lowlands, although there is some other heavy soil along the streams. Miami clear loam and silt loam predominate on the timbered uplands. On the prairies is found mainly Carrington clear loam, with some

Marshall silt loam and Wabash silt loam. There are very few areas of rough, stony land. \({ }^{1}\)

Timber.-The uplands the surveyor, E. Dwelle, in 1836 found thinly timbered with black, red, burr, and white oak.

Beginnings of Settlement.-The first settlers in the town of Norway arrived before the first land sale was held in 1839. Thomas Drought, an Irishman, who had lived in Canada since 1826, drove a yoke of oxen from Montreal to Wisconsin, leaving Montreal in July, 1838, and arriving in Milwaukee in September. \({ }^{2}\) He bought the northeast quarter of section 12 in the spring of 1839. In 1838 James Ash and George Drought entered tracts on section 1 which were still in their possession in 1860.

In 1839 a group of about forty Norwegians arrived in Milwaukee on their way to the Norwegian settlement on Fox River in Illinois. They were persuaded to stay in Wisconsin and settled near Muskego Lake in Waukesha County. In the fall the floods turned what had seemed to be good prairie land into marshes and swamps. Many of the settlers stayed, but others moved south and west. John Nelson Luraas, one of the important men of the Muskego settlement, bought a farm in Norway and others followed. In the spring of 1840 two Norwegians, Sören Bache and Johannes Johanneson, who had spent the winter in the Fox River settlement in Illinois, visited Norway. Both bought land and decided to stay. Largely on their recommendation, in the fall of 1840 many new Norwegian settlers arrived, including Evan H. Heg, Syvert Ingebretson, Ole Hoganson, Ole Anderson, Helge Thomson, Johannes Skofstad, and others. Evan Heg, Johannes Johanneson, and especially Sören Bache, who was a man of means, bought several tracts of land and sold them in small parcels on favorable terms to the poorer settlers. The colony grew and became the center of Scandinavian immigration to the state. It was always known as the Muskego Settlement. \({ }^{3}\)

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Lands.There apparently was practically no purchase by speculators. The poverty of the early Norwegians seems to have been responsible for the division of the land into very small tracts. The southwest quarter of section 28, bought by Sören Bache in 1841, was divided into twelve different portions and resold from 1849 to 1859. Practically all of the land as resold was divided. Eliphalet Cramer bought several tracts on sections 7, 19, 30, 31, and 32 in 1839, but he was the
\({ }^{1}\) Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, Soil Survey of Kenosha
and Racine Counties, Wisconsin (unpublished).
2 Portrait and Biographical Album of Racine and Kenosha Counties, Wis\({ }^{2}\) Portrait and Biographical Album of Racine and Kenosha Counties, Wis-
consin (Chicago, 1892), 685.
s Rasmus B. Anderson, The First Chapter of Noreegian Immigration, 18211840 (Madison, 1895), 266ff.
only even moderately large purchaser aside from the more well-to-do Norwegians, like Sören Bache, who bought to resell in small amounts on liberal terms to their less fortunate countrymen. A continuous body of swamp land lying south and southeast of Wind Lake, of which there was aggregating about 2300 acres (in sections 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 22, 23, and 24 ), remained unsold until after 1860. The first entries were on sections \(1,5,6,7,12,13,18,19,20,24\), and 25 , on upland prairie and upland timbered Miami soils, the best land in the town.

\(\square\) Carrington silt loam, Carrington silty clay loam-dark colored, upland, prairie soils.
Clyde silt loam, Clyde silty clay loam, Maumee (Clyde) silt loam,
Maumee silty clay loam, Maumee fine sandy loam, Newton (Clyde) silt loam, Newton loamy fine sand-low, poorly drained, mineral
soils.

Miami silt loam, Miami silty clay loam, Bellefontaine (Miami) loam, Bellefontaine silt loam, Bellefontaine fine sandy loam, Superior fine
land soils.
Plainfield fine sand-light colored, upland, timbered, sandy soil.


Fox loam, Fox silt loam-light colored, timbered, upland solls ccupying outwash plains or terraces.

\section*{Peat.}

Fig. 23. Soll Map, Town of Norway
Prepared from map made by the Soils Division, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey

Progress of Farm Making.-According to the census of 1850, Norway at that time had 93 farms covering 2471 acres of improved land and 6971 acres unimproved. Although practically all but the swamp land had been entered before the end of the forties, much land was still in the hands of well-todo Norwegians and was not made into farms until it was sold, late in the forties and in the fifties, to settlers as they were able to take it over. In 1860 the town had 115 farms, but the total farm acreage was still small-only 13,144 acres. The improved area, however, had increased from 2471 to 12,250 acres, or 106 acres improved on the average farm of 113 acres. Fifty farms had over 100 improved acres at this period. One farm had 287 acres cleared, one had 220 acres, and 6 had 200 acres of improved land. Ten years later the number of farms was about the same, but the improved area had increased 2624 acres. At this time 80 farms or 70 per cent of the total number had over 100 acres improved, the largest area being 450 acres; one other farm had 380 acres and 17 had over 200 acres improved. In 1880 the number of farms was 156 and the total improved area 21,499 ; the unimproved acreage was 4248 acres, the average being 137 and 27 acres respectively. This put Norway ahead of all the other towns compared in average number of improved acres per farm, in the census periods 1860 and 1880. In 1870 it had been exceeded in this item only by New Glarus. By 1895 Norway had dropped sharply to 8849 acres of improved land, and in 1905 it had only 11,610 acres. Its average of improved acreage had decreased also, to 71 acres in the average farm of 122 acres.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-The classification for the different census periods, omitting 1850, is as follows: In 1860 and 1870 there were no farms under 20 acres. In 1880 there were 15 small farms. In 1860 there were 14 farms between 20 and 49 acres, 35 between 50 and 99 acres, 54 from 100 to 174 acres, and 12 between 175 and 499 acres. In 1870 there were 7 farms between 20 and 49 acres, 25 between 50 and 99,57 between 100 and 174, and 24 between 175 and 499 acres. Ten years later there were 8 farms of 20 to 49 acres, 23 of 50 to 99 , and 43 from 100 to 174 acres. The farms of 175 to 499 acres numbered 65 , and 2 overran that limit.

General Productions.-In 1849 Norway produced 9637 bushels of wheat, an average of 103 bushels per farm. In 1859 it produced 19,726 bushels. At this time Norway ranked fifteenth in total production and thirteenth in average per farm. The highest individual records for this period were 360 bushels on 120 cleared acres, raised on section 34 by C. Schneider, and 300 bushels raised by Alexander Anderson on section 36, on 45 acres of cleared land. The 1870 census records an aggregate of 32,147 bushels and an average of 284 bushels. By 1879 this had fallen to 23,124 bushels. In 1884 the acreage was about the same as in 1879 and


Fig. 24. Town of Norway, 1915 After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company
the total production 5322 bushels greater. In 1894, however, the yield had fallen to 3970 bushels and in 1904 to 1938 bushels.

In the amount of corn raised Norway stood nineteenth in total production in 1859, with 2290 bushels and an even lower average per farm yield than in 1849. In 1869 sixteen towns had a higher aggregate and thirteen a higher average per farm. In 1879 Norway stood still lower on the list in average production per farm, and in almost the same ratio for total production. At this period it ranked low also in total number and average per farm of swine, cattle, milch cows, and in butter production. In 1860 and 1870 Norway had ranked second in average number of cows per farm. In butter production it rose from seventh place in 1860 to second in 1870. In 1895 the number of milch cows had increased to 1346 with a butter production of 147,320 pounds. Swine had dropped to 702. Sheep, on the other hand, from none re corded in 1880 now amounted to 1013 with a wool production of 5421 pounds, or 5.3 pounds per sheep. In 1895, 33,578 bushels of corn was produced, and 84,992 bushels of oats.

Value of Productions.-The census of 1870 gives the value of all farm productions in the town as \(\$ 104,841\), which is equivalent to \(\$ 928\) per farm. In 1879 the average per farm had fallen to \(\$ 483\). Only eight towns had a lower average than this. At the first period there were 35 incomes of \(\$ 1000\) or over, the largest being \(\$ 3007\), made out of wheat, corn, and livestock. There were 50 incomes between \(\$ 600\) and
\(\$ 999,27\) between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599\), and one between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399\). No incomes fell under \(\$ 200\). In 1879 the largest income was \(\$ 2000\) and there were 21 others of \(\$ 1000\) or over. There were 37 of the second class ( \(\$ 600\) to \(\$ 999\) ), 27 of the third class ( \(\$ 400\) to \(\$ 599\) ), and 36 of the fourth class ( \(\$ 200\) to \(\$ 399\). Twenty-four incomes fell below \(\$ 200\). Ten farms reported no incomes.

Twenty-five years later the average farm income had almost doubled, and the dairy production per farm alone was almost as high as the average farm income had been in 1879 . Livestock production other than dairy cattle amounted to \(\$ 315\) per farm. In 1919 the average income was \(\$ 2158\). The number of cows had increased from 1583 to 1908, the value of dairy productions from \(\$ 400\) to \(\$ 1171\), of crops from \(\$ 148\) to \(\$ 174\). Livestock products other than dairying amounted to \(\$ 813\). Allowing for the difference in value of money, there was probably not much change between agricultural conditions in Norway in 1904 and in 1919, but 1904 had seen great improvement over the depression of 1879. Compared, however, with Pleasant Springs, where tobacco on excellent soil brought real wealth to its Norwegian settlers, Norway, settled at about the same time and by the same type of people, was unable on its poorer soil to carry on either dairying or livestock raising with complete success.

Manufactures.-Norway has always been an agricultural town and dependent on neighboring towns for mills and factories. The plat book of 1887 shows a cheese factory and a store on section 25 , and a blacksmith shop on section 34 .

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches. There are no villages in the town, but the farm of Evan Heg was early used as a trading post for supplies and mail. The first Scandinavian newspaper in the country was published there in 1847. It was called the Nord Lyset (Northern Light) and was edited by J. D. Reymert. \({ }^{*}\)

In 1845 a \(\log\) church was built by the Norwegian Lutherans. \({ }^{5}\) The plat book of 1887 shows Norwegian Lutheran churches on sections 8,18 , and 24, and a Union Methodist Episcopal church on section 1. The town plat of the same date shows schools on sections \(1,5,18,29\), and 35 .
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Yata} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Totas} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Ambrican} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Forbiow} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Faniurs} \\
\hline & & Wis-
consin & \({ }_{\text {Other }}^{\substack{\text { States }}}\) & Total & Eng- & \({ }_{\text {Ger- }}^{\text {many }}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ire- } \\
& \text { land }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Scan- } \\
\text { dina- } \\
\text { yia }
\end{gathered}
\] & Other & Total & Amer- & For- & al \\
\hline 1850 & \({ }^{751}\) & \({ }^{133}\) & 28 & 161 & & 69 & \({ }^{71}\) & 404 & 38 & 590 & \({ }^{6}\) & 140 & \\
\hline 1860
1870 & -961 & \({ }_{439}^{333} 4\) & \({ }_{21}^{44}\) & \({ }_{460}^{377}\) & \({ }^{18}\) & \({ }_{137}^{114}\) & \({ }_{21}^{33}\) & 388 & \({ }_{16}^{31}\) & 584 & 9 & 177 & 186
189 \\
\hline 1885 & \({ }_{990}\) & & & 580 & 7 & 113 & 18 & 270 & 2 & \({ }_{410}\) & 9 & 198 & \({ }_{207}^{108}\) \\
\hline 1895 & \({ }^{968}\) & & & \({ }^{660}\) & 3 & \({ }^{90}\) & 8 & & 4 & \({ }^{308}\) & 50 & \({ }^{155}\) & \({ }^{205}\) \\
\hline \({ }_{1905}^{1905}\) & \({ }_{8}^{981}\) & \({ }_{7}^{714}\) & \({ }_{30}^{26}\) & \({ }_{732}^{740}\) & 1 & \begin{tabular}{|l}
76 \\
48
\end{tabular} & 4 & 148 & \({ }_{27}^{13}\) & \({ }^{241}\) & \({ }_{84}^{84}\) & 115 & \({ }^{19}\) \\
\hline 1920 & 888 & & 30 & & 1 & \({ }^{43}\) & & & \({ }^{27}\) & \({ }^{156}\) & \({ }^{136}\) & 70 & \({ }^{200}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
- A. O. Barton, "The Beginnings of the Norwegian Press in America," in Wis. Hist. Soc. Proceedings, 1916, 186-212. Note illustrations of houses in the Muskego Settlement.

Population Changes.-Beginning with the Norwegian immigration of 1840, settlers poured in and by 1850 the town had a total population of 751, of whom 590 were foreign born. Of these foreigners, 404 were Norwegians, 69 Germans, 71 Irish, 19 Canadians, 17 Scotch, 8 English, and 2 Swiss. Of the Americans only 28 were from states other than Wisconsin.

The percentage of foreign born of the total population dropped from 78 per cent in 1850 to 60 per cent in 1860, and to 56 per cent in 1870. By 1885 it had dropped another 10 per cent; in the next ten years it dropped again, and in 1920 it was 17 per cent of the total. The overwhelmingly foreign character of the population is shown in the high proportion of
foreign born heads of families, who numbered 140 to 6 American born in 1850, 177 to 9 American born in 1860, 177 to 12 in 1870, and 198 to 9 in 1885. The proportions remained high in the census periods up to 1920, when the foreign born heads of families numbered only 70 to 136 American born.
M. A. K.

\title{
ORION ~RICHLAND COUNTY \\ Surreyed in 1882 \\ by Alvin Burt
}


\section*{O R I O N}

LOCATION.-The town of Orion occupies township 9, range 1 east (together with a fraction of township 8, same range), in Richland County, including the east tier of sections, which formerly constituted a part of Buena Vista. It is bounded north by Richland, east by Buena Vista, south by Pulaski (in Iowa County, which is separated from Orion by the Wisconsin River), and west by Eagle. Its easternmost corner is opposite Avoca, its westernmost opposite Muscoda, which because of the bridge at that point has been the principal market for the southern part of the town. Richland Center lies three miles north of the north boundary. The railroad from Lone Rock to Richland Center, up the valley of Pine River, passes through the northeast corner of the town, while the main line of the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railroad, Prairie du Chien division, is reached at Muscoda and at Lone Rock.

Surface and Drainage.-Orion is a hill town (fig. 7). Barring a small area of lowland along the Wisconsin in the southwestern part, the equivalent of three or four sections of lowland in the valleys of Ash Creek and Pine River in the northeastern part, and that portion of Pine River valley included in the eastern tier of sections, the surface is practically all upland, with only small, narrow, and steep-sided ravines or valleys here and there. There are no considerable rivers in the town, and the land, geographically, forms a promontory jutting down to the Wisconsin between the valleys of Pine River on the east and Eagle Creek on the west. Indian Creek, which enters the Wisconsin in fractional section 31, rises on the line between sections 21 and 20 , its trench forming part of the line of communication across the plateau and by way of Ash Creek with upper Pine River valley. This is one road to Richland Center. In sections 33 to 36 the Wisconsin River has worn its course against the hills, making a steep escarpment along which has been cut the road to Richland City and Lone Rock. By way of Eagle Creek and Hoosier Hollow, Orion has a way out toward the west and north.

Types of Sorl.-No soil survey of Richland County having been published to date, one can classify the soils of Orion only by their similarity to those of Iowa County. The southwestern, low lying portion is a sandy loam or loamy sand, the slopes from the valleys to the foothills are probably of Lintonia silt loam, and the ridges Knox silt loam. The valleys being extremely narrow, short (except Ash Creek and Pine River valleys), and few in number, the quantity of land described as alluvium (Miami silt loam) would be comparatively small. The surveyor, Alvin Burt, when in 1842 he prepared the government plat of township 9, range 1 east,
found practically no first-rate land. Most of it was described as second-rate, and some of it as third-rate. The surveyor's judgment, however, is not conclusive as to the quality of the soil, being influenced a good deal by the character of the surface-whether rough, stony, or otherwise undesirable for purposes of cultivation. Some parts of the Ash Creek valley were described as wet, or swampy. On the whole, the town must be classed as relatively poor in its farming lands.

Timber.-Like Eagle, the town of Orion was originally heavily wooded with several kinds of oak, ash, elm, maple, lynn, aspen, and undergrowth chiefly of hazel. Not a single section line was described as running through open land. The settlers who took lands in Orion had before them a heavy program of clearing, before their farms were made.

Beginnings of Settlement.-A glance at the plat shows that the earliest entries in the town by persons still retaining title in 1860 were those of William Dooley, section 32, and Daniel Mainwaring, section 33-both dating from 1849; John H. Segrist, section 3, 1848; J. H. Scheuerman, section 3, 1849; David Mayfield and Peter Joerris, section 3, 1849; F. Scheuerman, section 9, 1848; and Charles Neefe (Kneefe), section 15, 1848. All except the first two of the above purchases were in the several branches of Ash Creek valley. In fact, all of section 10 and adjacent parts of 9 , where the two branches of Ash Creek unite, giving a greater breadth of valley land than elsewhere, were entered in 1848 and 1849, except two or three small tracts which went in 1850. From the land ownership cards we learn that a number of other pieces scattered over the town were taken in 1849, and two tracts-in sections 31 and 32 -were purchased as early as 1846 .

The last-named purchase represents the actual beginning of settlement. For the land was entered by Thomas Matthews, who with Captain John R. Smith, his father-in-law, crossed over into Richland County from Muscoda in the fall of 1842 , and erected the first \(\log\) house in the town. Later these men purchased the land settled upon, and laid out the village of Orion. \({ }^{1}\) Matthews operated a ferry between Orion and Muscoda, but in the first months of their settlement the two men constructed the dam for Parish's mill on Eagle Creek-the later Rodolf's mill. Smith was a native of Kentucky, Matthews of Tennessee. Another Kentuckian, R. J. Darnall, arrived in 1843, and in 1846 came William Thompson of Kentucky and William Matthews of Illinois. The former settled at first in 14 and 15, moving later to section 2, where (in the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter) he built a sawmill, probably in 1849 or 1850. The Mayfield

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{1}\) History of Crawford and Richland Counties, Wisconsin (Springfeld, Ill.,
, 1130 . is History
1884), 1130 .
}
brothers, David and Green-Tennesseeans-came in 1847, two Joslyns-Vermonters-came in 1847 and 1848, and in the latter year came also the first German settlers-Henry Segrist, and Frederick and J. H. Scheuerman, who bought land in sections 3,2 , and 9 . The land where Lawe's ferry was afterwards built, on fractional section 34, was entered in 1849 by Henry Koop, and sold to the Lawes in 1855. James Lawe's house was an important place on the river bank for many years. The Mainwarings came in 1849 from Wales; Levi Houts of Indiana, Charles Kneefe of Germany, Alanson Hurd of New York, and Reason Barnes came in 1849. William Dooley, a native of Kentucky, came to Richland County in 1845 to work in Coles's lumber mill at Rock bridge, Pine River valley, where pine lumber was made for delivery down the Mississippi. From there he came to Orion, entered land in 1849, and after three years settled on his tract and began farming.

Thus it is seen that the earliest settlements were in the northern part of the town, in Ash Creek valley (or the west branch of Pine River and in Pine River valley itself), where soil and timber were good, and along Wisconsin River, the great artery of communication. The few settlers were engaged for some years in woods work, or in occupations connected with transportation, making farming operations subsidiary. In fact, there was little farming done until after the completion of the railway to Muscoda, in 1856, and the larger portion of the land of the town was entered in the years 1854 to 1856

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Land.-The chief obstacle to the utilization of the lands in this town was found in the surface characteristics of the region. It was in large part so rough and complex in topography as to discourage settlement for agricultural purposes. One area, the valley of Ash Creek, provided an opportunity for a limited number of contiguous farms, and Pine River valley was accessible. Aside from these there were favorable small tracts, large enough for a farm or two in a place, but no chance for a continuous body of settlement. The early land entries, scattered widely over the town, are markers to show where the best tracts lay. No town site speculations appear to have been tried, apart from the plat of Orion (at first called Richmond), which was purchased in 1846. Also, so far as the ownership cards reveal the facts, no mill site speculations occurred. Speculators, however, bought up a number of tracts of farm land. Among them were Hazen Cheney, Robert C. Field, Cyrus Woodman and C. C. Washburn, Josiah Noonan, Albert C. Daley, Chauncey Abbott and Julius T. Clark, John B. Duryea, Hamilton H. Gray, Parley Eaton, and Charles G Rodolf.

Progress of Farm Making.-In 1860, about 200 subdivisions of Orion land remained in possession of those who entered them at the United States land office, while over 300 subdivisions had already changed hands. A large proportion of the transfers represent the sales by speculators to actual farmers, of unimproved land. It is probably safe to say that most of the land was in the hands of those who bought it for the purpose of making farms. But progress in farm making was as yet limited. Many tracts were still without clearings of any extent, and 80 acres was the largest amount under cultivation on any farm. This was in Ash Creek valley, on the farm of a German settler of \(1848 .{ }^{2}\) One farm had 75 acres improved, one 70, one 63, and another 60. These five were all that had above 50 acres under cultivation. On the other hand, 20 or 25 acres, and even less, was a common record of improved land. Farming, in fact, was merely well begun. The number of farms was only 42 , the total amount of improved land 1473 acres, and there was a total of 3772 acres unimproved. That means, the total of land within the farms was hardly more than a fourth of the area of the town. In 1870 the number of farms was 83, and of improved acres 2472 , while the acreage in the farms was 9319 . Ten years later there were 102 farms embracing 12,751 acres, of which 5202 or an average of 51 acres per farm was improved. As in the case of some other neighbor towns-Eagle, Muscoda, Castle Rock-the quantity of improved land grew less rather than more, for some years after 1880. In 1885, according to the state census, it was 4975 acres; in 1895, 4355. The census of 1905 seems to show a decided upward curve. At that time the farms numbered 131, the total acreage 20,474 , and the amount of improved land 9413 acres. But the explanation is found in a change of boundaries, which gave to Orion the easternmost range of sections in township 9 , which sections lay mostly in the Pine River valley-a well cultivated farming area.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-According to the eighth census (1860) there were in Orion no farms of less than 20 acres, and only 5 of 20 to 49 acres. The third class, 50 to 99 acres, was represented by 12 farms, and the fourth, 100 to 174 acres, by 19 . There were 6 over 175 acres in area, but none over 500 . In 1870 there was 1 farm under 20 acres, and 18 of 20 to 49 acres. The largest number was in class three, 50 to 99 acres - 27 farms; 23 were in the class between 100 and 174 , and 14 between 175 and 500 acres. No farm overran the 500 -acre limit. Ten years later there were 2 under 20 acres, and 1 over 500 acres. There were 16 between 20 and 49 acres, 33 between 50 and 99 acres, 31 between 100 and 174, and 19 between 175 and 500. Thus the tendency was toward the good-sized and large farms.

Considered from the standpoint of their cultivated land, however, even the largest gross areas were not very large farms. In 1870 a large majority ( 56 farms) had less than
\({ }^{2}\) Charles Kneefe.

40 acres of cultivated land each, while no farm had more than 100 acres cultivated and only 27 had between 40 and 100 acres. In 1880 there were 52 farms with less than 40 acres of tillable, while 38 had between 40 and 100 acres, and 12 over 100 acres. When we exclude the waste land, the farms fall into the classes of small and fair-sized farms.

General Productions.-The wheat production recorded in 1870, amounting to only 73 bushels per farm, is evidence that agriculture was in an undeveloped condition at that time, taking the town as a whole, although the smallness of the crops compared with the acreage of improved land suggests that the crop of 1869 was not a good crop. Still, the average production of corn was better ( 208 bushels), and the town also produced a little wool- 22 pounds per farm on the average,-and some butter- 151 pounds. The total exhibit of productions, however, seems meager. In 1879 the wheat crop averaged 109 bushels per farm, corn 350, and oats 149. There were 12 head of swine per farm, which doubtless, with the corn crop, represent the major money income. Butter amounted to only 213 pounds per farm, and there was almost no cheese or milk sold. Two and a half cows and 3.8 other cattle, 9.1 sheep, and 2.6 horses made up the farm livestock equipment. Nothing in all this proclaims agricultural prosperity. Rather, it is evidence that farm families gained, on the average, a very moderate support from their farming operations.

The next five years brought little change in these conditions. Dairying on the coöperative principle was tardier there than in some of the neighboring towns of Richland and Grant counties. Only 1000 pounds of cheese was recorded for 1884. The butter record was 35,175 pounds as against 21,812 in 1879, showing some advance in home dairying. Wheat had dropped to 8055 bushels from 11,125 bushels, while corn had decreased from 35,766 to 35,233 -that is, it had not increased. Oats had increased by 7000 bushels, and there had been a big jump in hay production. This indicates more attention to livestock, and is a preparation for development along the dairying lines already in successful operation elsewhere. The next state census, 1895, assigns to the town 33,774 pounds of cheese and 46,200 pounds of butter, which shows that coöperative dairying had begun. Not only corn and oats, but wheat also, had advanced, and the aggregate of all descriptions of livestock had increased perceptibly.

As indicated above, the boundaries of the town were changed prior to 1905. It is very interesting to note how great a difference in the crop aggregates seems due to the inclusion of an additional six sections of land located in the favorable farming area of Pine River valley. The corn crop was raised to 60,000 bushels, the oats crop to 34,600 ; there were 8476 bushels of barley and 4064 of rye. Hay advanced to 3951 tons, and in harmony therewith the livestock figures were enormously increased. There is no better commentary on the relative meagerness of Orion's earlier agricultural
productions than this result of a 20 per cent increase in her area.

Special Productions.-The only special productions which the census makes noticeable were a little honey, some maple sugar and molasses, a few acres of hops, and a small amount of tobacco. The town made forest products to a considerable extent. There is reason to think that most of the fuel for Hamilton's lead smelting furnace at Muscoda, in the late thirties and early forties, was brought across the river from this town. \({ }^{3}\) River steamers had wood yards supplied by Orion men. Later, the demand for saw logs, stave timber, and hoop poles was partly met by the settlers of Orion, many of whom were practiced woodsmen.

In 1879 nearly all farms in the town made forest products to some extent, and several made such products to the value of \(\$ 300\) or \(\$ 400\). In one case, where a farmer's total income was \(\$ 479\), his forest products were listed at \(\$ 425\). Much of the wood taken out in clearing land was sold for cordwood.

Value of Productions.-In 1879, according to the tenth census, this town's total agricultural productions amounted to \(\$ 48,282\), or an average per farm of \(\$ 473\). Seven towns in our list of twenty-three stood lower, the rest higher. From the previous census we learn that in 1869 there were 31 incomes under \(\$ 200,24\) between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399,13\) between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599,12\) between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999\), and 3 over \(\$ 1000\). Ten years later there were 22 in the third and fourth classes, and 9 in the fifth. This shows that exactly one-half of the farms were producing less than \(\$ 400\). The hopeful element in the situation was the 9 generous incomes of \(\$ 1000\) or more. One of these amounted to \(\$ 2085\), another to \(\$ 1825\), and a third to \(\$ 1683\). All were made from the regular cereal crops, from hogs, cattle, and butter.

In 1904 the average farm income in Orion amounted to \(\$ 705\) and in 1919 to \(\$ 2571\). The number of cows had increased from 263 in 1880 to 1369 in 1905 (this increase due largely to the increased area of good farming land through the change of boundaries). Dairy productions were valued at an average of \(\$ 330\) per farm at this period, and other livestock productions at \(\$ 308\). By 1919 there were 1999 cows in the town; the average dairy production amounted to \(\$ 1650\) and other livestock production to \(\$ 895\). The dairy industry had developed considerably. Crop incomes amounted to \(\$ 67\) in 1904 and \(\$ 26\) in 1919.

Manufactures.-Orion has always been a farming town, save that, on account of its heavily wooded character, woods work was necessarily an activity antecedent to farming. The sawmill already mentioned, which was built by William Thompson in section 2, must have been a boon to settlers as a means of getting their timber sawed into lumber, though tradition describes it as a very small and inefficient mill. A grain grinding mill established later at the same water power
\({ }^{\text {s }}\) 'Charles Stephenson's letters, in collection of Woodman Papers in Wisconsin Historical Library.


Fig. 25. Town of Orion, 1915
After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company
was likewise a small affair. Later, a wool-carding mill was built there, and that filled a widely felt need. Farmers nearly all kept a few sheep. They took their wool to Ash Creek to have it carded for use in making bedding, or in preparation for household spinning, knitting, and to a small extent weaving. It is known that farmers twenty miles distant in Blue River valley patronized the carding mill on Ash Creek.

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches. Orion, in section 31, and Twin Bluffs, on the railroad in section 12, are the only villages this town has had. Orion was known by the name of Richmond, until the post office was established in 1851, when the name Orion was substituted. As already stated, the village was begun by John R. Smith and Thomas Matthews, who built the first log house in Orion
in 1842, and laid out the village after making their land entry in 1846. These first settlers established in 1842 the ferry between Muscoda and Richmond, for the sake of accommodating the hunters who desired to cross the river at that point. \({ }^{4}\) The first ferry was hardly useful for general purposes, but it was soon improved, and the ferrying business was conducted by Matthews-who bought out his partner-till the opening of the Muscoda bridge about 1870. Prior to the establishment of the Orion post office, mail for the Orion settlement was received through Muscoda. For a short time Richmond was the county seat of Richland County. But the establishment of Richland Center, in the Pine River valley, proved the end of its hopes of being the permanent capital of the county. The Orion post office was discontinued about thirty years ago. Twin Bluffs, in the northeastern corner of the town, being a station on the railway, has become an important village, with stores, post office, and high school.

Schools have usually numbered four, all of the one-room, one-teacher type. By \(1874^{5}\) there was a school in section 32 the Dooley school-one in the northwest quarter of section 20, another in section 8, and one in section 10. The school at Twin Bluffs is more recent. At that time the town had three churches-a Lutheran or Evangelical church in section 5, a "Christian" church in section 9, and a Methodist church in section 7. The first two were in the valley of Ash Creek (or upper Pine River), the third on the ridge between Ash Creek and Hoosier Hollow in the western part of the town. Preaching was also conducted at the village of Orion during most of that general period, and later there were church services more or less regularly at some of the schoolhouses. The Lutheran church in the northeastern portion of the town represented the German settlement, consisting of a few families who took land there in 1848 and 1849.

Population Changes.-In 1860 Orion had a population of 597, all but 70 of whom were native Americans. There were 85 American families and 21 foreign born families. Aside from the natives of Wisconsin among the heads of families-and these were very few- 19 were natives of Ohio, 15 of Pennsylvania, 7 of Indiana, and 11 of New York.
- History of Crazoford and Richland Counties, 1134
\({ }^{*}\) See Atlas of Richland County, Wisconsin (Madison, 1874), 39.

Virginia, Kentucky, and Illinois each furnished 7; Maryland, Tennessee, and Missouri 3; and Massachusetts, North Carolina, and New Jersey, each 1. Of the foreign born heads of families, Prussia claimed 10, Canada 3, England 3, Ireland 1, and there was 1 each from France, Nassau, Saxony, and Bavaria.

The table shows that the American element continued to predominate, the largest number of foreign born heads of families appearing in 1885, when it stood 51 against 87 American born.

Both the population table, representing conditions at the several census periods, and the several land ownership plats of the town indicate that changes in the original list of families have been relatively few. As in Eagle, the old families have tended to persist, the lands descending to their children. And the persistence of the American type is a marked fact of the social history. Quite as marked is the non-Yankee character of the American element. Like the settlers of the town of Eagle, those in Orion came from the recently forested sections of the country; Ohio, Indiana, and Pennsylvania (probably the western part) supplied the highest numbers, with Virginia, Kentucky, and Illinois adding an important element. It is not remarkable, therefore, that for many years, till the forest was fully subdued and farming became both a more congenial and a more profitable occupation than in the pioneer days, there was always a suggestion of the backwoods in Orion. At present one can find there a number of excellent modern farms and farm homes. The dairy business has improved greatly in recent years, and Orion people seem bent on profiting from the labor which their pioneers bestowed upon the land and the forest.

Orion-Population Statistics
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\section*{PLEASANTSPRINGS}

LiOCATION.-The town of Pleasant Springs, organized in 1848, occupies township 6 north, range 11 east, in the southeastern part of Dane County. It is bounded north by Cottage Grove, east by Christiana, south by Dunkirk, and west by Dunn. The markets are Stoughton, Cambridge, Madison, and other cities and villages in the county.

Surface and Drainage.-The town lies in the glaciated portion of Dane County. Its topography includes areas of undulating to gently rolling prairies. There are also considerable level tracts. The general topography is very different from the rough and hilly country of the west part of the county, which includes the town of Primrose. The natural drainage is also not as good as it is in the west, and there are many marshes. The town is watered in the northwest by Little Door Creek, which passes through section 6, and by the Yahara River, running from Lake Kegonsa on section 20, south through section 33 into the town of Dunkirk. Lake Kegonsa covers parts of five sections in the western part of the town. There are also many small streams and springs. The town is said to have been named for a large spring on section 27 and the abundance of smaller ones in different parts of the town.

Types of Soil.-The map in the soil survey of Dane County shows Miami silt loam, typical phase-a glacial, timbered, upland soil,- and Carrington silt loam, shallow phase, to be the predominating types of soil. Miami silt loam, typical phase, is estimated to be about 80 per cent under cultivation. The remainder is in permanent pasture. It is used for general farming, and for tobacco as a special crop. Practically all of the Carrington silt loam is under cultivation. The percentage of waste land is estimated to be smaller for this type of soil than for any other type in Dane County. General farming is followed and tobacco is an important special crop, yielding from 1200 to 1600 pounds per acre. Corn also does well and yields 60 to 70 bushels per acre. This land frequently sells for from \(\$ 200\) to \(\$ 300\) an acre in the tobacco growing sections. There are also some scattered areas of Clyde silt loam, timbered lowland soil with poor drainage, but excellent for agriculture if drained. Some of the largest crops are produced on this soil. Corn has yielded as high as 80 bushels per acre. Other soils which occur in small and scattered amounts are Clyde fine sandy loam, Carrington fine sandy loam, Fox fine sandy loam, Waukesha silt loam, Miami gravelly sandy loam, Fox silt loam, and some areas of muck and peat. \({ }^{1}\)

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{1}\) Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, Bulletin No. 65 A, Soil Series No. 20, Soil Survey of Dane County, Wisconsin (Madison, 1917).
}
mineral soils.

Miami silt loam-light colored, glaciated, timbered, upland soil.

Miami gravelly loam-light colored, timbered, morainic soil.

Fox silt loam, Fox fine sandy loam-light colored, timbered, upland soils occupying outwash plains or terraces.
\(\square\) Muck or peat.
Fig. 26. Soll Map, Town of Pleasant Springs Prepared from map made by the Soils Division, Wisconsin Geological and
Natural History Survey

Timber.-The upland timbered soils, which cover large areas in the central, northwest, and east parts of the town and are found also in the south central sections, the surveyor, Orin Miller, in 1833 found thinly timbered with burr and yellow oak, hickory, elm, and maple. There was a good deal of hazel undergrowth. Between sections 19 and 20 the surveyor noted a beautiful sugar grove. A few lines were described as running through prairie, and there was at least one "impassable swamp," evidently untimbered. On the whole, the lands of this town were pleasantly open, with timber enough for farm needs in most places.

Beginnings of Settlement.-The first settler in Pleasant Springs, according to local histories, was Abel Rasdell, a trader, who had a trading post near Lake Kegonsa in 1835.' Land office records, however, fail to indicate that he ever entered land. The earliest land entries were in 1835, 1830, and 1837, by speculators. The next entries were made in 1842 by H. Segurdsen on section 35, and in 1843 by Andrew Neilson and Stephen Knutson on section 1, R. McComb on section 2, K. Kittelson, H. Aslakson, and R. Biornson on section 3, R. McComb and K. Kittelson on section 10, A. Anderson on section 12, and E. Nerisen, H. Laurantzen, and K. Kelliksen on section 22. Settlers began to come in greater numbers in 1844. The largest influx, however, occurred in 1847 and 1848. By 1852 practically all of the land had been entered, and by 1860 most of it was in farms.

As the names of the entrants indicate, there was from the beginning a Norwegian element in Pleasant Springs. Norwegians had come to the United States in increasing numbers after the first organized group of 1836, and the Koshkonong settlement (named after Koshkonong Creek) in southeastern Dane County, of which the Norwegians in Pleasant Springs were a part, was the sixth settlement in America and the third in Wisconsin. The first Norwegians settled here in 1840, although others had probably visited the region the year before. Among the first settlers was the father of Professor R. B. Anderson. \({ }^{3}\) The settlement covered the towns of Albion, Christiana, and Deerfield, and spread east into Jefferson County. From Deerfield it spread into Dunkirk and Pleasant Springs in Dane County, and from Pleasant Springs into Cottage Grove. A large part of the prosperity of Pleasant Springs, especially in tobacco culture, is due to these hard-working Norwegians.

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Land.-The earliest land entries in the town were along the shore of Lake Kegonsa, and according to the soil map included some marsh and peat. They also included some of the best land in the town. These entries were in the names of Isaac Bronson and J. Hathaway, Jr. (surveyors), and F. R. Tillon, on sections 19, 20, 29, and 30. In 1836 Lucius Lyon, a surveyor (afterwards senator from Michigan), entered the southwest quarter of section 13, rich upland prairie; the south half of section 18, peat, marsh, and some upland timbered soil; the east half of section 20 , largely peat and marsh; the east half of the northwest quarter of section 20 , also peat and marsh; the west half of section 21, upland timbered soil; the east half of section 23 , the west half of section 24 , the east half of section 29 , the east half of the southwest quarter of section 29 , and

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{2}\) Wis. Hist. Colls., iv, 344.
\({ }^{\bullet}\) Rasmus B. Anderson, First Chapter of Norwegian Immigration, 320
}
all of sections 31 and 32 -all of these being mainly rich upland prairie, with some upland timbered soil on section 32 and areas of lowland timbered soil on section 29. A. H. Nichols entered the southeast quarter of section 28 , lowland timbered soil and marsh, in 1836. In 1837 Edward Everett entered all of section 26 and the east half of section 27 , both tracts excellent prairie and timbered soils. The earliest entries of the actual settlers were scattered over the prairie and timbered portions of the town.

Progress of Farm Making.-In 1860 Pleasant Springs had more than three-fourths of its entire area in farms, but its improved acreage was slightly less than its unimproved. Seventeen farms, however, had over 100 acres improved land, the maximum being 400 acres; one other farm had 300 acres improved, one had 220, three had 200, and nine had between 150 and 200 acres improved. In 1870 the average number of improved acres per farm and the total number of improved acres had increased slightly. (Due probably to an error, the census for this period reports a decrease of almost 2000 acres in total farm acreage.) In the next ten years the improved acreage increased over 3500 acres, and the total acreage in farms covered practically the entire area of the town. The improved acreage decreased slightly once more between 1880 and 1885, but the census of 1895 reported 16,656 acres and that of \(1905,21,147\) acres improved. Only two towns, Mount Pleasant and Highland, had a higher total of improved acreage in 1905. The average number of improved acres per farm in 1905 for Pleasant Springs was 109 as against 65 acres improved in 1860. The sale from the town, in 1879, of \(\$ 17,206\) of forest products may mean that railway ties or wagon timbers were being harvested from the wood lots, not that clearing was in progress.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-The classes of farms with respect to area stood as follows during the three census periods: In 1860 no farms had less than 20 acres, 12 had between 20 and 49 acres, 33 between 50 and 99 acres, 71 between 100 and 174 acres, and 29 between 175 and 499 acres. In 1870 there were 2 farms under 20 acres, 7 between 20 and 49 acres, 36 between 50 and 99 acres, 60 between 100 and 174 acres, 34 between 175 and 499 acres, and 2 over 500 acres. In 1880 there were 7 small-sized farms under 20 acres, 15 between 20 and 49, 45 between 50 and 99,78 between 100 and 174, and 33 between 175 and 499 acres. No farms had more than 500 acres in this period. In each period the majority of the farms were of the moderate sizes-from 50 to 99 acres and from 100 to 174 acres. The number of largesized farms remained about the same, but the very small farms increased slightly in number. In 1905 the averagesized farm in Pleasant Springs, a tobacco producing town, was 123 acres; while in Primrose, a dairy town, also in Dane County, it was 170 acres.

General Productions.-In 1859, according to the census of 1860, Pleasant Springs produced 65,616 bushels of
wheat, which is 452 bushels per farm on the average-the largest total and also the largest average per farm wheat production of any of the towns studied. High individual records were 1440 bushels on 120 acres improved land on the farm of Zina Gilbert, section 24, and 1140 bushels raised by Lars Hoverson on 95 cleared acres on section 27. The 1870 census assigns the town a production of 82,698 bushels or 586 bushels per farm. This placed Pleasant Springs second among the towns as a wheat producer. Highland grew a larger aggregate amount, Bangor a higher average per farm. Individual records for this period were 2100 bushels raised by John Atkinson on 400 cleared acres, section 32; 2000 bushels by Knut Aslakson, Sr., on 200 acres, section 14; and other records of 1400 bushels, 1300 bushels, and several of 1000 bushels. Ten years later only 7 of the towns produced less per farm. In 1884 Pleasant Springs produced 13,790 bushels of wheat on 878 acres. The area was a little over a third of the area in 1879, and the product 8429 bushels less. The yield per acre was somewhat larger. In 1894 the acreage and yield were 373 acres and 9149 bushels, and in 1904 only 936 bushels of wheat was grown on 64 acres.

Pleasant Springs in 1859 stood twelfth in total amount of corn produced, with an aggregate of 12,692 bushels, an average of 87 bushels per farm. In 1869, 9 towns had a higher total production and 6 a higher average per farm. In 1879 only 4 towns had a greater average per farm and only 4 produced more than the 97,305 bushels, which the census for that period credits to Pleasant Springs. In this same period only 2 towns exceeded Pleasant Springs in number of swine, 4 in number of sheep, 10 in clip per sheep, 8 in number of milch cows, 10 in number of other cattle. In the next twentyfive years tobacco as a special crop, rather than dairying or general farming, became the foundation of the town's continued agricultural prosperity.

Special Productions.-Dane County has the largest tobacco production of any county in the state. The prairie soils of the southeastern towns seem to be most favorable for tobacco culture, and there it has been most extensively grown. Among these southeastern towns Pleasant Springs has the largest total production. In 1879 its output amounted to 859,888 pounds. In 1884 it amounted to \(1,570,000\) pounds valued at \(\$ 157,000\), and in 1904 to \(1,711,925\) pounds valued at \(\$ 112,633\). In 1919 the total production for Dane County was \(25,451,825\) pounds valued at \(\$ 5,090,365 .{ }^{4}\) Originally introduced into the county in the fifties by settlers from Ohio, it has been taken over almost entirely by the Norwegians from the Koshkonong settlement in eastern Dane County. They rented or bought small pieces of land on time, and with hard work soon owned moderate-sized farms. The tobacco grown in Dane County is chiefly Comstock's Spanish variety, of which about 80 per cent is sold as binder tobacco and the rest as filler.
\({ }^{\text {- Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Bulletinn No. 28, Wisconsin Agri- }}\) cultural Statistics for 1919, Annual Crop and Live Stock Revievo.

Ohio men were also responsible for the introduction of sheep into Dane County, and although Pleasant Springs never had as large a number as some of the towns in other counties that specialized in sheep, it had a fairly large number and an increased wool production after 1870. In 1860 there were only 697 sheep in the town, an average of 4 per farm, with a wool production of 15 pounds. This number had in creased by 1870 to an average of 14.5 sheep and 47 pounds, and in 1880 the figures were 14.1 and 78. Although the production per sheep had fallen to a little less than 4 pounds in 1870, it went up to almost 6 pounds in 1880. In 1885 the number of sheep had fallen to almost half the number of five years before, but the production had gone up to an average of 6 pounds. In the next ten years the industry practically disappeared.


Fig. 27. Town of Pleasant Springs, 1915 After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company

Value of Productions.-In 1869 the value of all farm productions in the town was \(\$ 179,575\), an average of \(\$ 1273\) per farm and, as only 124 farms reported incomes, an even higher average of \(\$ 1448\) for the number reporting. Ten years later the value of all productions was \(\$ 231,650\) and the average per farm \(\$ 1301\), the highest found in all the towns compared. There were no incomes under \(\$ 200\) in 1869, whereas in 1879, 8 fell in this group. At the first period there were 95 incomes of \(\$ 1000\) or over, the largest being \(\$ 5288 ; 2\) others were between \(\$ 3000\) and \(\$ 3999\), and the others between \(\$ 1000\) and \(\$ 2999 ; 23\) were between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999\), 4 between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599\), and 2 between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399\). Of all the incomes reported in 1869, 76.6 per cent were \(\$ 1000\)
or over. In 1879 the largest income was \(\$ 6300\), and there were 112 others of \(\$ 1000\) or more. There were 32 of the second class ( \(\$ 600\) to \(\$ 999\) ), 14 of the third class ( \(\$ 400\) to \(\$ 599\) ), and 11 of the fourth class ( \(\$ 200\) to \(\$ 399\) ).

In 1904 the average farm income in Pleasant Springs amounted to \(\$ 1161\). Of this, \(\$ 319\) was the value of dairy productions, \(\$ 230\) of livestock other than dairy cattle, \(\$ 577\) of tobacco, \(\$ 8.50\) of sugar beets, \(\$ 25\) of grain. In 1919 average farm incomes amounted to \(\$ 2992\). The number of cows had increased from 1627 in 1905 to 2324 , the income from dairy productions to \(\$ 757\) and from other livestock to \(\$ 595\). The value of all crops including tobacco had gone up from \(\$ 610\) in 1904 to \(\$ 1640\). Although the dairy industry had grown, the prosperity of Pleasant Springs was obviously still based largely on its income from tobacco.

Manufactures.-Pleasant Springs is wholly an agricultural town, and depends for its manufactured products on the many villages and towns in the county. There are no mills or factories. The town is crossed by the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railroad, which enters at section 32 and passes out at section 7. The Stoughton wagon manufacturer, G. T. Mandt, owned a number of tracts of land in the town.

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches.There are no villages in the town. The first school was taught in a private home. The first school building was built on
section 25. The first sermon is said to have been preached September 2, 1844, by Reverend W. Dietrichson under an oak tree on the farm of A. K. Juve. The first church was built by the Norwegian Lutheran denomination on section \(14 .{ }^{5}\) The plat book of 1891 shows Clarkson post office on section 14, the Norwegian Lutheran church on the same section, and schoolhouses on sections \(6,9,11,21,25,32\), and 35 .

Population Changes.-In 1850 Pleasant Springs had 21 American born heads of families and 131 foreign born. In 1860 there were 41 American and 150 foreign; in 1870, 27 American and 150 foreign; and in 1885 there were only 5 American born heads of families and 186 foreign born. These foreigners were practically all Scandinavians (Norwegians) from the Koshkonong settlement east of Pleasant Springs. In 1850, out of 483 foreigners 471 were Norwegians. In succeeding census periods this proportion remained about the same. In 1860 and 1870 it dropped to 90 per cent and 92 per cent because of the entrance of a small number of English, Irish, and Scotch, but it went up to 96 per cent of the total foreigners in 1880 and stayed at that percentage through 1920. The foreign born were 66 per cent of the total population in 1850. The number of Americans (which, of course, included children of foreigners born in Wisconsin) increased from 249 in 1850 to 601 in 1860, and the foreigners increased by 51 . The percentage of foreign born therefore dropped
\({ }^{-}\)History of Dane County, Wisconsin (Chicago, 1880), 911.
to 47 per cent. It remained in this proportion until 1885, when it dropped further to 33 per cent. It was about the same in 1895, but in 1920 it had dropped to 18 per cent of the total. A few Germans, English, and Irish came in through all the census periods, and in 1905 a few Finns and Russians. The number of Norwegians increased from 475 in 1870 to 721 in 1885. This increase corresponded with the increase in tobacco culture, which had doubled in acreage in the two years 1883 to 1885 . In 1895 they had dropped again to 488, which had been about their number from 1850 (with the exception of the one census period 1885) until 1920, when they dropped to 204. The number of Americans from states other than Wisconsin increased from 98 in 1850 to 176 in 1860, but dropped to 84 in 1870.
M. A. K.

Pleasant Springs-Population Statistics
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Year} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Totas} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Ambrican} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Forkios} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Faminss} \\
\hline & & Wis-
consin & \({ }_{\text {Other }}^{\substack{\text { Otates }}}\) & Total & Eng- & \({ }_{\text {Ger- }}^{\text {many }}\) & \[
\left.\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline \text { ree } \\
\text { land }
\end{array} \right\rvert\,
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Scan- } \\
\text { dina- }
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Other \\
Lands \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & Total & \({ }_{\text {Amer- }}^{\text {ican }}\) & \(\underset{\substack{\text { For- } \\ \text { eign }}}{ }\) & Total \\
\hline 1850 & \({ }^{732}\) & 151 & & & & & & 471 & & 483 & & 131 & 152 \\
\hline 1880 & 1,135 & \({ }^{425}\) & \({ }^{176}\) & \({ }^{601}\) & \({ }^{9}\) & 18 & \({ }^{20}\) & 484 & \({ }_{2}^{3}\) & [534 & \({ }_{27}^{41}\) & 150 & \({ }_{177}^{191}\) \\
\hline 1887 & 1, 1,559 & & & \({ }_{805} 5\) & 12 & 17 & & \({ }_{721}\) & 3 & \({ }_{754}{ }^{54}\) & , & 186 & 191 \\
\hline 1895 & 1,510 & & & 1,009 & 6 & & & 488 & 4 & 501 & \({ }^{44}\) & 205 & 239 \\
\hline 1905 & 1,384* & 852 & 48 & 900 & 1 & & & 468 & 7 & 484 & 99 & 141 & \({ }^{240}\) \\
\hline 1920 & 1,122 & 867 & 43 & 910 & & & & & 4 & & 157 & \({ }^{87}\) & \({ }^{244}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
his total.
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\section*{PLYMOUTH}

LOCATION．－The town of Plymouth，organized in 1848，occupies township 2 north，range 11 east，in Rock County．It is bounded north by Centre，east by Rock，south by Newark，west by Spring Valley．It lies about eleven miles southwest from the city of Janesville，the county seat，which in turn is about thirty－two miles from Madison． Rock County is in the extreme southern part of Wisconsin， and in the earliest days of settlement Freeport，Illinois，forty miles south，was one of the markets resorted to．Two rail roads run through the town－the Chicago，Milwaukee，and St．Paul，and the Northwestern，which cross at Hanover Junction on Bass Creek，where there is very good water power．

Surface and Drainage．－The town lies within the drainage basin of Rock River and is crossed by Bass Creek and its affluents．Bass Creek enters the town in section 6 and flows out through section 24 ．The surface varies from level to gently rolling．Where it is gently rolling on the prairie，although the differences in elevation are as much as 200 feet，the slopes are long and usually gentle．

Types of Soll and Climate．－The map in the soil sur－ vey of Rock County shows considerable amounts，in the north and south parts of the town，of Carrington silt loam．This is a prairie soil，rich in organic matter，and is now practically all in farms．There are also two patches of the shallow phase of this soil in the northwestern part of the town．Generally about 80 per cent of this is improved and the remainder in permanent pasture．There are two small patches of the Waukesha silt loam，deep phase，another prairie soil．This is the highest priced farm land in the county．Large areas in the south and north of the town are Miami silt loam，deep phase．This is also one of the more important agricultural soils．It varies in value from \(\$ 150\) to \(\$ 250\) an acre，and about 90 per cent of it is improved land．Clyde silt loam，one of the richest soils in Rock County，occurs extensively in Plymouth， and when drained is the best corn land in the state．It is found in the valleys of Bass Creek and its affluents．It is very high in organic matter，but is flat and low lying and the natural drainage is poor．There are also several areas of Carrington loam，of Carrington fine sandy loam－rich in organic matter，a fair agricultural soil about four－fifths under cultivation，－and several fairly large patches of peat．Other soils which occur in small and scattered amounts are Clyde fine sandy loam，Fox silt loam，Knox fine sandy loam，Car－ rington gravelly loam，Miami gravelly loam，and Fox fine sandy loam．

Of the total land area in Rock County，about 100,000 acres needs draining．Of this，52，672 acres is Clyde silt
 mineral soils．

Miami silt loam－light colored，glaciated，timbered，upland soil


Knox loam，Knox fine sandy loam，Baxter clay loam－light Knox loam，Knox fine sandy loam，Bax
colored，timbered，unglaciated，upland soils． soil．

Fox loam，Fox silt loam－light colored，timbered，upland soil
\(\square\) Peat．
Fig．28．Soil Map，Town of Plymouth
Prepared from map made by the Soils Division，Wisconsin Geological and loam and 13,248 acres peat．Considerable areas of both of these soils are found in Plymouth．In the soil survey of Rock County it is estimated that if the land in the county which is not used（over 16 per cent）and which adjoins land worth \(\$ 100\) to \(\$ 300\) an acre，were planted with corn and properly handled it would yield at a conservative figure over \(3,000,000\) bushels a year．

Climate is an important factor in the development of

Plymouth agriculture．The Rock River basin has the longest growing season in the state，with an average of about 170 days，which is as long as that of the corn region of central Illinois．Beloit weather bureau records show a growing sea－ son of 181 days．This is the best corn region in the state．\({ }^{1}\)

Timber．－Of the three soils which appear in greatest amounts in the town，the Carrington series are upland prairie， the Miami are upland timbered soils，and the Clyde series are timbered valley soils．According to the notes of the survey， which was made in 1833，on the uplands the timber was red， white，burr，and black oak，aspen，ash，elm，walnut，hickory， lynn，maple，and cherry．On the marshy or wet ground，of which there was a considerable area，the surveyor found some burr，red，and white oak，some undergrowth，and willow． Judging from his description，prairie，openings，and more heavily timbered lands were intermixed in this town．On the whole，it was an open town．

Beginnings of Settlement．－The first settlement of Rock County was in November，1835，when John Inman， Thomas，William，and Joshua Holmes，Milo Jones，and George Follmer arrived from Milwaukee with an ox team， wagon，provisions，and tools，and built a \(\log\) house where the present city of Janesville is located．Samuel St．John and his wife and Dr．James Heath and his wife came soon after， and all lived during that winter in the log cabin．John Inman and William Holmes had explored the country during the preceding summer．They had chosen this location because of the stretch of fine prairie and the nearness，along the banks of Rock River，of a supply of timber－mainly oak， maple，and ash．\({ }^{2}\)

Although there were a good many land entries in 1836， the first actual settlers in the town of Plymouth were David and Stephen C．Douglas and Samuel Colby，who came from Michigan in the spring of 1841 and settled on Stevens Creek， an affluent of Bass Creek，near the middle of section 2．\({ }^{3}\) Among the land entries for the year 1841 appear the names of Stephen C．Douglas，David Douglas，Samuel Chipman， E．B．Tenney，Elizabeth Dawson，C．S．Millard，S．K．Blod－ gett，Walter Inman，J．Stewart，N．Olson，P．Halvorsen， and J．Hulgerson，on sections 1，2，9，11，12，22，25，26，27， 32，and 33．All of these claims were in different hands in 1860．More settlers arrived from 1841 to 1850，but after 1850 the real increase in numbers began．In 1842 Plymouth included township 3，range 12 east，township 2 and half of township 3，range 11 east，township 2 and half of township
\({ }^{1}\) Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey，Bulletin No． 63 B，Soil
 \({ }_{2}\) Rock County，Wisconsin：A Newo History of Its Cities，Villages． （Chicago，1908），ii，
B 1 bid，
，

3 in range 10 east. Thirteen families were living in this entire region at this time. \({ }^{4}\) In 1844 the village of Hanover on Bass Creek was started by Joseph Hohensheldt. Mathias Gundel and his wife were, in 1845, the next and last settlers for some time, no others arriving for several years. In 1856 the village was platted by John L. V. Thomas, and the first gristmill was built there that year on the best water power in the town, by S. P. Chipman. E. A. Foote settled in 1845 in what is now Footville on the northern boundary of Plymouth, ten miles west of Janesville. E. T. Richards and his family and two other families who came soon after were the only settlers there until 1854, \({ }^{5}\) when the railroad was extended to this point. Three-fourths of the total number of the early settlers in Plymouth were from New York and New England. Two-thirds of the three-fourths were from New York. Many of the New Yorkers were, of course, New Englanders. Their biographies show that they had had frontier experience before coming to Wisconsin.

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Land.-The town was surveyed in 1833. The first land entries were made in 1836 by speculators and included all of sections 4,5 , and 6 , along Bass Creek-level, fertile land, mainly Clyde silt loam; all of sections 7, 8, and 9 -upland timber, Miami soils with some Clyde silt loam; the south half and the northeast quarter of section 12-excellent farm land; all of section 17-peat and marshy soil along one of the affluents of Bass Creek; the north half of section 18-largely peat; and entries on sections 19 and 20 , and 31 through 36 -all excellent farm land, part upland prairie, part upland timbered soils. Some of the largest crops were produced in this southern tier of sections on the eastern half of the southeast quarter of section 32, by Samuel Smiley, who bought his land in 1850 from the original purchaser of 1836 . In 1856 he raised on 200 acres of improved land 2500 bushels of corn and 900 bushels of wheat; \({ }^{6}\) and in 1859 on the same amount of improved land, 1500 bushels of corn, 113 bushels of wheat, 900 bushels of oats, and 400 bushels of rye. With the exception of the peat and marsh areas in sections 17 and 18, all of the land entered in 1836 was among the best agriculturally in the town. The names of the entrants for that year were James T. Watson (the largest purchaser, who entered all of sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 17, and parts of 18, 19, 20), Miller McNiel, James Whitehead, M. L. Martin, C. B. Blair, Samuel W. Beall, F. C. Winslow, and D. Spalding. None of this land is found among the entries of 1841, with the exception of all of section 9, which was sold to Elizabeth Dawson in that year. She still held it in 1860 , as well as half of sections 17 , 18, and 20, and three-fourths of section 6 , which she bought in 1842 and 1857. Only three of the original claimants of 1836 kept their tracts. James T. Watson retained the north-
: History of Rock County, Wisconsin (Janesville, 1856), 121.
P Portrait and Biographical Album of Rock County, Wis
\({ }^{1889}\) : Portrait and Biographical Album of Rock County, Wisconsin (Chicago

west quarter of section 5, as did C. B. Blair the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 33. James Whitehead, a native of New Jersey, settled in 1845 on the southwest quarter of section 30 and the northwest quarter of section 31. He apparently passed through this region in 1836, liked and entered this tract, but went on to Milwaukee, where he worked for Solomon Juneau for a short time. From there he went on to Jersey County, Illinois, where he lived for eight years. In 1845 he returned to Plymouth, and local histories make the statement that he entered his half-section then. Land office records, however, give the year 1836. In 1845 he was evidently not a rich man, for the histories describe him as making from logs his own ox-yoke and his wagon with which he made the nine-days' trip to Milwaukee to sell his grain. He went west in 1849 in the gold rush, was successful, replaced his \(\log\) cabin in 1851 with a large house, \({ }^{7}\) and in 1859 produced on this tract of 100 acres cleared land 500 bushels of wheat, 500 bushels of corn, and 900 bushels of oats. Plymouth is almost uniformly good farm land, and by 1856 none of it remained unsold; but a great deal of it was still in the hands of speculators, and the plat shows much of it undeveloped in 1859.

Progress of Farm Making.-The amount of speculation in Plymouth is shown by the small proportion of acreage included in the 60 farms reported in 1850. This was 2255 acres improved and 4934 unimproved, a total of less than a third of the area of the town. In Rock County as a whole, at this period, more than one-half of the total area was in farms, and the amount of improved exceeded the amount of unimproved. The number of farms in Plymouth in 1860, due to the great number of transfers between 1850 and 1860 and the increase of settlers with the coming of the railroads, went up to 147 . The total acreage was 13,594 , and all the land except that owned by the state had been entered by 1856. Almost 40 per cent was still left unimproved in the hands of owners not interested in farm making. In 1860 the average farm had 51 acres of improved land and 40 acres unimproved. One farm had 360 improved acres, 2 had 160, and 3 had 140. In 1870 there were 165 farms with an average of 77 acres improved and 34 acres unimproved. At this time 35 farms had over 100 acres improved land, the largest number being 430 acres. Other large amounts of improved land among these 35 farms were \(360,295,285\), and 284 acres. Eight farms had over 200 acres improved. Forty-six farms had from 61 to 100 acres improved. About one-half of the farms had 61 and more acres improved and one-fifth had over 100 acres. In 1880 there were 169 farms, practically the same number, but the improved acreage had increased by 4282 acres. The total acreage increased only 1487 acres, and from 1880 to 1905 there was a slight decrease of 215 acres in the total area in farms, and an increase of only 947 improved acres. About 3000 acres was not in farms in 1905. The areas

\footnotetext{
Portrait and Biographical Albwm of Rock County, 393.
}
of peat and marsh and the undrained Clyde silt loam regions in the valleys account for this.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-The classes of farms with respect to area, omitting 1850, stood as follows: In 1860 there were 18 farms under 20 acres, 29 between 20 and 49, 38 from 50 to 99,45 from 100 to 174, and 17 from 175 to 499. Almost half of the farms even in this early period had 100 acres and more. The maximum was 360 acres. Eight farms had 200 acres and more. In 1870 one farm had 510 acres and 14 had under 20 acres. There were 27 of 20 to 49 acres, 50 of 50 to 99,41 of 100 to 174 , and 32 of 175 to 499. The large farm belonged to Jacob Fisher. In 1880, 16 farms were under 20 acres, 19 from 20 to 49,50 from 50 to 99 , and 47 from 100 to 174 . There were 36 farms containing from 175 to 499 acres, and one, which was owned by Edward Ryan, had 555 acres.

The great increase of improved land in 1880 over the amount in 1870, although the number of farms was practically unchanged, is shown in the following statistics, in the decreased number of farms having 40 acres or less improved, and the increased number of farms having the larger cultivated amounts. In 1860 there were 78 farms having 40 acres or less of improved land; in 1870 there were 59, and in 1880, 34. At the three periods there were in the class of 41 to 60 acres, 27,25 , and 20 ; of 61 to 100 acres, 26,46 , and 50 ; and over 100 acres, 16,35 , and 65 .

General Productions.-In 1849 Rock County stood first in wheat production in Wisconsin. The total production of Plymouth for that year was 20,425 bushels with an average of 340 bushels per farm, one of the three highest farm averages of the nine towns compared for this period. In 1859 Plymouth produced 34,264 bushels. This amount was exceeded by eight other towns. There were several high individual records, of which 1268 bushels on 80 improved acres owned by Giles Fisher, and 1200 bushels on 360 improved acres on the farm of Jervis Bemis, were the largest. Fisher also raised 300 bushels of corn and 600 bushels of oats, and Bemis 1500 bushels of corn and 2000 bushels of oats. In 1869 Plymouth again ranked ninth in total production among the towns studied, with 41,366 bushels and an average of 250 bushels per farm. In 1879 Plymouth ranked lowest of all the towns both in total production and in average per farm. In 1884 and 1894 its wheat production was negligible, and in 1904 it fell to 195 bushels produced on 8 acres. There was a revival during and after the World War, but another sharp decline has followed.

Plymouth is, however, preëminently a corn producing town. It has a great amount of the best type of corn land in the state, and although as late as 1922 much of this was unimproved, the town has had from the earliest period not only one of the largest aggregate yields but also a high average per farm. In 1849 its total was 7905 bushels with an average
per farm of 131 bushels. In 1859 Plymouth was exceeded only by Highland and Pulaski in total production, and in 1869 only by Highland and Sugar Creek. In 1879 only one town, Sugar Creek, had a higher total production and a higher average per farm, and no town had a higher farm average of swine. In 1884 and 1894 it had the largest aggregate yield of corn of all the towns, and in 1904 it was again exceeded only by Sugar Creek. In 1879 only one town, Lodi, had a higher farm average of cattle, and one, Highland, a higher total number. In 1880 Plymouth had only 752 milch cows, ranking thirteenth among the towns studied; in 1895 it had 3822 cows, the largest number of any of the towns; and in 1920 dairying was the most important branch of farming in the town. In that year the entire county had 37,914 cows, with the Holstein breed predominating. Important general crops in addition to corn are hay, oats, and barley. In 1904 the hay crop was 4629 tons, oats 63,485 bushels, barley 10,755 bushels.

Special Productions.-Tobacco is an important special crop in Plymouth and throughout Rock County. The entire county produced in 1904, \(6,264,005\) pounds valued at \(\$ 371,197\). The same year Dane County, which leads the state in tobacco, produced \(14,902,295\) pounds valued at \(\$ 943,956\). Of the total yield in Rock County, Plymouth produced 501,100 pounds valued at \(\$ 36,575\)-an important addition to


Fig. 29. Town of Plymouth, 1915 After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company
her income from livestock and market cereals. Sugar beets are another important special crop which thrives on Rock County soils. They are less extensively grown in Plymouth, which produced 1728 tons valued at \(\$ 7787\) in 1904, than in other parts of the county. As there is a factory in Janesville, this crop might very well be more extensively cultivated. Other special crops are potatoes, peas, and cabbage.

Value of Productions.-In 1869 the value of all farm productions in Plymouth was \(\$ 174,579\)-an average of \(\$ 1058\) per farm, almost half of the incomes being \(\$ 1000\) and over. In 1879 the average per farm was \(\$ 751\), which kept Plymouth among the towns having the better incomes. Sixteen of the towns studied had less than this. At the first period there were 72 incomes of \(\$ 1000\) or over, the largest being \(\$ 7496\) (made on a farm of 510 acres on which were raised 2200 bushels of wheat, 3500 bushels of corn, 4500 bushels of oats, and livestock valued at \(\$ 30,600)\). Other large incomes at this period were \(\$ 4217, \$ 4073, \$ 3520\), and \(\$ 3107\). Fifteen were between \(\$ 2000\) and \(\$ 2999,52\) between \(\$ 1000\) and \(\$ 1999,33\) between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999,22\) between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599\), and 18 between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399\). There were 14 incomes of less than \(\$ 200\). Six farms reported no incomes. In 1879 the maximum income was \(\$ 4285\), made out of general farming, and there were 36 others of \(\$ 1000\) or more. There were 49 of the second class ( \(\$ 600\) to \(\$ 999\) ), 36 of the third class ( \(\$ 400\) to \(\$ 599\) ), and 28 of the fourth class ( \(\$ 200\) to \(\$ 399\) ). Nineteen incomes fell below \(\$ 200\). Less than one-fourth of the total number averaged \(\$ 1000\) and over, but more than onehalf averaged \(\$ 600\) and over.

The average farm income in 1904 had gone up to \(\$ 936\) and in 1919 to \(\$ 2566\). The value of dairy products, only \(\$ 265\) in 1904, advanced to \(\$ 1160\) in 1919, and livestock production other than dairy cattle, from \(\$ 348\) to \(\$ 741\). The striking increase was in the income from dairy products. Crop incomes, including considerable tobacco, some sugar beets, potatoes, and grain, advanced from \(\$ 323\) to \(\$ 665\).

Manufactures.-In 1856 the first gristmill was built by S. F. Chipman at Hanover on Bass Creek. The first store was opened here in the same year by Nathan Highme. In the next year the Milwaukee and Mississippi Railroad was completed as far as Hanover. The first store was opened in Footville in 1853 by Watson Beach, the second in 1854 by Bancroft and Northway. The railroad reached Footville in 1854. In 1889 the village had two stores, two blacksmith shops, one harness shop, one shoe shop, one hotel, and three churches. It had a population of \(300 .^{8}\)

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches.The town contains two villages-Hanover on section 14, and \({ }^{8}\) Portrait and Biographical Album of Rock County, 1020.

Footville on section 5. The first school in the town is said to have been taught in 1848 by Julius Gilbert in Mr. Foote's house on section 5. In 1853 a schoolhouse was moved from the town of Centre to Footville. A post office was established there in 1845, with C. F. Richards as postmaster. In 1855 a Methodist church was built in Footville and the school was moved there. This church building was used for school purposes until 1875, when it burned and a new schoolhouse was erected. In 1858 a schoolhouse was built in the village of Hanover. A post office had been established in 1856 and William Ranney appointed postmaster. The plat book of 1873 shows schools on sections 1, 3, 8, 20, 27, and 32 .

Population Changes.-In 1850 Plymouth had 60 American born heads of families and 47 foreign born, and 377 native born persons and 194 foreigners; the total population was 571 . In 1920 the total was 970 ; native, 842 ; foreign, 128. The foreign population, which in 1850 had been onethird of the total, had dropped to 13 per cent. The proportion of foreign born heads of families had decreased from 44 per cent to 28 per cent. Almost three-fourths of the foreigners in 1850 were Norwegians. In 1860, 1870, and 1885 the foreign born heads of families exceeded the native born in increasing proportions. In 1885 they were almost 68 per cent of the total number of families; in 1895 they had dropped to 41 per cent. The highest proportion of foreign born was found in the first census period, 1850. Norwegians were the largest foreign group in every period except in 1860, when they were exceeded in numbers by the Irish, and in 1905, when there was a slightly greater number of Germans. Germans and Irish contributed fairly large groups, the Irish through 1895 and the Germans through 1920. In 1860 over half of the total number of Americans came from other states, in 1920 less than one per cent. The largest group of these in 1860 was from New York, the next largest from Pennsylvania, and the next from New England. Ten years later the number of Americans from other states had dropped from 502 to 364.
M. A. K.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Year} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Totas} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Ambacas} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Forkias} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{FAmiurs} \\
\hline & & Wis.
consin & \[
\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned}
& \text { Other } \\
& \text { States }
\end{aligned}\right.
\] & otal &  & (ers & \[
\left.\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline \text { sazaze } \\
\text { rand }
\end{array} \right\rvert\,
\] & dina- & \[
\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|}
\substack{\text { Lher } \\
\text { Land }}
\end{array}
\] & Total & \({ }_{\text {Amer- }}^{\text {ican }}\) & \[
\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered}
\substack{\text { ror } \\
\text { eign }}
\end{gathered}\right.
\] & Total \\
\hline & 571 & 89 & 288 & 377 & & 10 & & \({ }^{139}\) & & 194 & & & \\
\hline 1860 & \({ }_{\text {cen }}^{\substack{1,235}}\) & \({ }_{678}^{427}\) & ( 564 & 1,942 & ( \({ }_{34}^{35}\) & \({ }_{58}^{29}\) & \({ }_{99}^{113}\) & 1141 & \({ }_{22}^{29}\) & - 308 & \begin{tabular}{|c}
109 \\
113
\end{tabular} & \({ }_{111}^{116}\) & \({ }_{2}^{225}\) \\
\hline 1885 & \({ }_{\text {1,011* }}\) & & & \({ }_{6} 1,02\) & 20 & & \({ }_{40}\) & &  & \({ }_{39}^{354}\) & \({ }_{66} 19\) & 140 & \({ }_{208}^{238}\) \\
\hline 1895 & 1,254 & & & \({ }^{937}\) & \({ }^{23}\) & 105 & 45 & & \({ }^{13}\) & 317 & \({ }^{229}\) & 160 & \({ }^{389}\) \\
\hline 1905 & 1,352 & \({ }_{765}^{935}\) & 141 & 1,076 & \({ }_{3}\) & \({ }^{122}\) & 18 & \({ }_{114}^{114}\) & \({ }_{13}^{13}\) & \({ }_{128}^{276}\) & 183 & \({ }_{65}{ }^{20}\) & \({ }_{203}^{303}\) \\
\hline 1920 & 970 & 766 &  & \({ }^{842}\) & \({ }^{3}\) & \({ }^{46}\) & 7 & & & 128 & 162 & & 227 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
* village excluded

\section*{PRAIRIE DU CHIEN ~ CRAWFORD COUNTY}


\section*{PRAIRIE DU CHIEN}

LOCATION.-The town of Prairie du Chien, organized in its present limits in 1872, occupies part of township 7, ranges 6 and 7 west, in Crawford County. It had been created as early as 1849 , including at that time nearly all of the present Crawford County. It was gradually restricted in size, until in 1872 the town of Bridgeport was created out of its southern portion. \({ }^{1}\) It is bounded north by Eastman, east by Wauzeka, south by Bridgeport and a part of the city of Prairie du Chien, and west by the Mississippi River. The city of Prairie du Chien, a part of which is in the town of Prairie du Chien, is one of the oldest settlements in the state. It lies on the Mississippi River just above its junction with the Wisconsin, and is 300 miles below St. Paul, 70 miles north of Dubuque, 600 miles north of St. Louis, 98 miles west of Madison, and 198 miles from Milwaukee. For many years it was the most northern boat landing on the Mississippi and the farthest west of the American frontier posts. Originally an Indian village, named after a chief of the Foxes, it was used as early as the middle of the eighteenth century by French traders who came there in the summer to exchange furs and game for supplies. \({ }^{2}\) Throughout the earliest period of settlement Mackinac was the source of supplies. Farming was gradually begun as a means of providing food. After 1816, as it developed into an American settlement, trade shifted from Mackinac to St. Louis, and the military posts, Indian settlements, and mining districts were also used as markets. At that time it took from twelve days to a month to make the trip from St. Louis to Prairie du Chien. The trip down the river could be made in from six to ten days. Boats could make 110 miles a day up stream with a favorable wind, with poles and sails. \({ }^{3}\) In 1823 the first upper river steamboat ascended the Mississippi to Prairie du Chien and beyond. In 1836 a horse ferry was established by Alexander McGregor between Prairie du Chien and the Iowa side of the river. \({ }^{4}\) About 1840 Bass and Rice operated a ferry for a short time in competition with McGregor. In 1857 the dependence of this western post on the river for markets was broken by the extension to Prairie du Chien of the Milwaukee and Mississippi Railroad. This was the most northern point on the Mississippi River to which a railroad had as yet been built. The same year a steam ferry was established between McGregor and Prairie du Chien. This was later bought by the railroad. In 1858 the La Crosse road was extended to La Crosse and was a rival of the Milwaukee and Mississippi Railroad (the Milwaukee and Prairie du Chien after 1861) until 1866, when they were consolidated as the Chicago, Mil-
\({ }^{1}\) History of Cravoford County, Wisconsin (Springfield, M1I, 1884), \({ }^{\text {J }}\) Jonathan Carver, Travels through the Interior Parts of North America in the Years 1766, 1767, and il 768 (London, 1778), 50 .
:Wis. Hist. Colls,, ii, 224 .
waukee, and St. Paul. In 1859 the first shipment (ten carloads) of wheat from Minnesota to the Great Lakes was made by way of Prairie du Chien. Within two years 100 carloads were shipped daily from here. In 1873 Lawler's pile-pontoon railway bridge was completed. It was 8000 feet long, and crossing both channels of the river and an island (about one and a quarter miles at this point), connected the Iowa and Wisconsin branches of the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railroad. At this period Prairie du Chien was one of the largest freight depots in the state. It had a grain elevator with a capacity of 250,000 bushels, and 275 carloads of wheat were shipped a day. Bridgeport, in the adjoining town of Bridgeport, was also one of the principal shipping points of the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railroad.

Surface and Drainage.-The town lies in the Driftless Area and is generally very rough and hilly, although the portions on the banks of the Mississippi are level. This level area above the river has much sand and gravel in its soil. Bluffs of magnesian limestone back of this plain, which is about a mile and a half wide, rise to a height of almost 250 feet. Above these bluffs, a slope of St. Peter sandstone over Trenton limestone rises another 100 feet. At the foot of these bluffs such fertile soil as there is in the town is to be found, and the early farms were here laid out in narrow strips from 40 to 80 rods wide and from 5 to 7 miles long. The town is watered by little streams, and there are many springs. Lagoons of the Mississippi in the western part cut into the town.

Types of Soil.-There is no regular soil survey of Crawford County. The government surveyor in 1840, Orson Lyon, in describing the quality of the land in range 6, called it all second and third-rate, in places mountainous, rocky, and broken, with the exception of the first 66 chains of the line passing through farm lot 20 between sections 17 and 20 , which was level and first-rate. Descriptions of the town give the soil along the Mississippi as sand, and on the ridges as heavy clay. The sides of the bluffs were often rocky and could not be used for other than grazing purposes or timber. The small proportion of improved to unimproved land as late as 1904 emphasizes these characteristics.

Timber.-Parts of the town, in range 6, the surveyor found thinly timbered with white and burr oak. A small area in this range, in the northern part, was well timbered and in most of it he noted some white, black, and burr oak, some hickory, and not much undergrowth. Between sections 18 and 19 he found it too rocky for timber.

Beginnings of Settlement.-Prairie du Chien was one of the first French settlements in the state, and its beginnings
are lost in the mists of tradition. Without doubt it is more than two hundred years old. In 1686 Nicolas Perrot built Fort St. Nicolas on this site, which was garrisoned for a year or more by Canadian militia, at one time under the command of Boisguillot. \({ }^{5}\) The remains of the old French fort were visible into the nineteenth century; it was located in the southern part of the prairie at the edge of the survey of 1820. \({ }^{\text {. }}\) This may possibly be only the trading post of Revolutionary times, but we are inclined to believe it was the military post of the seventeenth century. Although no records of a settlement are found before the middle of the eighteenth century, there is reason to believe that retired fur traders and voyageurs dwelt here even before that time. Carver in 1766 mentions no white settlers, but he does not explicitly deny their existence. \({ }^{7}\) During the British period a considerable settlement of French-Canadians grew up contiguous to the fur trade mart, and raised supplies for the traders. The first settlers to obtain title from the Indians were Basil Giard, Pierre Antaya, and Augustin Ange. \({ }^{8}\) Giard also had a Spanish grant on the river opposite Prairie du Chien. \({ }^{\text {a }}\) Other early settlers were Michel Brisbois (1781) and Pierre la Pointe (1781). The settlement as known in the nineteenth century may thus be said to date from 1781, although Jean Marie Cardinal and others claimed to have dwelt there as early as \(1763 .{ }^{10}\) During the American Revolution Prairie du Chien was a station for recruiting Indian auxiliaries both for the campaigns in Canada and for the attacks on St. Louis and the Illinois. \({ }^{11}\) Some of George Rogers Clark's officers also recruited in this neighborhood, and in 1780 a large number of furs were burned to prevent their falling into American hands. \({ }^{12}\)

The village was begun on the island about a mile and a half wide, cut off from the mainland by a lagoon called the Marais de St. Feriole.

Notwithstanding the early settlement of Prairie du Chien, it grew very slowly. Until the close of the War of 1812 there were almost no American settlers, connections being mainly with Mackinac and Montreal, and with the French villages of Illinois and Wisconsin. In 1806, after Pike's visit, the governor of Indiana Territory appointed several of the traders justices of the peace under United

\section*{\({ }^{5}\) Wis. Hist. Collo}
\({ }^{-1}\) Carver, Travels, 50
- Carver, Hravels. Holls,, is, 282, where it is stated this claim was bought by Sinclair at Mackinac. Brisbois confused two acts: first, Sinclair's purchase of Mackinac Island from the Indians for the British government; second, Giard and others' purchase of Prairie du Chien from the Indians, without government sanction. See Wis. Hist. Colls., xviii, 433.
Wis. Hist. Colls,, ix, 285.
\({ }^{10}\) Early Families of Prairie du Chien, by Rev. M. E. Fraser. MS. in Wis\({ }^{n}\) nin Historical Library.
\({ }^{11}\) Wis. Hist. Colls., xviii, 357, 371.
\({ }^{13}\) Ibid., 404-411.

States authority; these men, however, were so closely allied with the British, that they went over to the English side in the War of 1812. This was true even of Henry Monroe Fisher, said to have been the first American at Prairie du Chien. It was not, however, true of the Indian agent Nicolas Boilvin, who stayed at his post as long as possible, and then went down the river to St. Louis. Among the principal Canadians at Prairie du Chien before the war were the Brisbois family, James Aird, Joseph Rolette, Duncan Graham, and Nicolas Jarrot. All these except the last served under the British flag from 1812 to 1815. In 1816 the government sent a force to build Fort Crawford and to occupy the upper Mississippi for the United States. Thereafter the American settlement began. One of the earliest American visitors was Colonel John Shaw, who ascended the river to this place in 1815, and in 1818 built the first water gristmill. \({ }^{13}\) In 1816 came James H. Lockwood, who from that time onward became the leading American of the town. \({ }^{14}\) Lockwood found not more than thirty houses, and his estimate is corroborated by that of Keyes in 1817..\(^{\text {15 }}\) Pike in 1805 estimated the population at 370, and Schoolcraft in 1820 at 500. \({ }^{16}\) This means that the French had large families.

As, by the early land acts, no land could be sold before it was surveyed and no land could be surveyed before the Indian title was extinguished, some provision had to be made for early settlers holding land under foreign grants or by long occupation. Therefore, by an act of Congress of March 3, 1807, claims were recognized on proof of continued occupation from June 1, 1796 (the date of evacuation by the British of all garrisons and posts, according to the provisions of the Jay Treaty) to March 3, 1807. The treaties of St Louis with the Indians, of June 3, 1816, and August 24, 1816, ratified purchases made from them by French and English. The French-Canadians about Prairie du Chien seem to have known very little about these provisions to safeguard their rights, and in 1816, because of evictions by the American commander on his taking over the post at Prairie du Chien, various petitions were sent to Congress. In 1820 an act was passed reviving the act of 1807, and commissioners were sent to Prairie du Chien to verify the validity of disputed claims on the basis of occupation. The commissioners recognized the claims in the upper village, of Joseph Rivard, Augustus Hebert, Alexander Dumont, François Vertefeuille, Pierre Charlefou, Benjamin Cadotte, and Michel Brisbois. Other claims recognized were on farm lot 70 and on farm lots 1 through 24. The claimants were James McFarlane, Augustus Hebert, François Vertefeuille, Joseph Rolette, Jean Bte. Albert, François Cherreviere, Michel Brisbois, Benjamin Cadotte, John Simpson, Denis Courtois, Magdeline Gauthier, Jean Fisher Rolette, and the heirs of
\({ }^{1 s}\) Wis. Hist. Colls., ii, 224-229; Wis. Mag. of Hist., iii, 354-356.
\({ }^{4}\) Wis. Hist. Colle
\({ }^{14}\) Wis. Hist. Colls,, ii, 98-196.
1834), ive 863. State Papers. Public Lands (Duff Green Edition, Washington,

Claude Gagnier, of Pierre Joudron, of John Campbell, of James Aird, and of Felix Mercier. These lots were not again surveyed when the rest of the town was surveyed and the titles to them were duly entered in the land office. \({ }^{17}\)

In 1828 Joseph M. Street came as Indian agent and remained four or five years, and in 1830 came his brother-inlaw, Thomas P. Burnett. The year 1836 was a period of speculation in Prairie du Chien as well as elsewhere. Two land companies were organized, who bought up all they could get of private land claims below the fort, and laid out this land in city lots. Alexander McGregor arrived in 1836, laid out the lower village, and established a ferry across the river. Another settler in that year was Reverend Alfred Brunson. \({ }^{18}\) In the fall of 1836 the total population of Crawford County, outside of Fort Crawford, was 537 ; in 1850 it was 2500.

The first land entries, aside from those made valid in 1820 by act of Congress, were made in 1841, the year after the town was surveyed. In that year Edward Hughes, Abraham Trepouier, Joseph Lessard, David Drew, Hypolite Martin, Joseph Martin, Pierre Grimard, Oliver Cherrier, William Dunn, Joseph Rolette, Baptiste Lariviere, Antoine Boisvert, George P. Brisbois, Michel St. Cyr, Stephen Tainter, and Mary Taylor entered claims in sections 2, 8, 9, \(10,15,22,23,26,28,29\), and 30 . Of these apparently only three remained in their original owners' hands and were developed. Edward Hughes in 1860 still held the tract of approximately 280 acres on section 2 which he had entered in 1841; Oliver Cherrier held the south half of the southeast quarter of section 10, and William Dunn the west half of the northwest quarter of section 15 . Cherrier raised 900 bushels of wheat in 1859 on this particular piece of land on section 10 -the largest amount recorded at that time in the town.

Very few land entries were made between 1841 and 1855, but in that year and the next a great number of claims were entered by settlers who were encouraged by the building of the railroad in those years.

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Lands.-The first settlement of Prairie du Chien followed the location of the fur traders' post. Land taken after this was along the river and at the foot of the bluffs, where the most fertile portions were found. In 1841 the first land taken up after the survey of the town followed the same general lines. The choice of fertile tracts was very small. Although by 1860 most of the land had been entered, very little of it had been improved, and the town-including the present Bridgeport -although its first settlement had been made so long before, had only 40 farms.

Progress of Farm Making.-The farms of Prairie du Chien in 1860 had an average of 56 acres improved land and 146 unimproved land. This was, proportionally for the size of the farms, one of the lowest averages of number of
\({ }^{n 7}\) Land Office records and American State Papers, Public Lands, have been used here.
sis
Wis. Hist. Colls., xv, 264-291; Wis. Mag. of Hist., ii, 129.
improved acres among the towns studied. Those in Door, Richland, and Iowa counties also had low averages, while the towns of Mount Pleasant and Norway, in Racine County, had the highest averages of improved acres. The largest number of improved acres in Prairie du Chien was 160. Three of the 40 farms had that much, one had 150 acres, and one had 125 acres improved. In 1870 the number of farms was 161 , the total improved area was 6495 or an average of 40 acres, and the total unimproved 21,366 or an average of 133 acres. This was an even smaller average of improved acres proportionally for the size of farms. At this period 6 farms had more than 100 acres improved, the maximum being 500 acres, and 23 farms had from 61 to 100 acres improved. Ten years later there were 113 farms, the improved acres numbered 4832 (a decrease of 1663 acres in 10 years), the unimproved 12,550 , the average being the still very low proportion of 42 and 111 respectively. In actual average number of improved acres only one of the towns studied, Sevastopol, had less. The number of improved acres gradually increased during the following years and in 1905, according to the state census, Prairie du Chien had 131 farms, 6514 improved acres and 15,266 acres unimproved. This was practically the same proportion as in 1880 and an actual increase in number of acres of improved land for the whole town of 1682, in 25 years.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-In 1860 there were no farms under 20 acres in size. There were 5 farms between 20 and 49 acres, 10 between 50 and 99,10 between 100 and 174 , and 10 betwen 175 and 499 acres. There were 5 farms of 500 acres and more. These contained 500 , \(535,600,640\), and 700 acres respectively. The largest farm, 700 acres, was owned by Samuel Bassett; the 640 -acre farm by Edward Hughes, one of the early settlers. Although this town was not distinguished at any time for agricultural development, a predominating characteristic has been the large-sized farms, even at this early period. The contrast is sharp with the very small average of cultivated acres. In 1870 there were 10 farms under 20 acres, 21 farms of 20 to 49 acres, 49 of 50 to 99,41 of 100 to 174 , and 30 of 175 to 499. Ten farms contained 500 acres and over. The largest farm, which was owned by Oliver Cherrier, had 3200 acres. Another large farm was owned by H. L. Dousman and had 1600 acres. Both of these men were among the earliest settlers. In 1880 there were 6 farms under 20 acres, 5 farms of 20 to 49 acres, 27 farms of 50 to 99 acres, 48 of 100 to 174 acres, and 24 of 175 to 499 acres. Three farms had over 500 acres, the largest one reaching 1672 acres. There were not so many very large farms, but the percentage of farms of 100 acres and more was 75 per cent of the total, whereas in 1870 it had been 50 per cent of the total.

In classifying by number of cultivated acres we get very different results. Although half of all the farms in 1870 had 100 acres or more in area, less than 4 per cent had over

100 acres cultivated, and in 1880 less than 2 per cent had that much improved. In 1870, 18 per cent had over 60 acres improved and in 1880, 14 per cent.

The actual classification by number of improved acres is as follows: In 1860, 23 farms had 40 acres or less improved; in 1870 there were 115 and in 1880, 72. In the class of 41 to 60 acres there were at the three census periods 6,17 , and 25 ; of 61 to 100 acres, 6,23 , and 14 ; and over 100 acres, 5,6 , and 2.

General Productions.-In 1859, according to the census, Prairie du Chien produced 5213 bushels of wheat or 130 bushels per farm on the average. Six towns among those studied had a lower average per farm. The 1870 census shows a production of 12,736 bushels or an average of 78 bushels per farm. Only two towns, Orion and Sevastopol, had a lower total and lower average per farm production than this. In 1880, with a total production of 18,232 bushels Prairie du Chien stood seventeenth among the towns studied. In 1884 the production had fallen to 13,436 bushels on 958 acres. In 1894 this had fallen to almost half, in acreage and yield. In 1904 the yield was cut to 2307 bushels from 246 acres. Prairie du Chien was never one of the leading wheat towns.

In corn production the town did not rank much better. Only three towns had a lower total production in 1879 and six had a lower average per farm. In 1859 Prairie du Chien ranked fifteenth in total production and third in average per farm. Ten years later eleven towns had a higher aggregate and twelve a higher average per farm. Oats are another crop in the production of which Prairie du Chien has stood almost at the bottom among the towns studied for all the census periods. In total number of sheep and swine, and in average per farm, Prairie du Chien stood almost lowest in 1870 and 1880, but in 1895 it ranked eleventh among the towns in number of swine. In 1905 it had dropped again to lowest rank. In stock cattle it ranked with the two or three towns having the very smallest number. Only Sevastopol and Orion had fewer milch cows in 1880 and 1895, and in 1905 Prairie du Chien stood at the bottom of the list. Practically no cheese production was recorded for the town by any of the censuses, and the butter production was only 14,080 pounds in 1894 the lowest of all the towns.

Value of Productions.-In 1869 the value of all farm productions in the town was \(\$ 75,341\) or \(\$ 468\) per farm on the average. In 1879 this had shrunk to \(\$ 37,745\) and the average was \(\$ 334\), the lowest of all the towns studied. At the first named census period there were 18 incomes of \(\$ 1000\) or over, the maximum being \(\$ 6000\). This was probably made up in part from other than agricultural sources. \({ }^{19}\) The next

1 The farm for which this income was reported had 500 improved acres,
Thimproved, and was valued at \(\$ 20,000\). It had 18 horses, 25 cows, 20 other 1100 unimproved, and was valued at \(\$ \$ 0,000\). It had 18 harses, 25 cows, 20 other
cattle 100 sheep and 12 swine. Livestock was valued at \(\$ 3000\). Three thousand cattle, 100 sheep, and 12 swine. Livestock was valued at \(\$ 3000\). Three thousand
dollars was reported paid out in wages, including board. was as follows: wheat, 160 bushels; ; rye, 60 bushels; corn, 200 bushels; oats, 500 bushels; barley, 230 bushels. One thousand pounds of butter and 3000 gallons
highest was \(\$ 2500\) and the next \(\$ 2000\), these two being made out of general farming. Twenty-two incomes were between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999,31\) between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599\), and 36 between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399\). There were 33 incomes of less than \(\$ 200\). Twenty-one farms reported no incomes. More than half the farms of this period yielded an income under \(\$ 600\). More than one-third were in the two lowest income groups. In 1879 the largest income was \(\$ 5600\), made out of general farming and dairying; the next largest was \(\$ 1100\). Five incomes were between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999\), 22 were between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599,50\) between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399\), and 34 fell below \(\$ 200\). Three-fourths of the farms were in the two lowest income groups.

In 1904 the average farm income was \(\$ 295\), by far the lowest of all the towns studied. The next lowest was Sparta, with an average of \(\$ 488\). There were 581 cows in the town in 1905, and the average dairy production came to \(\$ 90\). Other livestock products amounted to \(\$ 138\) per farm, and crop incomes to \(\$ 66.50\) per farm. In 1919, with greatly increased prices, average farm productions totaled \(\$ 1394\), which even after an allowance is made for inflated values shows an increase in income. The number of cows at this time had gone up to 897 , dairy products to \(\$ 585\) per farm, other livestock to \(\$ 635\), and crop incomes to \(\$ 174\).

Manufactures.-In 1810, according to early accounts, the first flour mill, called a "band mill," was built by François Cherreviere. He charged one-third for the grinding, which was done with two horses hitched to a sweep with a band. In 1818 the first water-power flour mill was built by Colonel John Shaw \({ }^{20}\) on section 6 in Mill Coulee. This was the only one in the town. It was rebuilt in 1840 by Joseph Rolette, and in 1883 by George E. Jacobia. \({ }^{21}\) The first regular gristmill in the city of Prairie du Chien was built in 1847, by Edward Pelton. In 1878 a gristmill which was run by artesian well power was built in the city. The first sawmill was built in 1857. The second one, built in 1872, was a very large one, cutting 85,000 feet of lumber in a day. The logs used were mostly rafted down from the Chippewa valley.

The city of Prairie du Chien is divided into "Upper Town" and "Lower Town." In 1872, because of dissatisfaction over taxes, the southern portion, which contained Lower Town, was detached and made a part of the new town of Bridgeport. The earliest trading in Upper Town was done in a stone building which was the headquarters for the Indian traders in the main village, the site of the first settlements. In 1839 the first general store was opened by Edward Pelton. In 1847 Thomas A. Sawyer opened a general grocery, Martin Neinhardt an exclusive grocery, O. P. Martin a drug of milk were reported. Wool clipped from the 100 sheep amounted to only 130
pounds; potatoes amounted to 40 bushels, hay to 200 tons; and \(\$ 400\) was reported pounds; potatoes amounted
for the value of home manu tures.
\(x W\).
or the value of home manufactures. December 30, 1817. See Wis. Mag. of Hist., iii, 356 .
store and grocery store combined. Other stores were opened in the forties.

In 1830 the Prairie du Chien Ferry Company, a wild-cat banking venture without a charter, was started, with George W. Pine president. In 1856 the Bank of Prairie du Chien was opened by Anson Eldred of Milwaukee, but it failed soon after. In 1856-57 the Exchange Bank was opened by Chase Brothers, but this also was closed in a few years. Another Exchange Bank was opened in 1872 by C. M. Seley. Its cash capital in 1883 was \(\$ 10,000\), and it was then the only bank in Prairie du Chien.

Post Offices, Schools, Churches, and Newspapers. -The first post office in Crawford County was established in 1823 in Prairie du Chien village, with Judge James Duane Doty as first postmaster. This place was incorporated two years earlier by act of the Territory of Michigan.

The first school established was a private one. It was opened May 25, 1818, by Willard Keyes and continued about three months, with approximately thirty students at \(\$ 2.00\) a month. \({ }^{22}\) The first public school district was created in 1842 ; the first school in it was taught in a private building by Miss Rice. In 1857 a new two-story school was built, and in 1875 a high school. In 1884 there were three full school districts on sections 12, 10, and 9 ; there were also four joint districts-one on sections 23 and 29 ; one on section 30 jointly with the city of Prairie du Chien; another in the town of Wauzeka, jointly with Wauzeka; and a fourth in the town of Bridgeport, jointly with Bridgeport. \({ }^{23}\)

There are two Roman Catholic schools in the city of Prairie du Chien. St. Mary's Institute for Girls, established in 1872, is partly in the town of Prairie du Chien and partly in Bridgeport. The College of the Sacred Heart, for boys, opened in 1880, is in the south portion of the city, in the town of Bridgeport. There was also from 1867 to 1878 a nondenominational independent German school, which at one time had seventy-five pupils. Campion College, a Roman Catholic school conducted by the Jesuit order, is one of the newer educational institutions of Prairie du Chien.

The earliest religious services are said to have been held in 1817, when Father Dunand, a Trappist monk from Illinois, baptized 125 persons. In 1825 a Sunday-school was started by Mrs. Juliana Lockwood. As there was no church in the town at this time, the Catholic catechism was taught in the school. This lasted only one year. The family of General Joseph M. Street, which arrived in 1828, was the first Protestant family of which we have a record. In 1830 a Presbyterian missionary to the Indians, and in 1832 a Presbyterian student, preached occasionally. In 1833 the Reverend David Lowry, a Presbyterian who had been sent to Prairie du
\({ }^{1}\) Ibid., 314. Keyes says (see "Journal", in Wis. Mag. of Hist., iii, 362 ) under date of May 23, , 1818: "close my business at the Mill and remove to the
village-have made arrangements to commence a school-limited my engagement village- have made arrangements to commence a school-lil
to 3 months- 3 ostudents subscribed at \(\$ 2\) per month each
much English."
much English." \({ }_{\mathbf{2}}^{\text {History of Crawford County, } 636 .}\)


Fig. 30. Town of Prairie du Chien, 1915 After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company

Chien as superintendent of the Indian school, preached Sundays in the village. In 1836 Reverend Alfred Brunson began his missionary work in Prairie du Chien. \({ }^{24}\) From 1834 to 1839 the Catholics, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Methodist Episcopalians were organized into congregations, and a Catholic church was built. A Methodist Episcopal church was erected about 1847, an Episcopal church about 1855, a Congregational in 1856, and a Lutheran in 1868. In 1880 St. Gabriel's Catholic Church outnumbered all other denominations combined.

The first newspaper in Crawford County was started in Prairie du Chien in 1846 by O. J. and H. A. Wright. This was discontinued in 1852 and was succeeded in the same year by the Crawford County Courier, edited by Buel E. Hutchinson. Other early papers were the Prairie \(d u\) Chien Leader, started in 1857 by William Hill, and the Prairie du Chien Union in 1864, by James Green.
\({ }^{2}\) See note 13 ante.

Population Changes.-The population to begin with was mainly French-Canadian. In 1860 there were 461 families in the town, which at this time included the present town of Bridgeport and the city of Prairie du Chien. Of these, less than half were American. There were 119 unattached Americans, again less than half of the total number of single individuals. Ireland furnished the largest number of foreigners at this time, a little over one-third, Germany almost another third, and Canada almost one-fifth. Of the 719 heads of families and single individuals, 110 gave New York as their place of birth, 51 W isconsin (these being largely descendants of the early French-Canadian settlers), 31 Pennsylvania, 26 Ohio, 21 Vermont, 17 Massachusetts, 14 Connecticut, 8 Virginia, 7 New Hampshire, 6 Missouri. States represented by 5 were Maine and Illinois, by 4 Indiana and Minnesota. Kentucky had 3, Louisiana had 2, and Tennessee, Michigan, New Jersey, and Iowa had 1 each. Over
half of the American settlers were from New York and the New England states. Of the total number, however, less than one-fourth were from these states. Another one-fourth were from Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and Indiana.

These figures include the city of Prairie du Chien. Exclusive of the city, nativity of the farmers on the 40 farms reported in the 1860 census is as follows: 18 were American and 20 were foreign born. \({ }^{25}\) Fourteen of the 20 foreigners were Irish, 3 French-Canadians, 2 Germans, and 1 English. Of the Americans the greatest number, 7, were from New York. Four were from New England and 4 were born in Wisconsin (the latter of French-Canadian descent). Two were from Pennsylvania and one from Ohio.

In 1895 the total population of the town, exclusive of the city of Prairie du Chien, was 592. Of these, only one-fourth were foreign born. Forty-two of them were German, 21 Irish, 8 Canadian, 6 English, and 4 Scandinavian. In 1905 out of a total of 581,130 or 22 per cent were foreign born. Out of the 451 native born, 405 or almost 90 per cent were born in Wisconsin. Bohemians were the largest group of foreign born, with 59 , Germans next with 39, and Irish next with 15. There were 9 Swiss, 6 Canadians, and 1 person each from Norway and England.

In 1920 the proportion of foreign born had gone down to 9 per cent, or 46 in a total of 499 . Out of the 453 American born, 397 or about 80 per cent were born in Wisconsin. The largest group of foreigners were Bohemians; Germans were next with 14. There were 2 Scandinavians and 6 persons from other countries.
M. A. K.
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\end{aligned}\right.
\] & \[
\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline \text { many } \\
\text { many }
\end{array}\right.
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|l|l|}
\hline \text { Ireen } \\
\text { land }
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|l|l}
\text { Other } \\
\text { Lands }
\end{array}
\] & Fotal & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Amer-l- } \\
\text { ican }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\left.\right|_{\text {eign }} ^{\text {Fign }}
\] & Tota \\
\hline 1850 & 1,301 & & 493 & 1,012 & & & & & & & 170 & 108 & 279 \\
\hline 1860 & 396 & 817 & 789 & 1,6 & \({ }^{33}\) & \({ }^{141}\) & 214 & 254 & \({ }_{148}^{24}\) & 790 & 184 & 277 & \({ }^{46}\) \\
\hline 1870 & 3,62 & 1,585 & 864 & 2,449 & 267 & 201 & 337 & & & 1,213 & 276 & 410 & 688 \\
\hline 1885 & 651 & & & 464 & & \({ }^{28}\) & \[
{ }_{42}^{47}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 34 \\
& { }_{21}
\end{aligned}
\] & \({ }_{78}^{52}\) & & & 105 & \({ }^{143}\) \\
\hline 1895 & 581 & 405 & \({ }^{46}\) & \({ }_{451}^{443}\) & 59 & \({ }_{6}\) & \({ }_{39}^{42}\) & \({ }_{15}^{21}\) & \({ }_{11}^{73}\) & 139 & \({ }_{41}^{34}\) & \({ }_{66}^{74}\) & \({ }_{102}^{108}\) \\
\hline 1920 & 499 & 397 & & 453 & & & & & & 46 & 83 & 19 & 102 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\(* 1\) family unknown.
\(\dagger 2\) families unknown
\({ }^{2}\) The nativity of two was unknown.
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\section*{PRIMROSE}

LOCATION.-The town of Primrose, organized in 1849, occupies township 5, range 7 east, in the southwestern part of Dane County. It is bounded north by Springdale, east by Montrose, south by New Glarus, Green County, and west by Perry. Until the coming of the railway, about 1853, when a market was available at Madison, the settlers drew their wheat to Milwaukee with ox teams, a seven to nine days' trip. \({ }^{1}\) The lake cities have always been markets for Dane County, and much of the livestock has gone to Chicago. After the construction in 1887 of the Illinois Central Railroad from Madison to Freeport, Belleville in the town of Montrose, four miles from the southeast corner of Primrose, became a shipping point for the southern portion of the town, while the Northwestern Railroad supplied similar facilities at Mount Horeb and other stations near the northern boundary of Primrose

Surface and Drainage.-The town lies in the Driftless Area. Its topography varies from undulating to gently rolling, and the natural drainage is good. There are many slopes


Fig. 31. Topographic Map, Town of Primrose Reproduced from United States Geological Survey New Glarus Quadrangle which are kept in permanent pasture because of the danger of serious washing when planted to a crop like corn. This factor has been important in the development of the dairy-
\({ }^{1}\) History of Dane County, Wisconsin, edited by C. W. Butterfield (Chicago
\({ }^{880}\) ) 917 .
ing industry. The town is not, however, as hilly as some of the neighboring towns, the ascent from the valley floors to the ridges being very gradual and not greater than from 100 to 200 feet. The valleys are shallow and the uplands broad and rolling, with comparatively few steep slopes. The west branch of Sugar River and its affluents, together with the branches of Little Sugar River, water the town. Small rivulets and springs are abundant. The lands, lying as they do nearer the heads of the streams, are less deeply eroded and less rough than those of New Glarus.

Types of Soil.-The map in the soil survey of Dane County shows Knox silt loam, an unglaciated, upland, timbered soil, to be the predominating type. The surface where this soil is found is frequently steep and sometimes rocky. Dairying is very profitably followed, and there are many comfortable farmhouses in this region. Next in importance is Dodgeville silt loam, an unglaciated, upland, prairie soil, which covers most of the northwest and central west parts of the town. About 95 per cent of this soil is cultivated, and the crop yields on it are high. The remainder is in permanent pasture. Other types of soil found in smaller amounts are Wabash silt loam, colluvial phase, along the valleys of the small streams, which usually needs draining before crops can be successfully planted on it, but is highly prized for pasture; and Boone fine sandy loam, found in fairly large areas in the eastern part of the town, generally on rather steep land used mainly for pasture. There are also very small scattered areas of rough, stony land which cannot be used for agricultural purposes. \({ }^{2}\)

Timber.-On the upland timbered Knox silt loam soils, the surveyor, J. W. Stephenson, in 1833 found burr, white, and black oak on most of the sections. On some sections he found only burr oak, and others were thinly timbered with burr and white oak.

Beginnings of Setilement.-The first settler in Dane County was Ebenezer Brigham, who came from Galena to Blue Mounds in 1828, attracted to this farthest north of the lead diggings by its possibilities of wealth. \({ }^{3}\) Others followed him and eventually either began farming or sold their land. Robert Spears was the first settler in Primrose, coming there in 1844 from Ohio. He built the first cabin in the town on section 19, on the road running from the lead mines of southwest Wisconsin to Madison. Although it had not been his original plan or intention, his house was soon used as a tavern by men on their way to the lead mines. \({ }^{4}\) He did not
\({ }^{2}\) Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, Bulletin No. 5s A, Soll Series No. 20, Soil Survey of Dane County, Wisconsin (Madison, 1917).
s Wistory of oflls, ii, 97 .
\({ }^{-}\)History of Dane County, Wisconsin (Madison, 1906), 380.
enter this tract until 1848, paying for it then with a military bounty land warrant.

Land entries were made several years before there was actual settlement. The earliest of these was by Arthur Bronson, a surveyor, on section 36 in 1836. Others were by Thomas Lysaght in 1844, on section 36; W. I. Oliver in 1845, on section 14; E. S. Hale, I. P. Philipps, and H. C. Chandler on sections 2, 9, and 15, in 1846; and G. Coates, E. S. Hale, and G. W. Schofield on sections 2, 3, and 20, in 1847. Entries for the year 1848 are in the names of S. G Hale, W. W. Hale, Joel Britts, D. H. Phillips, Charles Smith, John Keep, Robert Spears, and H. H. Gray on sec tions \(2,4,5,6,7,9,13,19\), and 20 . The only ones among these early claimants to retain their tracts were E. S. Hale, on section 2; W. J. Oliver, on section 14; probably Thomas Lysaght, on section \(36 ;{ }^{5}\) and Joel Britts, on sections 5, 6, and 7.

Other entries followed in 1849, 1850, and the succeeding years, especially in 1854. Some of the early actual settlers were W. W. Stephen, Christian Hendrickson (the first Norwegian), Robert Harrington, W. W. Day, Mr. and Mrs. John Craft, Hall Chandler, William and Fred Underhill, John Jones, Joseph Scofield, Robert White, Jacob and Samuel H. Nofsinger, Charles and Wilmot Marston, William Dudley, Billings Lewis, Freeman Fisher, and the La Follettes (Josiah, William, Warren, Elhanon, Robert, and Harvey M.). Many came from the lead region around Wiota; the La Follettes, Joel Britts, and the Nofsingers came from Indiana. Norwegian settlers from the older Norwegian colonies began coming in 1844. Among them were Nils Skagen, Salve Jorgenson, Nels Einarson, Gunof Tollefson, Ole Danielson, Ole Patterson, and Peter Haslerud: \({ }^{\text {© Great }}\) numbers of Norwegians came in the early fifties, and the early American population was soon far outnumbered by the Scandinavians

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Land. - The Winnebago and Black Hawk wars gave the Illinois militia an opportunity to see southern Wisconsin. Many of these men came back and settled in Primrose and other southern towns of Dane County. The first entries were widely scattered. The fresh water and timber in Primrose were especially attractive to early settlers. Joel Britts, one of the first settlers, raised one of the largest crops of wheat for the town in 1859-1100 bushels on 266 acres of improved land on sections 6 and 7, his original entry in 1848. He also raised in this year 900 bushels of oats. This particular tract, accord-
- The plat gives this same tract under the name of William Lysagt.
- History of Dane County \((1906)\), 380ff.
ing to the soil survey, was part prairie, part oak openings, and was watered by a tributary of a branch of Sugar River.

Progress of Farm Making.-In 1860 Primrose had 7124 acres improved land, and a total of 15,546 acres in its farms-much more than half of the area of the town. Practically all of the land in the town had been entered by 1857, but there had been a great number of original entries, and of transfers from the first American settlers or purchasers to Scandinavians, in the fifties, which may account for the amount of land still undeveloped in 1860. Besides, Primrose was a hilly town for crops, and it was not until the dairy industry began its real development that the rougher land was used for permanent pasture. From 1860 to 1870 the number of farms increased only from 116 to 137, while the total acreage in farms increased to 20,763 acres, almost the entire area of the town. In 1880 the number of farms was 147, the total acreage was about the same, but the improved acreage had increased 2559 acres. By 1905 it had increased again, by 4565 acres, and the number of farms had decreased to 128. The entire town practically was in farms, and the farms had grown in size from an average of 133 acres in \(\mathbf{1 8 6 0}\) to an average of \(\mathbf{1 7 0}\) acres in 1905. The improved acreage had mounted from an average of 61 acres in 1860 to 133 acres in 1905. As early as 1860 seven farms out of a total of 105 had 120 acres and more improved land, these seven farms having respectively \(120,145,150,160,200,232\), and 280 aeres of improved land.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-The classification for the different census periods is as follows: In 1860 there were no farms under 20 acres, in 1870 there was one small farm, and in \(\mathbf{1 8 8 0}\) there were two. Primrose ran to moderately large farms. In 1860 there were 4 farms between 20 and 49 acres, 29 between 50 and 99 acres, 62 between 100 and 174 acres, and 20 between 175 and 499 acres. One farm had 643 acres. In 1870 there were 5 farms between 20 and 49 acres, 30 between 50 and 99,59 between 100 and 174, and 42 between 175 and 499. The large farms were increasing in number but there were none over 500 acres. In 1880 there was a slight decrease in the number of large farms and a shift back to the moderately large farms. There were 8 farms between 20 and 49 acres, 36 between 50 and 99 acres, 62 between 100 and 174 acres, and 37 between 175 and 499 acres. Two farms exceeded 500 acres. One of these had 780 and the other 520 acres.

The extent to which the rougher land was not cultivated in Primrose, as in other towns of the Driftless Area, is brought out in the following classification. In 1860, 42 of the farms had no more than 40 acres of improved land, and 10 farms had over 100 acres. Three of these 10 had 280, 232, and 200 acres improved. Thirty-nine farms had from 41 to \(\mathbf{6 0}\) cultivated acres, and 25 farms from 61 to 100 . Ten years later 23 farms had over 100 acres improved, and 53 farms from 61 to 100 . In this period and in 1880 only 30 farms had

40 acres or less improved. In both periods more than half the farms had over 60 acres cultivated, and in 1880 almost onethird had over 100 acres. The largest improved acreage in any farm was 396 acres in 1880 and 300 acres in 1870.

General Productions.-The census of 1860 records for the whole town a wheat production of 36,492 bushels, which put Primrose seventh in rank among the towns studied. Its average production per farm for this period was 314 bushels. According to the 1870 census it produced 50,193 bushels in 1869, which was 366 bushels per farm. This put the town sixth in total production and third in average per farm. Ten years later the total had fallen to \(\mathbf{1 3 , 5 2 9}\), and Primrose stood third lowest in average per farm, with 92 bushels. In 1884 and 1894 it fell again in production, and in 1904 the yield was only 209 bushels on 13 acres. Primrose was, however, by this time a well developed dairy town.

As a corn town Primrose in 1859 ranked eleventh in total production, with 13,655 bushels. This increased to \(\mathbf{2 0 , 1 2 6}\) bushels in 1869, with an average of 146 bushels per farm, and to 63,215 bushels in 1879, with an average of 430 bushels. In 1904 its total production was about the same. In number of swine Primrose also ranked low. In 1860 it had a farm average of 3.6. In 1880 this had been increased to 14.5 , still a low number proportionally.

The topography, which was somewhat against a high ranking in corn production, was favorable to the development of the dairy industry. From 397 milch cows in 1860 the town increased its number to 2113 in 1895 and to 2305 in 1905. Butter sold and consumed on the farm amounted to 7742 pounds for the year 1904, and cheese, as reported by factories, totaled 913,654 pounds. The cheese production of Primrose became one of its principal sources of income. In 1878 the first cheese factory was built, and by 1885 the gradual filtering in of Swiss from the neighboring town of New Glarus, the proved adaptability of the country, and the development everywhere of diversified farming and dairying, as wheat failed, created a new type of agriculture in Primrose. The census report for that year recorded 327,994 pounds of cheese valued at \(\$ 24,258\). In 1894 the census reported 453,531 pounds valued at \(\$ 31,529\), and in 1904 this amount had doubled and was valued at \(\$ 82,970\).

Special Productions.-Dane County raises more tobacco than any other county in the state, but Primrose produces a very small proportion of this. In 1880 one farmer reported 4000 pounds on 5 acres; another reported 500 pounds on half an acre. In 1884 there was a total amount of 52,000 pounds for the town, and in 1904, 7065 pounds-a small quantity compared with the tobacco producing towns in the southeastern part of the county. Other special productions by 1904 were honey, apples, and potatoes-none in large enough amounts, however, to be really considered a specialization.


Fig. 32. Town of Primrose, 1915
After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company
Value of Productions.-According to the census of 1870 the value of productions in Primrose in 1869 was \(\$ 104,337\), an average of \(\$ 761\) per farm. Less than onefourth of the incomes were over \(\$ 1000\). Ten years later the total had fallen to \(\$ 64,908\) and the average to \(\$ 441\). Wheat growing had failed in Primrose, and dairying had not yet developed sufficiently to compensate for that loss. Thirtyfour incomes were under \(\$ 200\) in 1879, whereas in 1869 only 9 incomes fell in this group. At the first period there were 33 incomes of \(\$ 1000\) or over, the largest being \(\$ 3544\), made out of wheat and corn. Incomes next in size were \(\$ 2802\), \(\$ 2079\), and \(\$ 2026\). Forty-six were between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999\), 27 between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599\), and 22 between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399\). In 1879 the largest income was \(\$ 1800\), made out of dairying and general farming. Thirteen other incomes were of \(\$ 1000\) and over, but none were above \(\$ 1500\). Twenty-two were between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999,35\) between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599\), and 42 between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399\).

By 1904 Primrose was well launched as a dairy town, with an average income of \(\$ 1321\). Only two towns, New Glarus and Sugar Creek, had higher incomes. Dairy productions amounted to \(\$ 774\) of this total, and the average crop income to only \(\$ 40\). By 1920 the number of cows had increased to 3026, and the average farm income in 1919 was \(\$ 3924\). Only one town, New Glarus, exceeded this. Dairy products accounted for \(\$ 2677\) of this, and other livestock productions for the remainder. Crop incomes averaged only \(\$ 1.00\) per farm.

\section*{Manufactures.-Primrose is essentially an agricultural} town. For its manufactures and mill and store products it has depended on the neighboring towns and villages. In 1858 a gristmill was built on section 8 on the south branch of Sugar River, by Edward M. Britts and Charles Smith, but apparently it was used for only a few years. \({ }^{7}\) In 1878 the Primrose Union Cheese Company built a cheese factory, \({ }^{8}\) and the 1895 census reported eleven cheese factories. In 1904 there were sixteen.

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches.There are no villages in the town of Primrose. Baptists and Methodists held services in private homes until a schoolhouse was built. There are now three churches in the town. Two are Norwegian Lutheran-one on section 21, built in the fifties; the other on section 29 , built in 1866. The Scandinavian Methodists built a small church in 1867. In 1847 a post office was established on section 19 in the home of Robert Spears, and he was appointed postmaster. A schoolhouse was built in the same year, and Martha De Corso of Utica, Wisconsin, was appointed the first teacher. \({ }^{9}\) The plat book of 1891 shows schools on sections \(6,11,16,18,23\), and 32.

Population Changes.-In 1860 Primrose had 34 American born heads of families and 116 foreign born. Out of a total population of 852,412 were foreign born. Of these almost 90 per cent were Norwegians. The earliest settlers were Americans, but Norwegians began to arrive in great numbers in the fifties. In 1920 the total population was 684, and the foreign born had dropped from 48 per cent in 1860 to 15 per cent. In 1860 there were 160 Americans who were natives of states other than Wisconsin. This number dropped to 71 in ten years. In the same period the Norwegians and Irish increased slightly in numbers. Norwegian immigration to Primrose kept up through 1920, and the Swiss, who had not been reported by the censuses of 1885 and 1895, were again listed by the censuses of 1905 and 1920. The population of Primrose is, therefore, largely of Nor-
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{14}{|c|}{Primrose-Population Statistics} \\
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\hline 1870 & \({ }^{1} 015\) & \({ }^{474}\) & \({ }^{71}\) & 545 & \({ }_{34}\) & 14 & & & \[
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\end{gathered}
\] & & 19 & & \({ }^{176}\) \\
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\hline \(\underset{\substack{1895 \\ 1905}}{1}\) & \%92 & & & \({ }_{593}^{652}\) & \({ }_{6}^{8}\) & \({ }_{5}^{9}\) & 164
115 & \({ }^{57}\) & 5 & 288 & \({ }_{74}\) & 72 & 146 \\
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\end{tabular}
:History of Dane County (1880), 917.
\({ }^{\text {History }}\) of Dane County (1906), 384.
\(\cdot\) Ibistory of 383 .
wegian and Swiss descent. In agricultural development and success in dairying it resembles closely its neighbor New Glarus.
M. A. K.

\section*{SOCIAL HISTORY OF PRIMROSE}

\section*{Albert O. Barton \({ }^{1}\)}

At the present time the town of Primrose has the smallest population of any town in Dane County, the census of 1920 showing but 684 inhabitants. In fact, the population has been gradually shrinking in the past fifty years, as the highest in its history was in 1870, when the census showed 1015 inhabitants, or 331 more than in 1920. It is a purely agricultural town, and having no cities or villages within its borders, and lying off the more beaten lines of travel, it has been less affected by changes than have most of the other towns of the county.

The town was first settled in 1844 and organized in 1848. The earliest settlers were almost entirely of old American stock. Closely following them came the stream of Norwegian immigration, and for a generation or more the population was overwhelmingly of that stock, a part of the great Norwegian settlement of that region. In more recent years many of the farms have passed into the hands of the Swiss element working in from Green County. It is largely a dairy town, the farmers having got their cue from the success which this industry had brought to their Swiss neighbors of the south.

The first settlers came mostly in groups and along certain lines of travel. From Ohio came Robert Spears, the first settler, and the other Spears; also the Nash, Patchin, Smith, Thomas, and other families. From Indiana came the Brittses, Nofsingers, La Follettes, and Ketchums. From Maine, by way of the Great Lakes, came the several Chandler families, while from the mining region about Wiota came the Hales, Underhills, Joneses, and others. The first Norwegian settler in the town was Christ Hendrickson, who arrived in 1846. Robert Spears was the son of a Revolutionary soldier, and most of the "first things" in the town's history took place in the northwestern part, where he settled. He served in the Civil War, dying before its close; he is buried in the cemetery at Belleville, Wisconsin. The first American settlers were a hardy, intelligent, and cultured group, who organized the town and conducted its business with ability and left well-kept records. They commenced at once the building of schools and obtained teachers from their own ranks. The first Primrose youth to push on for a higher education was Wallace W. Patchin, son of George Patchin, who went to a Michigan academy one summer in the forties and came back a school teacher. It is interesting to note that only last year, 1922, the first teacher in district number two, Mrs. Mary Thomas Parkinson, passed away at the age of eighty-nine, seventy-two years after she, as a girl of seventeen, opened in a \(\log\) cabin the first school in the district.
\({ }^{1}\) The writer of this article, Albert \(\mathbf{O}\). Barton, is assistant editor of the
isconsin Farmer. He is a native of Primrose, son of the Ole Barton mentioned Wisconsin Frarmer. He is a native of Primroses, son of the olice Barton mentioned in the text as one of the leaders of the community. Mr. Barton was graduated
from the University of Wisconsin with the class of 1896 . He entered upon a from the University of Wisconsin with the class of 11996 . He entered upon a
journalistic career and for many years has been closely associted with Senator journalistic career and for many years has been closesy associated wwith senator
La Follette in state and national politics. During the late war he directed for
ther the State Council of Defense the work of assembling and preserving materials in war history. Mr. Barton published this year an
La Follettés' Winning of Wisconsin.- Eorroa.

A year before she died the children of this district honored her by placing, with appropriate exercises, an enlarged portrait of her in the present schoolhouse. This school, in which the writer was long a pupil, is now known as the Britts Valley School, in honor of Joel Britts, who gave the site for the schoolhouse.

Among the more prominent leaders in the first group of settlers were David Thomas, the first chairman of the town; Joel Britts, an extensive landowner and first town school superintendent; and Josiah M. La Follette, father of Senator R. M. La Follette, who, however, died in 1856, while chairman of the town. The American group was not large enough to build a church, but held services in the schoolhouses and private homes.

The Norwegian flood of immigration set into the town so heavily that by 1850 a church congregation was organized by Reverend Elling Eielson, the celebrated pulpiteer and organizer, who for years owned a farm in Primrose. In \(1855-56\) the Norwegians built their first church, hewing the heavy timbers from the woods near the site. Immediately upon its completion this church became the scene of one of the most historic events in the history of the Norwegian Lutheran church of America. The annual convention of the church was held there, with delegates from surrounding states. Violent discussions on doctrinal points arose between Elling Eielson and Reverend P. A. Rasmussen, of Lisbon, Illinois, which resulted in Rasmussen's leading off one party and producing a schism never fully healed. In 1854 Reverend Adolph C. Preus organized a congregation which later joined the Norse Synod. A Norse Methodist congregation was also organized in the fifties by Reverend Chr. B. Willerup, a Dane, who organized the first Scandinavian Methodist church in America, at Cambridge, Wisconsin.

On the border line between the towns of Primrose and Springdale lies the picturesque little village of Mount Vernon, which is associated with Primrose history. This village was founded in 1850 by George Britts, who built a sawmill there. He was a nephew of Joel Britts, of Primrose. The Britts family having originally come from Virginia, he named the place Mount Vernon. Both Primrose and Springdale were settled in the same year, 1844, and in 1919 their seventy-fifth anniversary was observed with a celebration at Mount Vernon. The first settler in what is now Mount Vernon was George Patchin, who built a cabin in 1845, but the same year moved to Primrose. His son, David Patchin, born in October, 1845, was the first white child born in Primrose.

The town of Primrose had a very creditable record in the Civil War, the official records showing that it furnished a total of ninetytwo soldiers. Of these, twenty-seven were members of the Fifteenth Wisconsin, the so-called Norwegian Regiment, which figured so prominently in the battle of Chickamauga. In 1862 a group of volunteers from Primrose, Perry, and York spent three weeks training on the meadow of W. C. B. Weltzin. Three Primrose soldiers were killed in the war-George B. Thomas, son of David Thomas; William E. Moon, a school teacher; and Andrew E. Bearstad. Among Primrose Civil War soldiers still living are N. N. Byrge, Mount Horeb; Edw. S. Ketchum, Los Angeles, California; Ole Nelson, Des Moines, Iowa; and Captain George Jackson, Chicago, whose father died in Rock County and was, so far as is known, the first Norwegian buried in Wisconsin.

Primrose farmers were among the first in the field when the coöperative movement began in the early seventies. On May 10,

1873, the Primrose Farmers' Club was organized for mutual improvement of agricultural methods in the districts, and for coöperation in the purchase and sale of produce. The group consisted of about one hundred members, and regular meetings were held until 1877. April 25, 1874, the Primrose Mutual Fire Insurance Company was organized. This was the pioneer company of its kind in the locality. On February 6, 1878, the Primrose Union Cheese Factory Association was organized, and the first coöperative cheese factory in the town, and one of the first in the county, was built. A leader and organizer in these three enterprises was Ole Barton, who became the first president of the Farmers' Club and secretary of the insurance company.

Primrose owes its chief distinction politically to the fact that it has furnished a representative in Congress, a governor, and a United States senator, all in the person of one man-Robert Marion La Follette, who was born June 14, 1855, on section 18, a few rods from the site of the first settlement in the town. His father, Josiah La Follette, died eight months afterwards, in February, 1856. His widow retained the Primrose farm until 1873, when the family moved to Madison. There were five other La Follette brothers who owned land or lived in Primrose in the fifties. The families came from Indiana about 1850. Earlier they had come from Kentucky and before that from Virginia, where Senator La Follette's mother was born. Robert M. La Follette was the first native of Primrose to graduate from the University of Wisconsin.

The town has been represented in the legislature three times-in 1868 by Gunof Tollefson, in 1883 by Eli Pederson, and in 1889 by P. O. Baker. It has furnished one county clerk-W. C. B. Weltzin (1873-75)-and two district attorneys-R. M. La Follette (188185) and A. J. Myrland, district attorney of Burnett County, later a University regent, and now secretary of the State Tax Commission Other natives of Primrose who attained prominence were David S. Britts, known as the "boy hunter of Primrose," a Civil War veteran, who became a distinguished surgeon and died in Minneapolis in April, 1914; and William T. La Follette, likewise a Civil War veteran, an older brother of Senator Robert M. La Follette, who died some years ago. He became an editor in South Dakota and held there the important office of railroad commissioner.

The original La Follette brothers included Josiah, Elhanon,

William, Warren, Robert, and Harvey M., all of whom owned land in Primrose, but not all of whom lived there. Josiah was the only one married at the time of their coming to Wisconsin, and was the leading spirit among them. At his death all of them returned to Indiana except Harvey M., who remained until 1860, when he also returned and was soon afterwards killed in a runaway. Three of his sons have risen to prominence. Harvey M. La Follette, Jr., became state superintendent of public instruction in Indiana, and later a prominent capitalist of Tennessee; William L. La Follette became a member of Congress from the state of Washington; and Charles S. La Follette became passenger agent of the Big Four Railroad in Chicago. The La Follettes were largely instrumental in introducing horses into Primrose. Elhanon La Follette, a bachelor, was a singing-school teacher and had classes at the Spears Valley and Britts Valley schools.

The early Primrose settlers buried their dead on their farms, in southern fashion. On the old Britts farm is a great clump of lilacs marking burials made seventy years ago, still undisturbed. When Marion, infant son of Josiah La Follette, died he was buried on a farm hillside. When later the father died, both were buried in one grave in the cemetery at Postville, Green County, whence the remains were later transferred to Madison. In the Postville cemetery were also buried David Thomas, the first chairman of the town, his son George, killed in the Civil War, and other pioneers.

It often happens that some particular little spot or area acquires many unique historical distinctions. This is true of the little locality known as Spears Valley in northwestern Primrose. In this valley, as stated above, most of the interesting "first things" in the history of the town occurred. Here came the first settler; here occurred the first marriage, the first birth, the first death in the town. Here was the first post office; here was taught the first school; here the first town meetings and the first religious services were held. Here also was born, but a few feet from the first \(\log\) cabin, Wisconsin's first native-born governor and present senior United States senator. To continue the distinctions, the great tornado of 1878 swept through the valley, leaving its trail of desolation. All these events occurred within a radius of a mile from the big spring on section 19, where Robert Spears and his nephew Isaac Spears came in a covered wagon in 1844 and built the first cabin.

Primrose lays claim to seven graduates of the University of Wisconsin, these being Robert M. La Follette, August J. Myrland, Albert O. Barton, Ella A. Barton, Nina Skuldt (deceased), Orville Osmundsen, and Stella Osmundsen. Other natives or one-time residents of the town have graduated from other universities and colleges. Among them may be mentioned Reverend Alvin Nesheim, who graduated from Augsburg Seminary in 1915, and Merle Rue, who graduated from St. Olaf's College in 1921.

Since the organization of the Republican party, Primrose has been overwhelmingly Republican in political sentiment. In one election after another, also, in the past twenty years it has given a wellnigh unanimous vote to its native son Robert M. La Follette, and in the election of 1922 it presented the unusual spectacle of casting every one of its 131 votes for him for United States senator.

From the organization of the town until near the close of the Civil War, scarcely any but Yankee names were found among the town officers. Since that time the names have been almost wholly of Norwegian origin. Among the early political leaders in the Norwegian element were W. C. B. Weltzin and Gunof Tollefson. Weltzin had been educated in Norway and was repeatedly elected a town officer, having been chairman four years, clerk ten years, and treasurer four years. Two men who largely administered the town's affairs later for over a decade were Peter O. Baker, afterwards assemblyman, and Ole Barton. Baker was town chairman for ten years, from 1879 to 1889, and a supervisor before that time. Barton had an even longer record of service, being town clerk for eleven years, 1871 to 1884 , and chairman four years, between 1889 and 1894, besides being supervisor several times. These two able and well-read men were intimate personal and political friends and near neighbors, whose tastes and reading ran in the direction of public affairs. For years they were wont to meet and hold long and frequent discussions on such subjects-discussions marked by great liberality and intelligence,and in their day they may be said to have been the leaders in political thought in the town.

At present hardly any of the original American farms remain in possession of the families who first owned them, and the fact that many of their present owners bear German or Swiss names indicates the changing character of the population.


\section*{P U L A S K I}

LOCATION.-The town of Pulaski embraces township 8 , range 1 east, and also the west one-third of township 8, range 2 east, in Iowa County. The Wisconsin River forms the northern boundary of the town throughout its extent of eight miles. \({ }^{1}\) The town of Clyde is on the east, Highland on the south, and Muscoda in Grant County on the west. The two villages of Muscoda and Avoca, six miles apart (the latter within the town limits) on the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railroad, are the principal markets, though in earlier times the mining centers of Highland and Mineral Point were utilized by the farmers living in the town. Ferry connection was maintained in early days with the north side of the Wisconsin at Richland City. Lone Rock lies just east of Pulaski, across the Wisconsin.

Surface and Drainage.-All of Pulaski is in the Driftless Area. The northern one-third of the town occupies the sandy plain bordering the Wisconsin, the balance lies in the uplands and small valleys south of the river (fig. 7). Underwood Creek is the principal stream. The bluffs of the Wisconsin extend almost due east and west through the town, reaching an elevation of 1100 feet above sea level or 400 feet above the river plain. Much of the surface of the upland is rough, some of it rocky. There are in places beetling cliffs of sandstone. On the whole, however, the ridges have considerable breadths of cultivable land; and the valleys, though narrow, on account of their length contribute an appreciable body of flat lowland. It may be said that the upland portion of Pulaski contains more area with favorable surface for agricultural purposes than does the lowland portion, much of which near the river is marshy and the balance sandy.

Types of Soil.-The United States surveyor Sylvester Sibley described the soil of township 8, range 1 east as mainly second-rate and poor, although he found a little land which he called good. The soil survey of Iowa County represents the upland soil as Knox silt loam-an excellent general farming soil,-the lowland slopes from the foothills to the beginning of the alluvial as Lintonia silt loam, and the alluvial in the narrow valleys as Wabash silt loam. Where the smaller streams (especially Underwood Creek) debouch from the bluffs, there was spread upon and mixed with the sand of the Wisconsin River plain a body of rich upland silt. The resultant is called Wabash loam and constitutes in area the equivalent of about four sections. \({ }^{2}\) It is especially fine soil for growing corn, is friable, well drained, and easily tilled. The presence of the Wabash loam in Pulaski differentiates that town from Muscoda, where the river plain is almost exclusively of Plainfield sand. Another difference between the
\({ }_{2}^{1}\) This description follows the latest Iowa County atlas, dated 1915.
\({ }^{2}\) Soil Survey of Iowe County.
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two towns is in the breadth of marsh land, which in Pulaski is often a full mile along the river front, whereas Muscoda has dry land down to the river's edge. The importance of the marsh lies in its supply of quantities of cheap but coarse hay, which influenced the business of stock raising on the adjacent farms. The marsh furnished free hay for winter, the bluffs free range for summer. In time, to be sure, these lands were considered valuable enough to pass under private ownership.

Timber.-The river plain bore very little timber of any kind. The uplands and the narrow valleys were generally thinly timbered with oak. Some tracts had only scattering oak trees, some had clumps of hickory, and there were a few other kinds of trees. It was an open town, but the oaks were in many cases old, heavy, and had great spread of branches. Clearing consisted in removing a few of these obdurate big trees from each acre before starting the plow.

Beginnings of Settlement.-The purchase of land for settlement was preceded by purchases made for speculative purposes. As early as 1835 a tract of river front land in fractional section 6 was entered by William Shaw Russell, and adjoining lots were purchased in 1836 by Stephen Taylor and others, including Thomas Jefferson Parish, whose activities in and about the trading post of Muscoda and also in Eagle were referred to in our account of those towns. Parish and his associates bought farming land near the bluffs, in the Wabash loam soil, as well as river front land, but there is no evidence of intention to settle.

The earliest settler in the town, according to tradition, was John Booth of Kentucky, said to have entered the town in 1835, settling in section \(23 .^{3}\) The land office records fail to confirm this tradition. His son (report says) was William S. Booth, who had been associated with Hamilton's smelting operations at Muscoda and who is said to have settled in Pulaski in 1841, but whose land entries were all of later date. \({ }^{4}\) It seems probable that John Booth was a squatter, but William \(S\). Booth became an important settler. Perhaps the first permanent settler in the town was Vincent Dziewanowski, a Polish refugee and revolutionist of 1832, who began smelting lead for Hamilton at Muscoda in 1836, took up his first claim in 1838, and seems to have lived on his land from about the year 1840, though he is known to have married and brought his wife to it in 1843.5 He lived in section 23 in the little valley of Booth Creek. Hard by settled, about 1843, Solon R. Walbridge and Charles Walbridge. Elisha (or Elijah) Alexander entered land in section 23 in the year 1839, and Isaac Alexander is said to have settled there in 1840. Other early settlers were William Garland, Samuel Swinehart (a pioneer lumberman of Richland County), the Underwoods (Oliver Perry and P. M.), Amos Kendall, and Henry Husk.

The early farms were opened on the Wabash loam soil of the Wisconsin River plain or near the mouths of the smaller valleys. The sole local market at first was Muscoda, which, beginning about 1837, became an important steamer port on

\footnotetext{
\({ }_{-1}^{*}\) History of Iowa County, Wisconsin (Chicago, 1881), 825.
\({ }^{8}\) Mrs. William F. Allen, "A Polish Pioneer's Story," in Wisconsin Magazine of History, vi, 373 (June, 1923).
}
the river, but some trading was done at Mineral Point and at Highland. These farms in Pulaski occupied, indeed, the most conveniently located rich soils to supply the limited Muscoda trade. When the railroad began building westward from Madison in 1853 and ' 54 it was known that a wider market would soon be available, and then the uplands were rapidly absorbed, together with all valuable lands in the river valleys. Since the oldest settlers are known to have been in the town from the early forties, yet in some cases were not land entrymen until the fifties, it seems probable that they either farmed selected tracts of government land or else lived on land early purchased by some of the speculators mentioned.

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Land.-Pulaski's fertile plane land and picturesque valleys offered exceptional advantages to farmers who depended on the river trade, because good soil was scarce near the river on the south side. On the other hand, the eight-mile stretch of Plainfield sand and marsh land did not attract purchasers for many years. Speculators who happened to enter lands in those tracts were glad to be rid of them at any price. \({ }^{6}\) The uplands were taken, when the railway approached completion, because they offered a favorable opportunity for wheat growing, the task of clearing the oak openings being comparatively light. Some lands were held by speculators but the aggregate was not large. A considerable number of the early settlers came in from the lead mines, while the later comers were in part immigrant Germans, Irish, Bohemians, and English who sought government land in favorable wheat growing districts. To a certain extent, Pulaski was a "new frontier" to persons who settled first in the older agricultural sections of the state. \({ }^{7}\) A road having been opened very early to Highland and Mineral Point, the lead mining connection was maintained for both social and business purposes.

Progress of Farm Making.-According to the census of 1860, Pulaski farms numbered 139 and contained 18,243 acres. Of that amount 5664 acres or an average of 40 acres per farm was under cultivation, while 12,579 or an average per farm of 90 acres remained uncultivated. The change in the next ten years was moderate. The farms in 1870 numbered 162, the average of improved land was 50 acres, and the average of unimproved 77 acres. The aggregate of land in farms had risen to 20,682 acres or 127 acres per farm. The 1880 census reveals much progress. The farms at that time numbered 179, and included 25,531 acres, of which 12,378 acres was improved. The average of improved land was 68 acres, of unimproved 73. Castle Rock, Highland, and Muscoda, neighboring towns south of the Wisconsin, all had more cultivated land per farm than Pulaski, but Eagle and Orion, north of the river, had less. Twenty-five years later, according to the state census of 1905, Pulaski had 153 farms which
\({ }^{-}\)See Introduction
Thus John Day came from England to Racine County, where he became the owner of 20 acres. Wanting more land, which was already high priced at the
lake shore, he went to Pulaski and entered government land in section 32 on the
uplands, making a valuable wheat farm.
included an aggregate of 30,259 acres, of which 13,711 was improved land and 16,548 unimproved. This gave an average of 191 acres per farm, and an average of almost 87 acres under cultivation. This census shows that the farms had been growing less numerous and larger, and that the cultivated area had expanded only a very little during a quartercentury. The comparison of improved with unimproved land indicates the roughness of the town. The steep slopes and rocky hills have some value for pasturage, but more for timber. Since the decline of wheat growing, many gullied slopes have been thrown into pasture lots or used as permanent meadow.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-In 1850 Pulaski had 17 farms all told. Of these, 11 had less than 40 acres of cultivated land, and 6 over 40 acres. The 1860 census shows one farm of less than 20 acres. There were 23 in the second classification, 20 to 49 acres; 40 in the third, 50 to 99 acres; 43 in the fourth, 100 to 174 acres; and 32 in the fifth, 175 to 499. The largest farm at that date was 490 acres. Ninety-five of the farms had 40 acres or less under cultivation, only 44 had more than 40 acres, and only 5 more than 100 acres cultivated. Two farms had 160 acres each of cultivated land. The 1870 record is as follows: one very small farm of less than 20 acres, and one very large farm of more than 500 acres (that one had 700 acres); 25 that had from 20 to 49 acres, 48 that had 50 to 99 acres, 60 that had 100 to 174 acres, and 27 of 175 to 499 acres. But the number having 40 acres or less under cultivation was 89 ; from 41 to 60 acres, 32 ; from 61 to 100 acres, 27 ; and over 100 acres, 14. The largest number of cultivated acres in any farm was \(\mathbf{3 4 0}\). There was also one farm having 160, one 150 , one 140 , one 130, and four which had each 120 acres under cultivation. Of the 179 farms in the town in 1880, one had less than 20 acres, and 26 between 20 and 49 acres. The third and fourth classes comprised the majority of all the farms, there being 48 between 50 and 99 acres and 63 between 100 and 174 acres. Class four, 175 to 499 acres, had 39 ; class five, 500 and over, 2. At that time 71 farms had 40 acres or less under cultivation, and the other three classes had 32,42 , and 34 respectively. Two farms had 350 acres each.

General Productions.-In 1859 Pulaski grew wheat to the extent of 189 bushels per farm on the average, which ranked that town eleventh on our list of twenty-one towns. The record in 1869 was 205 bushels as an average, which was exceeded by thirteen towns. But in 1879 it was 202 bushels, and the town then ranked fifth among the twenty-three towns. Those which exceeded Pulaski were Newton, Highland, Empire, and Bangor. The statercensus of 1885 credits Pulaski with 1626 acres of wheat yielding 24,478 bushels, or a trifle over 15 bushels per acre. In 1894 the acreage was 982 acres, the product was 17,495 bushels; and in 1904 Pulaski had 285 acres of wheat. Wheat, therefore, may be said to have disappeared as a principal crop.

The history of corn culture can be summarized as follows: 301 bushels per farm in 1859, 227 in 1869, 457 in 1879, 2326 acres with an average yield of \(\mathbf{3 2}\) bushels in 1884, 1875 acres and an average yield of less than 20 bushels per acre in 1894, 2513 acres with an aggregate yield of 92,720 bushels in 1904. That makes an average yield of nearly 37 bushels. Since the farms in 1905 numbered 153, the corn crop per farm averaged 599 bushels.

In the item of livestock Pulaski has held a medium position among the twenty-three towns. In 1860 there were in the town 308 horses, or 2.6 to the farm; \(\mathbf{3 7 0}\) cows, which is nearly 3 to the farm; 179 working oxen; and 431 other cattle, or over 3 to the farm. At that census there were also 6 sheep and 9 swine to the farm and the aggregate value of livestock was \(\$ 322\) per farm. Eight towns had a higher average and twelve a lower. It is a commentary on the excellence for corn growing of Pulaski's Wabash loam that the town had more swine to the farm than any other town except Prairie du Chien. Ten years later Highland had 11 and Castle Rock 10, while Pulaski's 9 tied with Muscoda, these four towns having more than any of the others. The aggregate livestock valuation per farm in Pulaski in 1870 was \(\$ 486\), which was exceeded in thirteen other towns. In the \(\mathbf{1 8 8 0}\) census this town stood number eighteen in livestock valuation per farm.

The production of butter per farm averaged, according to the 1860 census, 220 pounds; ten years later, 148 pounds; and ten years later still, 147 pounds. Up to 1885 there was practically no cheese produced in the town. In 1885 the state census assigned to Pulaski \(\$ 4840\) worth of butter and \(\$ 6837\) worth of products "not herein before enumerated," which may refer to cheese made in factories. In the 1895 census the value of cheese is given as \(\$ 16,425\), the amount 189,865 pounds, and in 1904 the value of all dairy products was \(\$ 203\) per farm on the average, or an aggregate for the town of \(\$ 31,059\). This was made up almost wholly of cheese. At the last date given the total livestock productions amounted to \(\$ 516\) per farm and constituted five-sixths of the farm income.

Special Productions.-Pulaski, in the early years, was one of the high ranking towns in the production of hay. Her farm average in 1859 was 15 tons; in 1869 it was 10, and in 1879 it was 14, with 3 bushels of clover seed per farm in addition. In 1904 the hay crop was 4419 tons-an average of almost 29 tons to the farm. It was worth \(\$ 22,686\). However, the hay crop considered in comparison with that of other towns was not notable after 1859, and the reason is that the hay marshes along the Wisconsin were extensive only with reference to the small amount of land farmed in the early period-not absolutely, with reference to the town as a whole. Possibly hay does not deserve to be called a specialty, and there seems to have been no other, although Pulaski is one of the few towns which, because it possessed a strip of sandy land, produced some rye, which continues to be grown there.

In 1869 there were, however, several farmers who grew some hops. Samuel Swinehart had the largest amount, 6000 pounds, Oliver Perry Underwood 2400 pounds, and Vincent Dziewanowski 500 pounds. The hop yards were in the Wabash loam soils.


Fig. 34. Town of Pulaski, 1915 After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company

Value of Productions.-In 1869 there were 9 farm incomes of less than \(\$ 200,47\) which ranged from \(\$ 200\) to \(\$ 399\), 38 from \(\$ 400\) to \(\$ 599,37\) from \(\$ 600\) to \(\$ 999\), and 31 over \(\$ 1000\). The largest income that year, \(\$ 3246\), was from the farm of John Gallagher, which comprised 700 acres and had 340 acres of improved land. The farm was valued at \(\$ 17,000\), its livestock at \(\$ 1325\). It produced 700 bushels of wheat, 1500 bushels of corn, 1100 of oats. There were 32 swine, 10 sheep, 4 horses, 9 milch cows, and 15 other cattle. The value of animals slaughtered on the farm was \(\$ 665\).

Ten years later the number of incomes under \(\$ 200\) reached 34 , and those of the second grade 65 . That is to say, 99 out of 179 farms, or more than one-half of the whole, made incomes of less than \(\$ 400\). Only 23 farms made \(\$ 400\) to \(\$ 599\), 39 farms \(\$ 600\) to \(\$ 999\), and 17 farms over \(\$ 1000\). One farm reported no income. The average for all farms in 1879 was \(\$ 467\).

The second largest income was \(\$ 1834\), derived from a 120 acre farm valued at \(\$ 4000\), owned by Patrick Brown. Other high incomes were \(\$ 1530, \$ 1521, \$ 1500, \$ 1461, \$ 1450\), and \(\$ 1436\). The successful farmers producing these incomes were John C. Schafer, Rufus Bennett, Thomas Day, Oliver P. Underwood, Samuel Swinehart, and Vincent Dziewanowski.

In 1904 the average farm income had gone up to only \(\$ 607\) from \(\$ 467\) in 1879. The number of cows, however, had increased from 618 to 1057 . In 1919 the number of cows had more than doubled, and dairy productions had advanced in value to \(\$ 1219\). Average farm incomes had gone up to \(\$ 2150\). Crop incomes averaged \(\$ 91\) per farm in 1904 and only \(\$ 67\) in 1919.

Manufactures.-The first mill in Pulaski is said to have been erected on Booth's Creek in 1847 by H. Mears and H. Atkins. The dam being erected on government land in section 23, thereby causing the water to flood a portion of Dziewanowski's claim, that settler entered the land containing the mill site, thus preventing its use for mill purposes. The incident created bitter feeling among the settlers, who needed a mill, and it is one of the few cases which went against the miller. Probably the reason lay in the fact that an equally good mill site existed just below, in section 14, where the mill was promptly established and where it continued under various managements for a number of years. \({ }^{8}\)

Avoca had a planing mill, blacksmith and wagon shops, tinner's shop, harness shop, etc., but no general manufacturing developed in Pulaski until with the rise of cheese making in the 1880's cheese factories became numerous.

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches.Avoca, established in 1857, after the completion of the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railroad through the town, is the only village. It became and long remained an important trading point both for the farmers of the town, for some of those living in neighboring towns, and for the miners from fifteen to thirty miles to the southward who produced "black jack." Many of the "prairie farmers" on the Military Ridge marketed wheat and hogs at Avoca and bought supplies there. Avoca, too, appears to be the only post office the town has had since pioneer days, when a post office named Wallis existed for some years. The high school at Avoca, created under the impulse of the state free high school law of 1875, became an important educational center for the surrounding rural population as well as for the village. Avoca's school history, however, was important long before the establishment of the free high school. As early as 1860 the village had an able schoolmaster of eastern training-Isaac A. Sabin, who attracted advanced pupils from as far west as the town of Hickory Grove in Grant County. Among later school principals several became men of note. Aside from the graded schools in the village, which serve a large district, there were in 1915 schools in sections \(29,27,8\), and in section 30 , range 2 east.

The first religious services were held at the home of Vincent Dziewanowski by the Methodist denomination, probably in the early 1840's. The very first preacher is said to have been a kleptomaniac of the type sometimes called by the less
- There was a mill at Avoca during the recent war which, because it ground wheat into excellent flour while all other local mills in that region had either wheat into exceleecme feed mills, attracted custom among the farmers within a
sunpended or ber some thirty miles.
radius of
euphonious name of horsethief. Experience with him did not discourage the local Methodists, who maintained services faithfully, and when the village of Avoca was founded worshiped there, in various buildings, until their church was completed in 1864. A Congregational church, also, was built in the village, and later a church of the Catholic faith. In the rural town are three churches--Catholic, Lutheran, and German Presbyterian, all of which served for many years the religious needs of the people.

Population Changes.-In 1850, according to the census, the town of Pulaski had 181 inhabitants. Of these, 162 were of American and 19 of foreign birth. They were grouped in 34 families, 26 with American heads, 8 with foreign born heads. Ten years later the American families numbered 126, the foreign 70, and ten years after that the numbers were almost exactly reversed-that is, American families numbered 73, foreign 124. From that date, 1870, foreign families predominated till 1905, when the numbers were 91 and 68 respectively. In 1920 they were 206 and 63. These foreigners were mainly from Germany, which in 1870 furnished 181, and from Bohemia, 113. Among the native born in 1870, the number born in Wisconsin was 454, in other American states 260. Of the latter, 103 were natives of New York, 37 each of Pennsylvania and Ohio, 19 of Illinois, 10 of Vermont, 7 of Rhode Island, 5 each of Massachusetts and Indiana, 4 of Iowa, 3 each of Connecticut, Virginia, and Kentucky, and 1 of Delaware. Fifty years later 1033 were natives of Wisconsin, while only 57 had birthplaces in other American states and only 133 in foreign countries. The population of Pulaski increased 324 between 1905 and 1920.
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\section*{GLIMPSES OF SOCIAL HISTORY IN PULASKI}

Just ten years ago Mrs. Chester W. Smith (Clara Daggett) of Portage, Wisconsin, who spent her girlhood in Avoca, began a correspondence which led to the publication of her interesting Reminiscences of Avoca, Wisconsin, for the "Good Fellowship Club." Mrs. Smith came to Avoca as a young girl with her family in the early days of the Civil War, and remained until she was prepared to teach
\({ }^{1}\) Printed at Portage, Wisconsin, 1914.
school, about 1870. \({ }^{2}\) The correspondence which she initiated in 1913 resulted in the organization of the Public School Good Fellowship Club of Avoca-that name being suggested by Henry Sherman Vail, of Chicago, one of her schoolmates of half a century earlier. The idea was to assemble letters from as many of the former schoolmates as could still be reached, collect a small fund, print the letters with other matter, and distribute to all who were especially interested. Mr. Vail was chosen president of the club, and Mrs. Smith secretarytreasurer.

Mrs. Smith wrote her reminiscences in an informal, chatty, humorous, but sympathetic manner. She apparently tried to recover some characteristic picture of each of the families she had known intimately, as they used to gather at the "brown church" for preaching services and Sunday-school. The total number of adults and young persons mentioned as attending the regular service is ninetyseven. The minister spoken of was Reverend Alfred A. Overton, a native of Connecticut, who in 1860 was forty-five years of age. Mr. Overton spent many years in the service of the Avoca Methodist Episcopal church, reared an interesting family there, and exerted an influence for good which is incalculable. Among the parishioners were James W. Vail, the railway station agent at Avoca, a native of New York; his wife Rebecca, a native of Connecticut, spoken of as the best educated woman who ever settled in Avoca; their four daughters and son Henry, all natives of Wisconsin. Mrs. Vail was a great-granddaughter of Roger Sherman. The Vails came to Wisconsin in early territorial days, settling near Janesville. The daughters became teachers, one of them being remembered as a special favorite of the Avoca public school pupils. Henry Sherman Vail attained prominence as an insurance actuary and for many years was head of the actuarial firm of H. S. Vail and Sons, Chicago. The Snows, a Massachusetts family, were also connected with the business of the railway at Avoca, and a number of other families mentioned resided in the village. But a large proportion of the church congregation conjured up by Mrs. Smith belonged to families from the surrounding rural neighborhood. Such were the Underwoods, Walbridges, Dziewanowskis, Ashleys, Husks, Hurds, and others.

In addition to those who frequented the "brown church," Mrs. Smith mentions the McAllisters, Dimocks, Pattens, Lincolns, Nichols, Richardsons, Ingrahams, Franklins, Garlands, and others-
"She was described as a "school teacher" in the census schedule for 1870,
when her age was given as eighteen. when her age was given as eighteen.
mostly farm people. Investigation would show that the majority of the farmers whose personalities lingered in her memory were among those living in the lowland portion of Pulaski, the ridge people being less habituated to participation in the social life of the village. Still, she accounts for a good proportion of the settlers, and they were, with rare exceptions, American born and mostly Easterners. A similar survey of the frequenters of the little German Presbyterian church, located by the side of the Muscoda-Highland road on Hickory Flat, would present a very different story, as would also a survey of the rural Lutheran church and the Catholic church.

Mrs. Smith's main purpose was to revive the memory of the school fellows, the teachers, and characteristic incidents occurring in the social environment of the school. She remembered Mr. Sabin as teacher but did not attend his school, which was about to close when she arrived. There was trouble because some of the girls danced during the school week. \({ }^{3}\) Then came Emma Daggett, a cousin, and Cornelia A. Derby, of Vermont, who taught one year and returned home, Mr. Parks, Myra Vail, Oliver Ashley, Oliver Underwood, and Abbie Taggert. About 100 pupils were in attendance during those years, the upper room having 50 . The subjects of instruction appear to have included algebra, although this was before the days of the high school. Wilson's United States History and the state and national constitutions were memorized, as was Clark's Grammar, while the youngsters read the stories and poems from McGuffey's Fifth Reader with as little understanding of their meaning as those of similar age have today. "It was a long time," says Mrs. Smith, "before I understood the following, because each one read it to suit himself:

> The footman with his usual phrase Comes up with 'Madam, dinner stays.'

I wasn't sure whether 'Madam, dinner stays' was a woman or a corset." The pupils edited a school paper called "The Prairie Flower," writing (not printing) in it both prose items and verse. They also had "exhibitions" on Friday afternoons, which included tableaus, recitations, and part-songs. Spelling matches were as popular in the Avoca school as elsewhere. The children of one family, from Maine, shone in mathematics, which may explain why the boys became bankers. Of considerable community importance
'She does not mention the epidemic of diphtheria which broke out in the school during Mr. Sabin's year and brought tragedy to distant country homes.
was the Good Templars Lodge, created, it would seem, by the enthusiasm mainly of Uri Lord, an Easterner.

The Civil War brought to these schoolmates the full measure of patriotic ecstasy, of distressing apprehension, joy, and sorrow. There were partings with the young soldiers when the train carried them to Camp Randall; there were war marriages, entertainments to raise soldier funds, and the inevitable, pathetic military funerals. "The first soldier to be buried in Avoca," writes our chronicler, "was Captain Jerry Moore. As the flag-draped coffin stood in front of the pulpit in the church, I think we began to realize that war wasn't all cheers and glory. . . . Walter Smith, whose life in Libby Prison left him almost a skeleton, and an invalid, proved the horrors of a prison."

The letters, twenty-eight in number, elicited by Mr. Vail's circular reinforced by communications from the secretary, are an evidence of the centrifugal forces which were operative in that period. Only two of the twenty-eight were dated at Avoca, and only one other was written in Iowa County. Wisconsin continued to be the home of eight, California claimed three, Colorado two, Nebraska two, Iowa two, Illinois, Ohio, Vermont, South Dakota, Montana, Washington, Minnesota each one. The most distant of Mrs. Smith's correspondents was W. H. Swinehart, son of the pioneer Sam Swinehart, who started the first sawmill in Richland County. Swinehart reported: "I came to Yukon in 1898, from Juneau, Alaska. came with the big gold stampede of over 20,000 people on the trail at the same time. I claim distinction as being the only man in that big crowd who came for the purpose of farming. I had four horses, plows, harrows, seed potatoes, cultivators, and provisions for a year and a half. In fact, our party was quite a curiosity because we were not seeking gold. I have been farming here since 1898 with varied success, and would have plenty and to spare if I had kept what money I made growing stuff for the gold seekers to eat; but in Rome one does as the Romans do, speculates in gold fields of course."

Thus did the pioneering spirit which brought to Pulaski men from New England, the Middle States, the South, and the West, together with representatives of several European stocks, urge these same men and their descendants to the conquest of newer and ever newer portions of the American continent. Possibly Pulaski is merely typical of southern Wisconsin towns in this respect. Yet it seems as if the "scattering" from that little neighborhood during the seventies and the eighties was rather exceptional.
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\section*{SEVASTOPOL}

LOCATION.-The town of Sevastopol, organized in 1859, occupies township 28 north, ranges 26 and 27 and a small corner of range 25 east, in Door County. It is bounded north by the towns of Harbor and Jacksonport, east by Lake Michigan, south by the town of Sturgeon Bay, and west by Green Bay. The town was originally called Laurieville, but in 1860 the name was changed to Sevastopol.

Door County is unique among Wisconsin counties, in that it is a narrow peninsula about sixty miles long, eighteen miles wide at the south end, about four miles at the north, with a shore line of more than two hundred miles. With the completion of the Sturgeon Bay Canal the northern end became practically an island. Washington, Rock, and Chambers islands are a part of the county.

In 1856 there were, for the entire county, only a few rough logging roads near Sturgeon Bay. The long shore line and the narrowness of the peninsula made travel by water so easy that the settlers were not interested in roads, especially since the county was so heavily wooded that road building was of more than the usual hardship in pioneer communities. Green Bay, fifty miles to the south of Sturgeon Bay, was the nearest trading point in the earliest days. It was reached by a long trip on foot through the woods or by water. As the lumbering centers developed, they were markets for agricultural products.

There were three early shipping points in Sevastopol: Podunk, a small lumbering village in the extreme northwestern corner of the town, later called Thayerville, where a pier was built about 1867; Lily Bay, originally known as St Joseph, in the southeastern corner of the town, an important shipping point about 1884 and a regular port for the Goodrich boats; and Whitefish Bay, where a lumber mill and pier were built probably in the sixties by V. and C. V. Mashek. \({ }^{2}\) Sturgeon Bay, the county seat in the town south of Sevastopol, is now the fruit distributing center for the entire fruit region which lies mainly in the towns of Sturgeon Bay and Sevastopol. Farm produce is shipped chiefly by water.

There is at present only fifteen miles of railroad in the county, none of it in Sevastopol; but the system of highways, built since 1905, is unusually good, and there are freight and passenger automobile stages and regular lines of lake boats to Milwaukee and Chicago.

Surface, Soils, Drainage, and Climate.-All of Door County lies in the region of the late Wisconsin drift. The predominating soils are the Miami series. Miami loam covers
\({ }^{1}\) It was supposedly named Sebastopol, after the Russian fortress captured in the Criman War, but through an error was officially entered on the records as
Sevastopol. H. R. Holand. \(A\) History of Door County, Wisconsin (Chicago, 1917), Sevastopol. H. R. Holand, \(A\) History of Door County, Wisconsin (Chicago, 1917),
S23. \({ }^{323 .}{ }_{2}{ }_{\text {Ibid. }}\), 325.
31.5 per cent of the county and is most extensive north of Sturgeon Bay. The surface varies from gently undulating to rolling. About 60 per cent of this soil is under cultivation. Fruit growing is the most important industry, although dairying has increased during the last few years. A strip of land about three-fourths to one-fourth of a mile wide, extending along Lake Michigan south a little beyond the Sturgeon Bay Canal and north to the end of the peninsula, consists of beach sand. This is washed up by the waves and is practically unproductive. Along the west coast south almost to Sturgeon Bay is found a line of steep bluffs. There are also scattered areas of Miami silt loam, which vary from gently undulating to rolling, and in some places-such as section 21 and the northwest quarter of section 22 in range 26 of Sevastopolare nearly level. The town has a few short streams, some of which are dry during a portion of the year. Clark Lake occupies parts of sections 2,3 , and 4 of range 27 , and extends into the town of Jacksonport. There are three small lakesone between sections 30 and 31 , one on section 21, and one between sections 21 and 16 .

The climate of Door County has been an important factor in its agricultural history. It is ideal for fruit growing, because it is made equable by the large bodies of water almost surrounding the county. The average growing season in the vicinity of Sturgeon Bay is 129 days, which compares favorably with that of North Yakima, Washington, and Hamilton, Montana-two of the important western fruit growing districts. \({ }^{3}\)

Timber.-Sevastopol was originally very heavily timbered. The government surveyor in 1835 noted for range 26, cedar, hemlock, birch, maple, aspen, pine, and oak. A large part of the county was covered with white pine. Trees in Sturgeon Bay and Sevastopol measured three and four feet in diameter, and an account is given by one of the old settlers in the town of Clay Banks, of a tree that was three feet in diameter ninety feet from the ground, and scaled 10,000 feet of lumber. \({ }^{4}\). The great fire of 1871 , which raged for days and caused the loss of many lives, much property, and most of the great forest in the southern part of the county, burned out trees which had stood for a hundred years or more.

Beginnings of Settlement.-French fur traders entered this region very early. In 1669 Father Claude Allouez, a French missionary, came to the shores of Green Bay, where he found eight French fur traders who had preceded him. On December 2, 1669, Allouez established the mission of St. Francis Xavier, at the Indian village on the west shore of
\({ }^{5}\) Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, Bulletin No. 52 D, Soll Series No. 19, Soil Survey of Door County, Wisconsin (Madison, 1919). \({ }_{\bullet}\) Holand, 445 .

Green Bay. A year later this mission was moved to Red Banks, and in 1671 to Depere. \({ }^{5}\) In 1816, when American troops were sent to take over the post at Green Bay, they stopped at Washington Island, which was renamed after their flagship, having been previously called Huron and Potawatomi Island successively. Chambers Island was named for Colonel Talbot Chambers of the United States army. \({ }^{\text {e }}\) Other travelers touched the shores of Door county in early days. In 1680 Henri de Tonti and his party, retreating from hostile Indians on the Illinois River, crossed the Sturgeon Bay portage. Mrs. Henry Baird wrote a description of a trip in 1825 along the eastern coast of Green Bay to Mackinac Island. \({ }^{7}\)

The earliest settlers after the county was surveyed, in 1834 and 1835, were fur traders and fishermen. The first of these was Increase Claflin, a New Yorker of New England descent, with a long frontier experience in the West, who built in March, 1835, the first house in Door County, on what is now known as Little Sturgeon Point. \({ }^{8}\) In 1836 fishermen came to Rock Island. About 1838, according to local histories, John P. Clark settled on Whitefish Bay in the town of Sevastopol, and soon after bought large tracts of land there in order to engage extensively in fishing. The earliest land entries in his name were in 1843. About the same time another fisherman, Mil McMillan, settled on the western shore of the town, on Green Bay.

In 1852 the first permanent settlers arrived in Sevastopol. In accounts of these earliest days the names are given of H. P. and Jacob Hanson, Louis Klinkenberg, and Salvi Salvison, \({ }^{9}\) who belonged to the Norwegian Moravian settlement at Fort Howard-most of whom in 1852 went on to Ephraim. John and Thomas Garland, according to local histories, arrived in 1853, \({ }^{10}\) Alexander and Robert Laurie in 1854. Ship carpenters by trade, they built some of the vessels used on Green Bay. \({ }^{11}\) Early histories of the town mention George Bassford, A. Sackett, Henry Stephenson, John Haux, Jacob Crass, and Joseph Zettel as arrivals in 1856. For 1857 they give Peter J. Simon, Leonard Heldman, Nicholas Armbrust, and John Meyer-Germans; Henry Martin, Andrew Fin-

\section*{\({ }^{\circ}\) Wis. Hist. Soc. Proceedings, 1905, 150 \\ \({ }^{-}\)Wis. Hist. Colls., xi, 393.}
\({ }^{7}\) Ibid, xiv, 17
\({ }^{8}\) Holand, 77 .
\({ }^{-}\)The 1880 census lists Jacob Hanson as a sailor and fisherman, and Peter, the son of Hans Hanson, as a fisherman. Salvi Salvison and Hans Hanson are listed as farmers in the section of free inhabitants. A8l of them had smal
holdings which they gradually developed, and in the 1870 agricultural census holdings which they gradually developed, and in the 180 agricuitural
Jacob and Peter Hanson, as well as Salvi Salvison, are listed as farmers. 10 According to land office records, the land entry of John Garland on section 19 was in 1854, and Thomas bought his tract on the same section from a private
individual in 1858. They were listed as farmers in the section of free inhabitants individual in 1858 .
of the 1860 census.
of the 1860 census.
nt The 1860 census lists them as sailors. Alexander was drowned in 1868 ,
but Robert in 1869 had a farm of 250 acres. See Joseph Schafer, \(A\) History of Agriculture in Wisconsin, 188-189.
negan, James Gillespie-Irish; and Luke Coyne, E. C. Daniels, and Alexander Templeton. \({ }^{12}\) The earliest land entries for range 26 were in 1854, and include the names of Robert Laurie, Jacob Hanson, John Garland, and Louis Klinkenberg. Other entries for this year and also for the next few years were evidently by men interested primarily in lumbering or speculating. Among these for 1854 were Charles E. Crandell and A. P. Lyman, buyers of considerable tracts, most of which they sold again before 1860 .

Agriculture was slow in developing, and from 1850 to 1890 lumbering and fishing were the more important industries. There was much poverty and actual suffering among the pioneers. Early accounts tell of their cutting down one tree, making it into shingles or other marketable lumber, and selling it for supplies. For at least the first ten years after the arrival of the earliest settlers, clearing was done in this manner. The names of the first settlers appear again and again in the history of the development of the town, many of them too poor to move on to more easily cleared land. Joseph Zettel made the beginning in fruit growing, planting his first trees early in the sixties. Peter J. Simons, it is said, grew the first bushel of wheat in the town, and in 1873 bought the first mower used north of Sturgeon Bay. The Lauries were prominent in stone quarrying, fruit growing, and other ventures.

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Land.-The first land entries of the town were in 1843 on sections 2,27 , and 28 of range 27 , on the east coast, by J. P. Clark for fishing purposes. The earliest entries on range 26 were in 1854, on sections \(6,7,8,17,18,19,20,21,28,30,31\), and 33 -that is, along the west part of the town as close to the water as possible, for transportation reasons. Large entries in the next five years, evidently for lumbering, were on sections 4, \(5,8,9,11,13,15,17,22,28,29,32\), and 33 . Settlers scattered throughout the town. George Bassford, the largest purchaser of land for agricultural purposes, in 1858 entered 240 acres on section 15, in the middle of the town. William G. McMaster, Rawson, Adams and Bartlett, A. P. Lyman, Michael Hart, Murray and Harvey, and others in 1860 held large tracts of undeveloped forest land. These and others bought and sold, between 1854 and 1860, around 1000 acres each. In spite of the large number of transfers, only 9 per cent of the area of the town was in farms in 1860. Section 34, most of sections 35 and 36 , and parts of sections 26,27 , and 33 of range 26 were entered as swamp land in 1854 and remained unsold until after 1860. Section 16, the school section, was also not entered until after 1860. In range 27 over 8000 acres was entered as swamp land and not sold before 1860. Six hundred and forty acres was entered in the two ranges in 1866 and 1867 as canal grant land.

Progress of Farm Making.-There was practically no agriculture in Sevastopol before 1870. In 1860 the town \({ }^{3}\) Holand, 322 .
had the smallest number of improved acres in its farms of any of the towns compared, the total being 215 acres. The next smallest number was in the town of Orion, where the total was 1473 acres; but the average there was 35 acres, whereas in Sevastopol it was 12 acres. One hundred and one acres remained unimproved in the average farm of 114 acres. No farm in the town had more than 25 acres of improved land, and only one of the 17 farms had that much. Two had 20 improved acres. In 1870 the number of farms was 48 , the total improved area 1156 acres or an average of 24 acres per farm, and the total unimproved 4114 or an average of 85 acres. No farms had over 100 acres improved land, and only two had from 61 to 100 acres improved. These were the farms of two of the first settlers, George Bassford and Joseph Zettel. In 1880 there were 94 farms, 3222 improved acres, 5216 unimproved, the average being 34 and 55 acres respectively. Throughout all of these periods Sevastopol had the smallest number of improved acres of any of the towns. In 1905 Sevastopol had 225 farms, a total improved area of 11,407 acres and 8915 unimproved, or an average of 50 acres per farm improved and 39 unimproved.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-The classes of farms considered with respect to area, in 1860, stood as follows: None had less than 20 acres; 1 farm had between 20 and 49 acres; in the class of 50 to 99 there were 6 farms; from 100 to 174,9 ; and from 175 to 499 , 1 . The largest farm, which belonged to George Bassford, had only 240 acres and was valued at \(\$ 1000\).

In 1870 the classes stood as follows: There were no farms of less than 20 acres; there were 12 of 20 to 49 acres each, 19 of 50 to 99,12 of 100 to 174 , and 5 of 175 to 499 . The largest farm, 360 acres, again was George Bassford's. Only 100 acres was cleared, and the farm was valued at \(\$ 3000\).

Ten years later there was 1 small farm (under 20 acres); there were 22 farms of 20 to 49 acres, 48 farms of 50 to 99 , and 17 farms of 100 to 174 acres. The large farms, of 174 to 499 acres, numbered 6 . The largest farm, 323 acres, was owned by Joseph Zettel.

A classification of farms by number of cultivated acres is more indicative of the labor involved in conquering the forest, and the attendant hardships of the settlers. In 1860 none of the 17 farms had as much as 40 acres of improved land; in 1870 all but 5 of the 48 farms were in that class; and in 1880, 61 out of a total number of 94 . In the class of 41 to 60 acres of arable land there were at the two periods 1870 and 1880 , 3 and 20 ; of 61 to 100 acres, 2 and 11 ; and over 100 acres, none in 1870 and only 2 in 1880.

General Productions.-Only 236 bushels of wheat was reported for the entire town by the census of 1860 -an average of 13 bushels for each farm, whereas for towns that were considerably improved at this time, the average reported ran as high as 452 bushels (in the case of Pleasant Springs in Dane County). The 1870 census records for Sevastopol a
wheat production of 3145 bushels, which is 65 bushels per farm-by far the lowest of all the towns. Ten years later this average had been raised to 150 bushels per farm, and at this period twelve towns reported a still lower average. In 1885 Sevastopol, as might be expected in a town in which the lands had been so recently cleared, reported a total of 19,088 bushels, or 4921 bushels more than in 1880; and the wheat acreage also increased 204 acres. In 1894, however, the acreage was reduced to less than half of what it had been in 1884, but the yield per acre had been increased from 19 bushels per acre to almost 28 bushels. Careful and intelligent agriculture, which was showing itself in highly developed special crops, was also being applied by the few farmers who still kept up wheat production. In 1904, however, it had fallen to a low yield per acre, and only 328 acres of wheat was raised. Wheat growing, though it was never extensive as compared with the wheat producing towns, continued longer than in the other towns, due to the later clearing of the forest lands.

Sevastopol's corn production was inconsiderable throughout the period. In 1860 the census reported 408 bushels, an average of 24 bushels per farm. In 1869 this had fallen to 30 bushels, or an average of .6 bushel per farm. Only Newton produced less. In 1879, when a good corn town, like Plymouth, was producing an average of 813 bushels per farm, Sevastopol reported an average of 20 bushels. In 1884 the total amount produced was only 470 bushels; and although this went up to 5351 bushels in 1894, it dropped again to 1685 bushels in 1904 - once more the smallest amount reported except in the case of Newton.

In total and average number of swine, also, as might be expected, Sevastopol stood throughout all of the census periods among the lowest in the list of towns studied. Cattle raising, too, is difficult until the forest has been cleared, and Sevastopol ranked lowest of all the towns until 1885, when Orion and Muscoda reported a smaller number. In 1895 it stood again at the bottom of the list, but in 1905 it was fifteenth. Cattle raising, however, has not been an important industry in the town at any time. Dairying, too, has begun only in the last few years to develop strongly, but in 1905 the town had 1202 milch cows and a milk production of 184,165 gallons in addition to 80,650 pounds of butter. Dairying is steadily improving, and next to fruit growing is the leading industry.

Sheep raising has never been important. In 1895 the number of sheep was 1270; in 1885 it was 620 ; and in 1880, 156. The wool clip averaged over 5 pounds in 1879.

Special Productions. \({ }^{13}\)-Fishing was the first important industry to be developed in Door County. John P. Clark, who bought over 2000 acres along a nine-mile strip on the east coast of Sevastopol, fished there with Indians (and, according to the 1860 census, some white men), seining as
*Holand has been largely drawn on for the description of special productions.
much as 35,000 pounds in one catch. Their annual catch (fishing also for part of the season at Two Rivers, Manitowoc County) was from 1500 to 2000 barrels holding 200 pounds each, which they took by boat to Cleveland and sold for \(\$ 12\) a barrel. For years great quantities of white fish, trout, herring, and sturgeon have been caught along the shores of Door County; and although the fisheries have been largely depleted, many people still depend on them for a living and Washington Island is famous for its fisheries. In 1905 there were only 17 fishermen in Sevastopol.

Lumbering was in the early period and until 1890 the leading industry of Door County. It was not especially prosperous, however, because of the low prices paid for lumber, and most of the lumber operators failed. F. B. Gardiner, one of the most important, started a mill in 1855 in Sturgeon Bay. In 1882 there were about sixty piers in the county, some of them shipping from 5000 to 6000 cords of wood a year. Prices at this time were from \(\$ 1.50\) to \(\$ 2.00\) per 1000 feet and \(\$ 1.60\) per cord of maple. The receipts of the largest shipper of cedar in the county (in the town of Jacksonport) were about \(\$ 150,000\) a year. In 1869 the value of forest products in the town of Sevastopol, as given by the 1870 census, came to only \(\$ 828\); half of that was made by Robert Laurie In 1879 it was only \$1291. Horn and Joseph, who had two piers in the town (built in the sixties)-one at St. Joseph (later Lily Bay) and one at Whitefish Bay-were shippers of wood and cedar.

In 1880 a great deal of good land was still uncleared, but by 1900 most of it was under cultivation. This was due largely to the development of special crops, among which peas had an important place. According to the state census for 1885, Sevastopol produced 2802 bushels of peas and beans. In 1894 it produced 7598 bushels, and in 1904 it had one of the two largest productions in the county, with 35,509 bushels Door County has until recently grown peas more successfully than any other county in the Middle West. In 1916 the pea crop sold for almost \(\$ 2,000,000\), but since then the industry has declined because of crop diseases, and in 1921 the entire county produced only 36,294 bushels valued at \(\$ 71,862 .{ }^{14}\) In 1904 Sevastopol produced 28,065 bushels of potatoes and 8121 bushels of apples. In apples it has led the state through several census periods. In October, 1869, Laurie at the county fair showed thirteen varieties. In 1892 Zettel had a harvest of 3000 bushels. At the World's Fair in 1893 he showed more than twenty varieties. About this time A. L. Hatch, a fruit grower of Richland County, and Professor E S. Goff, of the College of Agriculture of the University of Wisconsin, became interested in fruit growing in Door County, and by 1917 a total of over 5400 acres was devoted to the raising of fruit-estimated at 3500 acres of cherries, 1700 acres of apples, and 200 acres of plums. More than half of
\({ }^{4}\) Wis. Dept. of Agric., Bulletin No. 48, Wisconsin Agricultural Statistics for 1921, Anmual Crop and Live Stock Reviero.
this acreage was in Sturgeon Bay and Sevastopol. Smal fruits, such as strawberries and raspberries, as well as truck crops, are also grown.

From the beginning quarrying has also been an important industry in Door County. Because of the cheapness and accessibility of stone, the county has as good a system of roads as any in the state. Millions of tons of Door County stone have been used in building Lake Michigan harbors. Robert Laurie opened one of the first stone quarries in the county in 1880, on section 19 of the town of Sevastopol. Nearly a thousand tons was shipped that year to Marinette and other near-by towns for building purposes.

The Laurie brothers were also shipbuilders, and in 1859 built the Peninsula, one of the first boats made in Door County. The great number of fishermen and the superiority of transportation by water, together with the available large quantities of lumber, stimulated this industry, especially in Sturgeon Bay.

Maple sugar was one of the early special productions of Sevastopol. In 1859 it amounted to 3315 pounds, one farm producing a total of 1500 pounds. Ten of the seventeen farms made maple sugar. In 1869 the production amounted to only 1035 pounds.

Value of Productions.-In 1869 the value of all farm products in the town was \(\$ 18,118\), or \(\$ 360\) per farm on the average. In 1879 the average per farm was \(\$ 380\). Two towns, Prairie du Chien and Newton, had lower averages at this period. At the first census period there were 3 incomes of \(\$ 1000\) or over, the maximum being \(\$ 1681\), made out of general farming. The others were \(\$ 1337\) and \(\$ 1115\). Six


Fig. 35. Town of Sevastopol, 1915
After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company
were in the group between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999,8\) between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599\), and 16 between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399\). There were 10 incomes of less than \(\$ 200\). Over half made less than \(\$ 400\) in this period. Five farms reported no incomes. In 1879 the largest income was \(\$ 1374\), from general farming and forest products; the next largest was \(\$ 1300\), made from wheat. There were 3 other incomes over \(\$ 1000\), 11 between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999\), 23 between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599,25\) between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399\), and 30 below \(\$ 200\). Again over half made less than \(\$ 400\). Almost a third fell below \(\$ 200\).

By 1904 the apparently extreme depression shown in the average farm income of \(\$ 380\) twenty-five years before had only slightly improved, and the average was \(\$ 517\). In 1919 it was \(\$ 1536\), but it is necessary to allow for the high prices of this period. There was a decided development of the dairy industry, however, which from 209 milch cows in the town in 1879 advanced to 1202 in 1904 and to 1984 in 1919. The value of dairy products was \(\$ 175\) in 1904 and \(\$ 836\) in 1919. Other livestock products advanced from \(\$ 83\) to \(\$ 454\). Average crop incomes showed a decrease from \(\$ 259\) in 1904 to \(\$ 246\) in 1919. This was due probably to the serious decline in the pea crop since 1916.

Manufactures.-The 1860 census lists two steam sawmills in the town of Sturgeon Bay: R. T. Rawson and Company, with an annual output at that time of 600,000 feet of pine lumber; and L. Bradley, with a production of 400,000 feet of pine. These were built in the early fifties and were the first in the county. For Sevastopol that census lists, under industries, merely the fishery of J. P. Clark, on Whitefish Bay. A gristmill, the first in the county, is reported by local histories to have been built by F. B. Gardiner in Little Sturgeon Bay in the early fifties. \({ }^{15}\)

The earliest plat book for Door County (1899) shows the Laurie stone quarry on section 19, three cheese factories on sections 15,18 , and 26 , a saw- and shingle mill on section 7, a saw- and stone mill, a warehouse, a store, and a pier at Whitefish Bay, and a limekiln on section 33. According to this plat book, V. and C. Mashek held practically the entire Lake Michigan shore line-sections \(2,10,16,21,28,31\), and 32, which had been bought from I. S. Clark, brother of John P. Clark. The plat book of 1914 shows that all of this region had passed into other hands.

Post Offices, Schools, and Churches.-The town plat of 1899 shows the post office of Sevastopol on section 15, Valmy post office on section 18, and a post office at Whitefish Bay, section 16.

The Catholic Church of St. Peter and St. Paul, on Bailey's Harbor road on section 24, was built in 1885. When the congregation was organized in 1884 it had a membership of 60 families. Connected with it is a Catholic institute, built
\({ }^{w}\) It is not mentioned in the 1860 census of industries.
in 1892, for both day and boarding students. There is also an Evangelical Lutheran church, which was organized in 1886-the first Lutheran congregation in the town. In 1888 the first resident pastor was procured, but he stayed only one year. In 1894 a modern church building was erected. The congregation in 1917 was made up of 66 families, or about 350 individuals. \({ }^{16}\)

The first school in the county was a private school, taught in 1854 by Pauline Larson in the Moravian settlement at Ephraim. Sevastopol in 1869 had four schools. \({ }^{17}\) The plat book of 1899 shows eight school buildings on sections 36,15 , \(30,27,5,2,18\), and 7.

Population Changes.-In 1860 Sevastopol had 25 American born heads of families to 19 foreign born, and 104

\footnotetext{

}
natives to 96 foreigners. Ten years later there were only 7 American born heads of families in the town and 51 foreign born. The proportion of foreign born heads of families remained large through 1885 and 1895. By 1905 it had dropped considerably, and by 1920 it was 26 per cent of the total number of families. In that year foreigners were only 11 per cent of the total population. Throughout all the census periods Germans were the largest group of foreigners. Norwegians were the next largest and British and Irish next, though their numbers decreased considerably. Americans from states other than Wisconsin numbered 59 in 1860, and these were mainly from New York. There were a scattered few from Michigan, Illinois, Connecticut, Maine, Vermont, Massachusetts, Missouri, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Indiana.
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& \text { Land dry bottom, } \\
& \text { ". mostly level, }
\end{aligned}
\]
land hilly, \(3^{\text {rd }}\) rate, black \& white oak
\[
1^{\text {st }} \text { rate, " burroak. }
\]

E \(1 / 2\) brohen, W \(1 / 2\) level, 3 rate, "W, wh Land broken. 3 ra rate, black, white \& burr oak. black soburr oak. N.part 3 rd rate

\section*{Explanátory}

Date = year owner bought the farm of Private party Date=
enter series 3 lines
Data from \(7^{\prime \prime} .8^{*} * 9^{\prime \prime}\) censuses, \(1^{3 /}\) line \(=1850,2^{\text {nd }}=1860,3^{\text {nd }}=18\) 1 sil no \(=\) acres of cultivated land
\(2^{\text {nd }}\) nd \(=. \quad\) uncultivated
\(4^{\text {th }}\). \(=\) valuation of lind .ivestock somachinery \(5^{\text {th . . }}=\) bu. of wheat grown last year

\section*{State Land.}

DDate \(=\) incomplete titie
a Date assigned
ADate = Patented
PDate \(=\) Paten


\section*{FARMS AND FARMERS OF 1860}

\author{
Prepared from United States, State, and county records for the
}

STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF WISCONSIN

\section*{S P A R T A}

LOCATION.-The town of Sparta, organized in 1854, occupies township 17 and the south half of township 18, range 5 west, in Monroe County. It is bounded north by Little Falls, east by Lafayette and Angelo, south by Leon, west by Burns (La Crosse County). The county seat, Sparta, is an important market for the surrounding country. In the seventies stages ran from Sparta to Cataract, Wilton, Ontario, and Viroqua. The Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul and the Chicago and Northwestern railroads run through the town.

Surface and Drainage.- The town lies in the valley of the La Crosse River and is well watered by its tributaries. Monroe County is in the Driftless Area, and much of the country is broken and hilly. Wooded bluffs are scattered throughout. The natural drainage is excellent.

Types of Sorl.-John Dunn, who surveyed township 17 of the town in 1846, found a great deal of the soil sandy and second- and third-rate. Much of it is level, second-rate, timbered sandy soil. Where it is broken and hilly, the surveyor found it third-rate. He noted some areas of first-rate soil. These were between sections 16 and 21, valley bottom; between 11 and 14, level, timbered sand and loam; between 3 and 10, level prairie; between 20 and 21, timbered bottom; and between 7 and 18, level area. Between sections 15 and 16 he found sand and gravel, and between 5 and 6 wet bottom.

Timber.-The surveyor found practically the entire township timbered with black, burr, and white oak. He occasionally noted pine, aspen, and tamarack, but only in a few spots. He did not indicate how dense was the stand of timber, but in general, wherever primitive oaks \({ }^{1}\) are the exclusive sylvan occupants of the soil it is safe to conclude that the covering is not heavy, other timber having been eradicated by fires. It seems probable, therefore, that this town consisted mainly of land "thinly timbered" with oak. In other words, it was fairly open land.

Beginnings of Settlement.-The first settler in Monroe County, according to early accounts, was Esau Johnson, who brought his family in the fall of 1842 to the mouth of Moore's Creek, which he had previously explored. \({ }^{2}\) With the opening of the state highway between Hudson and Prairie du Chien, which passed through what is now Sparta, and the building of the road between Portage and La Crosse, new settlers poured in during 1849 and the early fifties. In 1849 George F. Pettit settled at what is now Castle Rock near Sparta, and later came to Sparta, where he was the first settler. His brother, William Pettit, in 1851 bought 160
\({ }^{1}\) Second-growth or scrub oaks often stand in close array.
\({ }^{2}\) History of Monroe County, Wisconsin (Chicago, 1912), 63.
acres at the intersection of the two state roads and built a cabin there which, because of the great amount of travel at this point, was much used as a tavern. \({ }^{3}\) Other early settlers were Edward Walrath in 1851, and his father, Reverend Frederick Walrath, in 1852. Among the settlers of 1851 were also Richard Casselman, J. D. Damman, Lyman Andres, A. H. Blake, Russell Hill, Reverend W. H. Card, and George A. Fisk.

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Land.When the grant of 500,000 acres was made by the federal government to the states in 1841 for purposes of internal improvements, a great deal of land in Wisconsin had already been settled. The selection, therefore, had to be made by the state in 1848 in such counties as still had unsold public lands. Monroe County was one of these, and all of section 14 , and sections 24 through 35 , as well as parts of sections 11, \(13,20,21,22\), and 23 , were taken by the state under this grant. This amounted in all to 118 forties or 4720 acres in township 17. At a public sale of these lands, November 13, 1851 (the year of the arrival of many new settlers), twentyfive purchasers bid in 57 forties or 2280 acres. The selections by the state, through commissioners in each county appointed by the governor, were generally made with care. In Sparta they consisted of the valley lands, largely those of La Crosse River, and included the site of the present city of Sparta. According to the state constitution, the 500,000 acres was added, as in Iowa, to the public school land fund. The law of April 2, 1849, covering the management and sale of school lands, provided among other things a preëmption right to settlers on such lands, to purchase a forty with improvements at the minimum price of \(\$ \mathbf{1 . 2 5}\) per acre. Some of this land was still in the hands of the state in 1860, but most of it was sold in the late fifties. As this land was sold by the state on thirty years' credit, with interest at 7 per cent, it was the safest kind of land to buy and was a favorite both of the farmer, who often bought more than he needed, and of the speculator.

George F. Pettit was the other purchaser of government land in 1849 besides the state of Wisconsin. In that year he entered the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter and the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 2 , the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter and the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 10, and the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 11.

The next entries were in 1850 on sections 1, 2, 3, 11, 12, 13, 23, and 24. In 1851 there were entries on sections 7, 8, 10, 15, 18, 19, and 22. Entries followed rapidly in the years
- Ibid., 246.

1853,1854 , and 1855 , and by 1857 practically all of the land, aside from portions still held by the state, had been sold.

Progress of Farm Making.-In 1860 Sparta had 109 farms covering 12,108 acres, of which 5250 was improved. This was less than half the area of the town. A considerable amount of land at this time was still unsold, and other areas not in farms belonged to the state. In 1870 the aggregate in farms had increased to 18,719 acres and the number of farms was 153 . In 1880 there were 196 farms and a total of 22,404 farm acres, of which \(\mathbf{1 1 , 3 8 0}\) was improved. In the next fifteen years the improved acreage went up to 15,642 , and in 1905 it was 16,152 acres. The total at this period was 27,792 acres, the unimproved 11,640 acres-or 66 acres improved and 47 unimproved in the average farm of 113 acres. The size of the farms was practically the same as it had been in 1860 and 1880. In 1870 it had been slightly larger, with an average of 122 acres. The total acreage in farms and the number of farms had more than doubled from 1860 to 1905.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-The classification for the census periods is as follows: In 1860 there were no farms under 20 acres, in 1870 there were 4, and in 1880, 2 in that class. In 1860 there were 16 farms between 20 and 49 acres, 39 between 50 and 99 acres, 40 between 100 and 174, and 14 between 175 and 499 acres. In 1870 there were 16 farms from 20 to 49,50 from 50 to 99,56 from 100 to 174,26 from 175 to 499 , and 1 farm overran that limit. In 1880, 1 farm had 804 acres, 31 had from 20 to 49 acres, 56 had from 50 to 99 acres, 72 from 100 to 174, and 34 from 175 to 499 acres. The largest number of farms in each period was in the group of 100 to 174 acres.

The broken and hilly nature of this Driftless Area town makes a classification of farms by numbers of improved acres desirable. In 1860 there were 59 farms having 40 acres or less of cultivated land; in 1870 there were 77 farms in that class, and in 1880, 81. In the class of 41 to 60 acres of improved land there were, at the three periods, 29,31 , and 27 ; of 61 to 100 acres, 15,33 , and 58 ; and over 100 acres, 6,12 , and 30.

General Productions.-The census of 1860 gives for the town of Sparta a wheat production of 22,234 bushels or an average of 204 bushels per farm. Thirteen of the towns studied produced a greater aggregate and 8 a higher average per farm. The largest individual record for this period, given on the plat, which covers only township 17, was 900 bushels raised by Edmund Gates on 115 acres of cleared land on sections 3 and 10. In 1869 the aggregate for the town had gone up to 42,774 bushels, an average of 279 bushels. In the next ten years the total fell to 29,053 bushels, but because of the generally lower wheat production at this time the town
had fallen only from eighth in rank among the towns to ninth. In average production per farm, however, it ranked thirteenth, whereas ten years before it had ranked ninth. In 1884 the total wheat production of Sparta had fallen to 20,477 bushels. In the next ten years it went up to 26,958 bushels, but the census of 1905 reported only 6183 bushels.

In corn production Sparta ranked sixth in 1859, with a total of 22,676 bushels. This increased to 27,863 bushels in 1869 and to 49,370 bushels in 1879. The average production per farm at these three periods was 208 bushels, 182 bushels, and 251 bushels. In 1904 Sparta produced 78,516 bushels.

In number of swine Sparta stood eighth in 1860, but it had one of the highest farm averages at this time. In 1870 it ranked very low both in average number per farm and in total number for the town. In 1880 it was still low, but in 1905 the state census reported a total of 2530 . From only 250 milch cows in 1860 and only 375 in 1870, the number in the town went up to 1711 in 1905 -still a rather low number, however. In number of other cattle Sparta showed a somewhat larger proportionate increase. The census of 1860 had reported a total of 214 , and this had gone up to 394 in 1870, to 769 in 1880, and to 3088 in 1905.

Special Productions.-Monroe County was affected by the fever of hop raising in the state in the sixties. By 1869 the enthusiasm was practically over, for although the crops of 1868 were the largest produced at any time in this period, in this year hop growing had been resumed in New York State, where it had been checked for years by insect pests; prices were going down, and besides, the hop louse had appeared in Wisconsin. Still the census of 1870 reports for the preceding year 145,171 pounds for the town of Sparta. One farmer, whose income is given as \(\$ 4694\), raised 40,011 pounds on 50 cultivated acres. Other amounts reported were 17,400 pounds, 14,872 pounds, and 12,000 pounds.

The special industry for which Sparta is known at present is berry culture. This was begun in 1887 by M. A. Thayer, a banker of Sparta, who had become interested in the subject. In 1891 his farm marketed 5000 cases of different kinds of berries, which were sold for \(\$ 7074\). With the plants and other produce the farm brought \(\$ 8846\), a net profit over his expenses of \(\$ 4346\). In 1896 the Sparta Fruit Growers' Association was incorporated, and this was the beginning of the success of this industry, which is the result of good marketing methods rather than of natural advantages. In 1908, 42,000 cases of strawberries were shipped from Sparta. The town was the first wholesale strawberry center in Wisconsin, and until recently had the largest output. \({ }^{4}\)

Value of Productions.-According to the census of 1870 the value of productions in Sparta at that period was \(\$ 151,597\), an average of \(\$ 990\) per farm. Over one-third of the incomes were \(\$ 1000\) and over. By 1879 the total was
* Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Wisconsin, Bulletin No. 248, March, 1915, Strawberry Culture in Wisconsin, by J. G. Moore.
\(\$ 109,302\) and the average had fallen to \(\$ 557\). Thirty incomes were under \(\$ 200\) in 1879, whereas ten years earlier there were none in that class. At the earlier period there were 58 incomes of \(\$ 1000\) or over, the largest being \(\$ 4694\), made out of hops. Incomes next in size were \(\$ 3856\) and \(\$ 3261\), and there were 9 between \(\$ 2000\) and \(\$ 2999\). Forty-six were between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999\), 32 between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599\), and 17 between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399\). In 1879 the largest income was \(\$ 1976\), made out of dairying. Twenty-seven others were \(\$ 1000\) and over, 46 were between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999,47\) between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599\), and 40 between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399\). Five farms reported no incomes.

In 1904 the average farm income had again decreased from \(\$ 557\)-which it had been in 1879 -to \(\$ 488\). Dairy products were valued at only \(\$ 204\) and other livestock at \(\$ 154\). The average crop income, which at this time should have been considerable, as berry culture was important in the town, came to only \(\$ 130\). In 1919 the average farm income


Fig. 36. Town of Sparta, 1915
After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company
had advanced to \(\$ 1827\), still not a high income considering the inflated prices of the period. Dairy products amounted to \(\$ 922\), other livestock products to \(\$ 691\), and crops (mainly berries) came to only \(\$ 214\).

The figures seem to show that the town had a period of seeming prosperity during the hop growing era. Yet, if we eliminate the big hop growers from the count, it will be seen that the general prosperity was not as great in 1869 as it appeared to be.

Manufactures.-The first logging was done on the La Crosse River in 1852. As no sawmills had been built, logs were driven to Neshonoc. Later in that year a sawmill was put up in the neighboring town of Angelo by Seth Angle. \({ }^{5}\) The first sawmill in the town was built in 1853 in the village of Sparta on Beaver Creek, by A. H. and Hilton Blake. In 1857 it was bought by K. and O. P. McClure, who destroyed it and put up the first gristmill in the town on the site. In 1867 this was again bought by T. B. Tyler and T. D. Steele, who put up a woolen mill in its place. In 1864 a paper mill was built by John L. Mather at a cost of \(\$ 42,000\). This was in 1871 bought and in 1879 rebuilt by Oran I. Newton. The water power at this place was later used by the electric light plant of the city of Sparta. A wagon works had been established also in the village in 1866 by E. Thorbus. During its first year this concern turned out seventy-five heavy wagons for farm use. In 1857 the first foundry was built by Captain George A. Fisk. After changing hands several times it was destroyed by fire about 1867. In that year Lowrie, Irwin, and Gilbert built another foundry. This again changed hands, was destroyed by fire, and after several other changes developed into a manufactory of well-drilling machinery. In 1901 the American Tobacco Company built a plant in Sparta. On the mercantile and banking side, also, the city of Sparta has met the changing and growing needs of the community from the earliest settlement. \({ }^{6}\) In the sixties \(\mathbf{H}\). Palmer and Company were the most extensive dealers in hops, handling as much as \(\$ 500,000\) worth in a year. \({ }^{7}\)

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches.Sparta was incorporated as a village in 1857 and as a city in 1883. In 1853 a post office had been established in the village and William Pettit made postmaster, with Richard Casselman as assistant.

Reverend Frederick Walrath, a Methodist minister, arrived in October, 1851, with his family and preached his first sermon in November to a congregation of five people in the Pettits' log house. People of the surrounding country heard him through that winter as he traveled about, preaching sometimes to individual families in the widely scattered, lonely log cabins. Early accounts give vivid descriptions of how he was pursued by wolves on some of these trips through the wild. \({ }^{8}\)

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{\circ}\) History of Monroe County (1912), 253,
\({ }^{\text {IIdid., 319ff. }}\)
\({ }^{\top}\) ITbid., , 279f.
\({ }^{8}\) Ibid., 247 ff .
}

Although the foreign population of Sparta is not large, the Germans and Norwegians each organized an Evangelical church in 1880.

In 1853 a small board house was put up and used as both school and church. Sarah Walrath was the first teacher. \({ }^{\circ}\) In 1855 Elizabeth Truax came to Sparta with her family, and as there was no school there then, and she had had some experience as a teacher, she collected eighteen children in April, 1855, and taught them in her own home. Her school increased to twenty-eight and then to forty-seven. In June a schoolhouse was built and Ann Shepherd, of Fond du Lac, was the first teacher. In 1868-69 a high school was put up which cost \(\$ 13,000\). There were seven teachers in the village in 1870. In 1897 there were sixteen. In 1896 a new high school building was erected. In 1903 a parochial school was established in connection with St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church. \({ }^{10}\)

The plat book of 1897 shows schools on sections 3, 6, 18, 20,27 , and 32 of township 17, and sections 18, 28, and 30 of township 18.

Population Changes.-The population of Sparta has been largely American from the earliest settlement. In 1860 there were 551 Americans and 64 foreigners. Out of a total of 118 heads of families 99 were American born. In a total population of 615 at this period 420 were from states other than Wisconsin. The largest number of these were from New York, the next largest from New England. In the New England group the largest number were from Vermont. Pennsylvania and Ohio furnished the next largest number, while Kentucky, Michigan, Indiana, and Virginia each furnished one. The proportion of foreigners throughout the different census periods has been 10 per cent in 1860, 1885, and 1920. It was a trifle higher at the other periods- \(\mathbf{1 5}\) per cent in 1870 , and 13 per cent and 12 per cent of the total population in 1895 and 1905. The largest foreign group was German, the next largest English, and there were some Scandinavians (Norwegians and Danes), some Irish, Canadians, Scotch, and a few from other European countries. On the whole the community, both village and country, has been

Sparta-Population Statistics
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Yiar} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Total} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{American} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Forbign} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Familims} \\
\hline & & \[
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\end{array} \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
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& \text { States }
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\] & Total & \[
\begin{aligned}
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& \text { Eng- } \\
& \text { land }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\left|\begin{array}{c}
\text { Ger- } \\
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\end{array}\right|
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline \\
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\end{array}
\] & \[
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& \text { Son- } \\
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\]
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& \text { Amer- } \\
& \text { ican }
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\end{aligned}
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\hline 1850
1860 & & & & & & & & & & & 99 & 19 & 118 \\
\hline 1860
1870 & 1,147 & 131
401 & \({ }_{570}\) & \({ }_{971}\) & 40 & 57 & 19 & & 51 & 176 & 160 & 55 & 215 \\
\hline 1885 & & & & 37 & & & & & & 109 & 175 & 40 & 215 \\
\hline 1895 & \({ }_{1,235}^{1,24}\) & & & 1,072 & 25 & 85 & 19 & 32 & & 163 & 218 & 83 & 301 \\
\hline 1905 & 1,482 & 1,109 & 183 & 1,292 & 12 & 98 & 10 & 29 & 41 & 190 & 228 & 62 & 290 \\
\hline 1920 & 1,525 & 1,186 & 185 & 1,371 & 3 & 82 & & 33 & 12
36 & 154 & 240 & 58 & 298 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\({ }^{1}{ }^{10}\) Ibidid., 254.0 .
prevailingly of old American stock, and such foreigners as mingled with the Americans were quickly assimilated to the Yankee type. In this respect the town of Sparta resembles strongly the town of Whitewater in Walworth County.
M. A. K.

\section*{BEAVER CREEK VALLEY, MONROE COUNTY \({ }^{1}\)}

\section*{Doane Robinson}

Th civil township of Sparta consists of township 17 and the south half of township 18 in range 4 west. Beaver Creek takes its rise in a big spring in the northwest corner of section 25 in township 18, and running five miles south enters La Crosse River in the northwestern part of section 24 in township 17, the junction being in the city of Sparta. It is a beautiful little valley, hemmed in by rugged bluffs, above which the notable Castle Rock stands sentinel. With its warm southern exposure, opening directly down into the city of Sparta, the geographical situation is ideal.

My parents, George McCook and Rhozina Grow Robinson, with three children-William Charles, Josepha Matilda, and Ella Kate-settled in October, 1855 , upon the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 35 and the south half of the southwest quarter of section 36. At that time there were three other families living in the district: Hugh Lawson, Alonzo Moseley, and one McCollester. Moseley lived one and a half miles north of Sparta, Lawson a mile and a half farther north, and McCollester a mile still farther up the valley. The Robinson plant adjoined Lawson's on the south. Lawson and Robinson were from the same locality in Gallia County, Ohio, and were related by marriage. Moseley was from Cattaragus County, New York; in the spring of 1856 Daniel Moseley, an uncle of Alonzo's, located upon the west side of the highway midway between Lawson's and Robinson's. In 1859 McCollester succumbed to the gold craze, sold his place to Henry Mierow, and cleared out for Pike's Peak.

Settlement thereafter was rapid; by the time the census of 1860 was taken there were seventeen families and ninety-one persons in the district. Water Street, the main thoroughfare of Sparta, was projected directly north through the district, and the settlers with the exception of five families were located along this highway. It was indeed a notable road, the chief avenue leading to the great northwestern section of Wisconsin. When winter came, closing the Mississippi to navigation, all the traffic from the East to St. Paul and northeastern Minnesota passed before our door. Great fourhorse stage-coaches left Sparta every morning and with frequent relays traveled day and night over this road. Great caravans of merchandise going into the north country formed an almost continuous procession; all agricultural products of an empire came down to the
\({ }^{1}\) Reprinted from Wis. Mag. of Hist., Dec., 1922.
market at Sparta; fifty teams in procession loaded with grain and pork were no infrequent spectacle. This thoroughfare maintained its importance until the building, about 1867, of the West Wisconsin (Omaha) Railroad from Chicago to Black River Falls and farther north. The primitive conditions existing are illustrated by one simple fact. This road crossed a tamarack swamp, about thirty rods in width, which was at our place. A corduroy bridge of heavy logs had been thrown across this swamp, and for more than ten years the tremendous traffic to the north country jolted across this corduroy and no effort was made to improve it. One hundred dollars properly expended would at any time have made an excellent turnpike upon this \(\log\) foundation. I can still hear the grumbling and cursing of travelers as the big stage rumbled and bounded over the logs, the white horses upon a keen gallop and the passengers bounding from their seats and bumping their heads on the coach roof.

The settlers from the first appreciated the necessity of providing


Figure 37
educational facilities for their children, and in the summer of 1857
Clarissa Moseley, the fifteen-year-old daughter of Daniel, was emClari ployed to teach the youngsters, the sessions being held in the upper room of the Moseley home. That same year they contracted with John Teasdale, a young Englishman, native of Kirkby Moorside, Yorkshire, England, who came to America in 1850 and learned the carpenter's trade at Johnstown, New York, to build a substantial frame schoolhouse. This school was located sixty rods south of our place, on the west side of the road, on the south bank of the tamarack swamp. Teasdale was paid for this structure in school district warrants, the contract price being \(\$ 400\). He did not sell his warrants at once, when they were at par. The great financial depression of 1857 came on, and being compelled to raise money he sold the warrants at thirty cents on the dollar. The panic of that year fell heavily upon the settlers. Farm produce brought almost nothing, and the money received frequently proved to be utterly worthless. Another illustration of the stress of the times is shown in the story of Peter Herring, a young German bachelor who came here before that period. He worked "grubbing" for Teasdale all day for onehalf the lower jaw of a pig. Teasdale's wife was Sarah Seymour, an Ulster woman. They had three sons-Howard, Frank, and Joseph. Frank died in childhood; Howard is still one of the prominent and dependable men of Monroe County; Joseph is a farmer near town.

The census of 1860 gives vital records (not always correct) of all the families then in the district, except the Lawsons, who were entirely missed. Hugh Lawson was a Scotch-Irishman who came to Ohio from western Pennsylvania, where he was born, his ancestors having emigrated early in the eighteenth century from Ulster to Windham, New Hampshire. He retained much of the quaint idiom of his race. His wife was Margaret Ann Cline, whom he married in Gallia County, Ohio. He settled in Beaver Creek valley in 1854, and in June, 1855, his wife and children joined him there. In 1860 they had Mary, eight; Samuel Robinson, seven; James Hill, aged one. Afterward Alice, Florence, and Robert were born to them. Daniel Moseley and his nephew Alonzo married sisters-Amanda and Eunice Hunt, of Cattaragus County. Their father, known as Colonel Hunt, and his son John Hunt with his wife Jane, soon joined them, if they did not immigrate at the same time. The Hunts lived in an adjoining neighborhood until the war came, when the father enlisted and his family came to live in our valley.

Several families came in 1860 too late for the census. At the very head of the valley, close to where the great highway crossed the big ridge which separates the waters of the La Crosse from those of Black River, John Winters and his wife, Wilhelmina Benson, with their children, John and Wilhelmina, settled. Both the parents were of generous build and fine examples of the German immigrant. Next to them settled Charles Benson, a brother of Mrs. Winters and a veritable giant. He was married and as I recall had one child, Bertha. Winters and Benson hewed out farms among the white oaks, and the second year had fine crops of winter wheat. Benson purchased a grain cradle to harvest his crop. The fingers dragged down the grain and he tried in vain to adjust them. His temper got the better of him and he caught up the contraption and broke it to pieces over a stump. He seized the scythe and bent it around a young white oak. At this juncture John Winters and his wife came along, and observing the havoc Benson had caused, concluded that he should be punished for his conduct; at the behest of his wife John
ceeded to the business. They were of almost equal strength-Benson short and powerful, Winters tall and lithe. They battled manfully, "Mene" looking on impartially until they clinched and were rolling in the fine winter wheat; then she, who was "as good a man as either of them," waded in, dragged them apart, soundly boxing the ears of each. It was years before the brothers-in-law were again friends.

Charles Benson's mother, a widow, with her son Fred, settled next south of Charles. Adjoining the Bensons on the east lived David J. Kelsey with his large family, from western New York. The Teasdales above mentioned came next, and then Henry Mierow, a Luxemburg Frenchman, on the McCollester place. He was a thrifty, worthy citizen, German speaking and of the Lutheran faith. Religious services were regularly held at his house, being served by a German shoemaker named Couchman, from Sparta, who was a lay preacher, devoted to his calling, and who walked out every Sunday to the Mierows-a four-mile trip. Peter Herring, the German bachelor, lived across the road from the Mierows. Some time during the war he married Mary Schmidt, the daughter of a new settler who at that time found a place in the bluffs back of Winters. When Peter and Mary were married the neighbors charivaried them. I recall the efforts of my father and my elder brother Will in producing weird musical instruments for the occasion, and it was the great disappointment of my young life that I was not permitted to participate.

Seth C. Clark came from Gloversville, New York, in 1860, and opened up a farm adjoining Mierow on the south. He was an old acquaintance of John Teasdale, the latter having promoted his coming. His wife, Lucretia Mosher, and children-Edward, Mary, and Francis-accompanied him. Seth Clark was one of the most complacent persons I have known, utterly satisfied with himself and all that was his. Withal he was a good man and a good citizen. His philosophy has been justified, for at ninety-seven he is still living (1922) with his daughter, Mrs. John Blackburn, two and one-half miles north of Sparta, in perfect health and full possession of his faculties, and as well satisfied with himself as ever he was in his life. Along Clark's south line a lane leads west from the main road about one mile to where Aleck Nicol, Peter Francis, Patrick Davis, and Jacob Mierow lived. Aleck Nicol was a Scotch carpenter, and his wife Ann was a trained shepherdess. Later they bought the south half of Daniel Moseley's farm and built a house directly across the road from our place, where they spent the remainder of their lives. In the early days Aleck was seriously addicted to drink, but in 1865 he joined the Good Templar order and from that time was a notable and consistent advocate of temperance. Peter Francis' family consisted of his wife Mary, his father Peter, who was seventynine in 1860 and the only venerable man who crossed my youthful horizon, his daughter Eliza, and sons George Thomas and William Henry. The Francis' were of French birth; Mrs. Francis was German, and all spoke the German language. Patrick Davis, a goodnatured Irishman with a large family, lived adjoining Nicols.

Returning to the main road, we note that Erastus Pomeroy lived next south of the Clarks. He was married to Elmira Forbes, and had in 1860 one child, Flora. A son died in 1859. Chester Pomeroy was the first to die in the valley; it was his death that first brought consciousness of that crisis to my mind. Then came the Lawsons, Daniel Moseleys, and Robinsons, of whom I have above written. Going south across the tamarack swamp, Ben C. Emery, a young bachelor from

Maine, had in 1859 settled upon an eighty, making his home at our place. Ben was a mighty good fellow who formed an attachment for father that continued as long as they lived. He never met a member of the family anywhere but he asked, "What is your father doing of?" Before 1860 Norman D. Fitch, a New Yorker, settled on a hundred-acre tract south of Ben Emery's. Soon after the war the family removed to western Michigan.

About 1861 a family named Cornwell located on an eighty across the road from the Fitches. They were relatives of the Kelseys. They did not remain long, and I have no vital records concerning them. Next south of the Fitches a family named Felch settled, but soon sold and removed to Sparta. Samuel Blackburn, an Ulster Irishman, and his Presbyterian family acquired the Felch place, and it is still in the family. Mr. Blackburn came from Elgin, Illinois, where he had been employed in the watch factory. I remember among his children John, Robert, Samuel, Mary, and Esther. I think there were others. John married Fanny Clark, daughter of Seth, and lives on the old place. Saladen Forbes, a brother of Mrs. Erastus Pomeroy, had a little place on the west side of the road south of the Blackburns. He had two sons, Frank and Lewis. His brother Lorenzo and his sister Selucia lived with him. They left early in the sixties to live at Wonewoc. Across from the Forbes place was Nathan B. Aldrich. The census shows the family to have been of Maine, but I am morally certain they were of New Hampshire. Before the war father and Nate Aldrich worked together a great deal and the families were intimate. Frank Houghtaling lived on a forty south of the Aldriches. I think the land was owned by Samuel Hoyt, a brother of Mrs. Aldrich. Alonzo Moseley, the first settler in the district, was across the road from the Houghtalings.

Two other families should be mentioned, for although they resided in an adjoining school district, the children did for a time attend our school and always affiliated with the activities of our neighborhood. They were the families of John Q. Ellis and John A. Clark, who lived on the west side of Beaver Creek, directly west of our schoolhouse and but a short distance from it. They were from Maine. Ellis was Clark's uncle, but they were of about the same age and always closely associated. Clark's father and mother lived with him. They were cultured people and always an influence for good in our affairs.

The settlers in the valley were simple, honest, neighborly folks, all exceedingly democratic and living very plainly, but unconscious that they were not living upon the fat of the land. They were generally a moral, religious people. The largest farms, of 160 acres each, were those of Daniel and Alonzo Moseley. For the most part the farms were confined to eighty acres and several were of only forty Even the larger farms had but a relatively small portion under cultivation. Just how a family of seven or eight persons subsisted upon the returns from forty acres of rather thin soil is one of the problems in domestic economy which is rather beyond me; but in truth they were fairly clothed, well fed, and above all cheerful and happy. The neighborly relations and the care and consideration the settlers held for each other are finely illustrated by a circumstance affecting our own family. In 1862, when many of the neighbors were in the war and every one was straining intensely under the public burdens, my father was attacked with typhoid and for weeks was at the point of death; as he began to mend, mother was afficted and also five of the six children. The scourge was upon us from mid-August until New Year's; every physician but one, Dr. Milligan, was in the ser-
vice and soon he, too, was taken with typhoid. We were wholly dependent upon our already overburdened neighbors. Not for a moment were we neglected; never was there a night during that long and weary siege that good Samaritans did not sit at the bedside of the afflicted. From about September 1 until Christmas, Sarah Teasdale, meantime keeping up her own home and even helping her husband in the fields, nursed us through every alternate night. All of the heroic were not in the South during the war.

Politically the settlers were chiefly Republicans. As I recall, only Hugh Lawson and my father were Democrats. When the war of 1861 came on, these people were stirred to the depths and, considering that most of the men were encumbered with large families, sent an extraordinary number to the front. I have not the official records, but at an early date in the conflict Nathan B. Aldrich, Norman D. Fitch, Erastus Pomeroy, John Winters, Lorenzo Forbes, John Hunt, and Charles Benson were in the service, where they continued until the end of the war. William J. Curran (Major William Curran, for many years connected with the adjutant general's office at Madison), whose home was at Hickson, Trempealeau County, and Alexander McPheeter, whose home was at Leon, were attending our district school when they enlisted. McPheeter died before his regiment left camp at Madison. All the others returned at the close of the war-Major Curran with one leg missing, Fitch and Winters bearing honorable wounds, Lorenzo Forbes a living skeleton from Andersonville. Out of a total of seventeen men in the district able to bear arms, nine were in active service. Two single men in the settlement-Peter Herring and Ben Emery, each under thirty-did not enlist, and they were the subjects of much criticism. It was to show the feeling of the neighbors that Peter was charivaried when he married instead of enlisting.

The families not represented at the front were loyal and utterly devoted to the Union cause, and exerted themselves to the extreme in the production of food and supplies for the army, in the care of soldiers' families, and in sending comforts to the men in arms. Even the smallest children had their assigned tasks to perform in that time when the flower of the land was below Mason and Dixon's Line. I recite but a common circumstance when I tell how my brother Will, fifteen years of age, bound his station behind the reaper; and when in 1864 the straw was unusually short, as lad of seven, it was my task to accompany Will and pull straw from the standing grain for bands to bind up the gavels. Father's old Kirby hand-raking reaper cut most of the crop in the valley, and throughout the weary harvest I trudged along pulling bands and laying them on the gavels for Will's use.

Daniel Moseley and his family were our nearest neighbors and our dearest friends. Daniel was a Republican but seldom drawn into the political debates that shook the countryside in those strenuous days; but at some time in his earlier years he had heard Wendell Phillips speak, and had enthroned him as his political deity. He never tired of singing Phillips' praise. The following verse printed very many years ago almost literally describes an incident of that period:

Uncle Daniel Moseley, he
And Aunt Manda, just the same,
Up on Beaver used to be,
Bout as docile like and tam
Uncle Daniel, long and slim,
Uncle Daniel, long and slim, Mind you some of Abram Link- oing awkward boned like him, oln, being awkward boned like him, Worked and drudged until, I jink,
His old back got in a kink His old back got in a kink Like a grape vine. He's so meek Cept that he'd heard Phillips,

Father, he was Democrat,
Fut Uncle Daniel reckoned that
He guessed he wasn't anything,
And 'twould bother you to bring
Better friends, till long one June,
Telling how a copperhead,
Telling how a copperhead, Wendell Phillips. Then and there Uncle Dan began to rare. Uncle Dan began to rare. Hene, Making for our house a sayin, Making for our house a sayin, Wendell Phillips, live or dead, Has got to just lick me," he said. Has got to just lick me, he said.
I always thought that father had I always thought that father He slopped down his milking pails. "Them sentiments that you assails Is mine," he says, "and only blood," He says, a stomping through the mud, "Can wipe that there insult away," And they were squaring for the fray, When mother in between them slips A shaming them, and Aunt Amanda ran And ketched ahold of Uncle Dan.

And father took his milking pails And changed his coat.
Twas Sunday night,
Along 'bout early candle light, And he and all our people pokes Away to church with Moseley's folks.

From the first the school was the pride of the neighborhood, and its social and religious center. As I recall it, the schoolhouse was always overcrowded for both school and public gatherings. Clarissa Moseley, Selucia Forbes, Esther Emery, Hattie Nash, Arthur K. Delaney (afterward a conspicuous figure in Dodge County affairs), Adeline Chamberlain, Adeline Nichols, Georgia Rawson, Nathaniel P. Bateman (soon after superintendent of public instruction in Montana), Blanche Root, Ira Metcalf, Francis Wright, Eva Nash, Libbie Chamberlain, and Agnes Goodwin were the teachers of my period, which ended in April, 1867, when I was ten years of age. In the winter of 1864-65 a Good Templars lodge was organized, and held its meetings in the schoolhouse. Aside from its splendid moral influence, it afforded a delightful social feature to the commu-
nity. With few exceptions all of the neighbors were consistent members. Several very striking reforms were effected in men who had before been addicted to strong drink. Perhaps no other influence so awakened the social consciousness of the locality.

From my earliest recollection Reverend Frederick Walrath, a local Methodist minister residing upon a farm near the Milwaukee depot at Sparta, preached at regular intervals on Sunday afternoons. I doubt if he ever had any material compensation for his services. He was a preacher of the old circuit riding school, who entertained his congregation with stories of religious frenzies which he had witnessed. Every one in the neighborhood attended church with fidelity, except the Germans at the upper end of the valley, who had services of their own, as before stated. So far as I can recall, all the settlers were Protestants except the family of Patrick Davis. Few, however, were regular communicants. I think now only Daniel and Amanda Moseley, who were Methodists, and Nathan and Elinore Aldrich, who were Baptists, were actual church members. In the winter of 1866 Adventist missionaries came among us and conducted meetings in the schoolhouse; three families adopted that faith-the Daniel Moseleys, the Aldriches, and the family of Peter Francis. The meetings caused some sectarian feeling, which soon died down. The three families of converts I believe continued steadfast in the new faith until the end.

Every spring about corn planting time we organized a Sundayschool, with John Q. Ellis as superintendent, which was continued until cold weather. As my recollection serves me, we began each year with the gospel of John and committed to memory ten verses each week. Usually in the winter time Louis Graves or S. C. Miles came out from Sparta and taught singing school. Spelling school was an institution, and the social and literary activities of the year culminated in "the exhibition" when school let out in March.

It is rather remarkable that so few of these pioneer families intermarried. So far as my information goes, only the marriage of John Blackburn and Fanny Clark, and that of George Francis and - Houghtaling, united any of them.

I do not recall that any member of a pioneer family was ever under arrest or accused of a crime. There was never to my knowledge the faintest suggestion of a scandal or hint of immorality among them.

I believe all of the original stock except Seth Clark are gone. Most of the boys and girls who played about the old schoolhouse in my time are grandparents, and some of them great-grandparents. A few only have representatives left upon the old homesteads. The descendants of those pioneers are scattered into almost every community of the West. I have not been able to follow many of them, but I have not been informed of one that has not been a creditable citizen of his locality. So far as I know, no one of them has risen to place of high distinction \({ }^{2}\) in any avenue of life, but hundreds of them are holding positions of responsibility and honor.
\({ }^{3}\) This statement might well be questioned in view of the writer of this article.-Edrror.
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\section*{S U G A R CREEK}

LOCATION.-The town of Sugar Creek, organized in 1848, occupies township 3, range 16 east, in Walworth County, except section 36, which is in Elkhorn. It is bounded north by La Grange, east by Lafayette and Elkhorn, south by Elkhorn and Delavan, and west by Richmond. It corners at the northwest with Whitewater, lies thirty miles west of Racine and eighteen miles east of Janesville. Milwaukee is about forty miles northeast.

Surface and Drainage.-The only considerable stream in the town is Sugar Creek, from which it takes its name. Sugar Creek rises in section 19, flows almost due east to the western part of 13, then north and somewhat east, entering Lafayette from section 12. It is a branch of White River, which empties into the Pishtaka, or Fox. The valley of Sugar Creek varies in breadth from half a mile to one and a quarter miles, the more depressed portions being originally swampy. There is a range of low glacial hills in the northern and northwestern portions of the town, similar to the moraine in the southeastern portion of Whitewater. On the whole, the northern part of the town is undulating to hilly, with a number of glacial lakes and ponds, including Otter Lake, Silver Lake, and Holden's Lake, together with smaller unnamed ponds. The southern portion is more level, indeed mainly prairie. The elevation above sea level at the highest points in the town is \(\mathbf{1 0 0 0}\) feet. The low, marshy land along


Fig. 38. Topographic Map, Town of Sugar Creek Reproduced from United States Geological Survey Delavan Sheet

Sugar Creek is continuous with the extensive marsh along the upper course of Turtle Creek. A north-flowing branch of Sugar Creek rising in Lafayette joins the latter in section 13. On the whole, the town is fairly well watered, either with streams, springs, lakes, or small ponds.

Types of Soil.-Orson Lyon, who made the government survey in 1836, described the land along a considerable proportion of the lines as first-rate, and along nearly all of the remainder as second-rate. The exceptions were a few of the lines which passed through the worst of the swampy grounds, where the land was classed as third-rate. Even the hilly land in the north and in the southwest was called second-rate, showing that the impression made upon the surveyor was not distinctly unfavorable. No soil survey of the county or this town has been published to date. But, according to general descriptions, the soil of the drier portions is a strong clayey silt loam such as is characteristic of the prairies and openings of the glaciated area. The marshes, to be sure, have a different type of soil, but this, too, when drained-as most of the marsh along Sugar Creek has been-becomes an excellent soil for producing farm crops. One must conclude, in the absence of a scientific soil survey, that the lands of this town, from the standpoint of their basic soils, would rank among the best in southern Wisconsin, and this excellence is fairly uniform.

Timber.-The surveyor found several small dry prairies in the town; he also found a number of openings, some timbered and some grassy marsh land, and various tracts of heavier woods. Sugar Creek prairie, which has been described as four and one-half miles long and one and one-half miles wide, occupies a considerable portion of the northern half of the town. Delavan prairie extended over the two southwestern sections. It has been estimated that one-fourth of the town was prairie, one-half openings, the remainder marsh and heavy woods. \({ }^{1}\) Thus the opportunity to make farms was exceptionally good, particularly since the prairie, woods or openings, and marsh were distributed in a favorable manner

Beginnings of Settlement.-The fact, as revealed by land entry records, that most of the best government lands in the town were purchased in 1839 at the first land sale held at the Milwaukee land office, indicates that settlement followed directly upon the heels of the land surveyor. Indeed, inasmuch as this town was surveyed in 1836, the earliest arrivals must have waited for the surveyor to complete his work in order to know where to drive their stakes. The first claim, it is said, was made by a John Davis from Indiana, on sections 13 and 14, near Silver Lake. \({ }^{2}\) Freeborn Welch also
\({ }^{2}\) History of Watworth County, Wisconsin (Chicago, 1882), 937 .
\(=\) Ibid., 938 .
made a claim, on sections 10 and 3 , but did not live there till 1837. In that year many land seekers came. One of these, Daniel Bigelow, who made a claim in section 17, broke up a quantity of prairie land, sowed winter wheat, and harvested the first crop in 1838. Other claims were made the same year in sections \(5,11,12,8,13,9,4,14,7,17,15,10\), and 31 ; and in 1838 and 1839 many others came, with the result, already indicated from the land sale records, that most of the best "Congress land" was claimed by that time. Good land being available in all sections, practically, the early entries were widely scattered, indicating that the entrymen were selecting the choicest locations for farms, with little or no reference to the question of who might be their neighbors. Doubtless it was foreseen that all of the land would be quickly taken by people of the same general class.

Among the early settlers, those who were there in 1839 or previously were John Davis, William McDonald, James Holden, Caleb Miller, John Rand, Henry McCart, Freeborn Welch, William Bowman, Milton Charles, P. G. Harrington, Joseph Welch, Asa Blood, Jeduthan Spooner, the Loomers (four of them), Samuel Salisbury, Julius Edwards, James Bigelow, Nelson Crosby, John Byrd, J. Fox, George W. Kendall, Joseph Nichols, Charles Rand, Joseph Barker, H. C. Kinne, James and Alanson Martin, Lewis Crosby, John S. Boyd, James W. Field, and perhaps others. \({ }^{3}\)

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Land.-We have evidence in the earliest locations that no considerable portion of this town was neglected by land seekers. Woods, openings, prairies, hills-all were penetrated about the same time, and selections were made with apparent indifference to the type of surface, save that the wettest marshes and swamps were avoided for some time. The state owned section 27, as well as 16, which delayed their acquisition by private owners. The state also owned portions of sections 21 and 19. Speculators appear to have avoided the town-a natural result of the fact that settlers were ready to take the lands as soon as they were surveyed, and the further fact that all through this region of prairie and openings, settlers' associations existed for the purpose of guaranteeing to the settlers their right to buy at the land office the lands they had selected. From the history of entries one must conclude that the choicest tract, in the settlers' eyes, was that portion of the north half of the town embracing sections \(4,13,11,10,9\), and portions of 12 and 8.

Progress of Farm Making.-According to the seventh census, Sugar Creek had in 1850 a total of 86 farms embracing 4827 acres of improved land and 5574 acres of unimproved. That gives an aggregate of 10,401 acres within the \({ }^{-}\)Ibid.
farms, or approximately one-half the area of the town. Inasmuch as practically all land save that owned by the state had been entered prior to that time, it follows that a considerable proportion of the privately owned lands had been left unimproved, either for future development by the original purchasers or for sale to others. The large number of land transfers which occurred between 1850 and 1860 suggests. the latter alternative. These lands may have been purchased by intending settlers who afterwards changed their plans, or they may have been bought in some cases by those who deliberately designed to speculate in them. The first comers being supplied and having taken the cream of the land, vigilance against speculators was thereafter relaxed.

In any event, the next census, 1860, shows an increase in number of farms from 86 to 150 . The farms then had in them 11,434 acres of improved land and 8031 of unimproved. Hence, probably all lands of the town were within the farms. At that time, though the average improved acreage in the farms was 76 and unimproved 53 , our plat records improved areas of 170,200 , even as high as 360 acres in selected farms.

There were, in 1870, 160 farms having 11,166 acres of improved land and 9131 acres of unimproved, or 69 and 57 acres respectively. Ten years later there were 179 farms with 16,814 acres improved, or 93 acres to the farm; while the unimproved had been reduced, doubtless largely by the process of reclaiming marsh land, to 4272 acres, or 23 acres to the farm. These totals were not greatly different in 1895, only about 1000 acres having been transferred from unimproved to improved in the interval of fifteen years. Apparently the period 1870 to 1880 was a time of exceptional activity in the conservation of the farm lands of the town.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-Omitting the record for 1850, at which time, as we have seen, the farms were only well begun, and classifying for the succeeding three censuses, we obtain the following result: In 1860 2 farms were under 20 acres in area, while 25 were between 20 and 49 acres, 51 between 50 and 99 acres, 44 between 100 and 174 acres, and 25 between 175 and 499 acres. Three exceeded the 500 -acre limit. In 1870 there were 3 under 20 acres, 37 between 20 and 49 acres, 41 between 50 and 99 acres, 46 between 100 and 174 acres, 31 between 175 and 499 acres, and 2 over 500 acres. In 1880 the smallest-sized farms numbered 7 . There were \(\mathbf{3 0}\) in class two, 55 in three, 57 in four, and 28 in five. Again there were 2 in class six. It appears, therefore, that in each period the majority of the farms were of the moderate sizes-from 50 to 99 acres, and from 100 to 174 acres. The number of large-sized farms did not increase materially, but the very small farms became somewhat more numerous.

General Productions.-In 1849, according to the census of 1850, Sugar Creek produced wheat to the aggregate of 32,699 bushels, or an average of 379 bushels for the 86
farms then in operation. The census shows that nearly all farms raised some wheat, and that eight farms produced each 1000 bushels or more, the highest amount being 1800 bushels. Other cereals, corn and oats, amounted to little in comparison. Also, there was little wool, butter, or other marketable produce aside from cattle and swine, of which the numbers were considerable. Two flocks of sheep numbered 50 each, and a few others 20 or over. Only about one-fourth of the farms had sheep, but almost all had some swine. Some herds of cattle numbered as high as \(\mathbf{3 0}\) head.

The wheat crop of 1859 amounted to 57,531 bushels, but the average for the 150 farms was only 383 bushels, as against 379 in 1849. The production of corn, oats, and hay had largely increased; wool was becoming an important crop, and livestock held a prominent place in farm economy.

The most striking revelation of the ninth census (1870) is that wheat raising had greatly declined by 1869, the average per farm being only 246 bushels, as against 383 bushels ten years earlier. The aggregate production, also, had dropped from 57,531 bushels to 39,511 bushels, despite the fact that the whole number of farms had increased. Ten years later the average was 149 bushels per farm and the aggregate 26,786 bushels. In 1884 it was 10,000 bushels less. Indeed, wheat had passed out of the category of market crops, into that of incidental crops.

During the same period, 1860 to 1885 , the corn crop advanced from 143 bushels per farm at the earlier date to 459 in 1869, and 1065 bushels in 1879. The aggregate in that year was 190,750 bushels, as against 73,460 in 1869 and 21,538 in 1859. Obviously, the trend away from wheat had been more than compensated by the development of corn culture, which signifies livestock and especially pork-Sugar Creek having more hogs per farm in 1870 than most of the towns compared, and in 1880 having only three superiors in that item.

The record of butter production- 184 pounds per farm in 1849, 294 pounds in 1859, 188 pounds in 1869 in addition to 50 pounds of cheese), and 297 pounds in 1879 (plus 318 gallons of milk sold)-shows another substitute for wheat in addition to pork. In 1885 the aggregate of butter was given as 65,966 pounds, and of cheese as 55,925 pounds. At that time the number of cattle was 2231 as against 1922 in 1880. At the latter date, however, the aggregate was divided between milch cows-761-and other cattle-1161. The probability is that five years later the majority were milch cows. At all events, in 1895 Sugar Creek had 1985 milch cows in a total of 3011 cattle and calves on hand. The three creameries in the town at that time made an aggregate of 295,675 pounds of butter. This had risen, by 1904, to 476,844 pounds from 1930 cows. This did not represent the total product, for aside from the cows which supplied the creameries, there were some 500 whose product consisted of 19,927 pounds of butter, besides milk and cream consumed on the
farms. Sugar Creek had become a leading dairying town of Walworth County.

Special Productions.-Tradition has it that when the first white explorers of the town reached the valley of the creek, they found Indians making sugar from the maple trees. This circumstance, it is said, induced them to name the stream Sugar Creek, which, in turn, gave its name to the town. Whatever may be the fact behind the tradition, it is certain that practically no maple sugar has ever been made in this town by white men. The surveyor, in his descriptions of the timber along survey lines, failed to note the presence of sugar maples anywhere, making it certain that there was no considerable "sugar bush" in the town, even though there may have been scattering maple trees. Moreover, the seventh, eighth, and ninth censuses all fail to show any maple sugar product.

In 1850 Sugar Creek farmers produced on the average 12.5 pounds of wool from 10 sheep. In 1860 the product was 52 pounds, the number of animals 15 . Ten years later the farms averaged 34 sheep and 123 pounds of wool, while in 1880 the figures were 21 and 165 pounds. It is perfectly clear that Sugar Creek specialized in sheep and wool. The multiplication of numbers is one proof, the steady increase in the product per unit is another. The first figures show merely the presence in the town of a considerable number of sheep, which must have been of the common stock, judging from the weight of the fleeces. From 1860, however, the records prove that the sheep were good producers, and they became steadily better. Indeed, the figures for 1880, which would indicate a production of 7.5 pounds of wool per unit for 3911 sheep, cannot be accepted as accurate because they are too high. Possibly the clip was from a larger number of sheep, many of which had been disposed of prior to the census date. Sheep raising was an important item in that town for more than a generation. The state census of 1885 gives the total wool product as 28,344 pounds-a decrease of only 1255 pounds since 1879 -and the number of sheep and lambs on hand was given as 6102, against 3911 in 1880. The business had not yet declined, but in the next decade it practically disappeared.

Value of Productions.-According to the tenth census (1880) the value of the productions per farm on the average in Sugar Creek in 1879 was \(\$ 651\). Nine of the towns compared stood higher in that respect, and 13 lower. In 1905 Sugar Creek had 176 farms, three less than in 1880, with an average farm income of \(\$ 1380\), more than double that of twenty-five years before. The number of cows in the town was more than three times the number in 1880 , and the value of dairy productions amounted to \(\$ 798\) per farm. Other livestock productions were valued at \(\$ 355\) per farm, and crop incomes averaged \(\$ 227\). The number of cows increased between 1905 and 1920 from 2479 to 2741 ; dairy products had gone up in value to \(\$ 1842\) per farm in 1919 , the value of other
livestock productions to \(\$ 1067\), and average farm incomes to \(\$ 3031\). Crop incomes had dropped to \(\$ 122\).

Taking up the schedules of individual farms, we find by reference to the ninth census (1870) that 11 farms produced less than \(\$ 200,26\) between \(\$ 200\) and \(\$ 399,27\) between \(\$ 400\) and \(\$ 599,48\) between \(\$ 600\) and \(\$ 999\), and \(48, \$ 1000\) and over. At least four incomes exceeded \(\$ 2000\), the largest being \(\$ 2936\). Ten years later the lowest class of incomes numbered 16 , the second 34 , the third 34 , the fourth 42 , and the fifth 52 . Two farms reported no incomes. Not many overran the \(\$ 2000\) limit, though one-the farm of J. A. Pierce-produced an income of \(\$ 5500\), mostly from wool and grain. The farm contained 600 acres of tilled land, 200 of permanent meadows and pasture, and 60 of woodland. The crop of 1879 comprised 1620 pounds of wool, 1130 bushels barley, 5600 bushels corn, 2000 bushels oats, and 1500 bushels wheat. There were 70 hogs, but only a few cows or other cattle.

If the excessively small incomes were to be excluded, on the ground that they probably do not represent the results of bona fide farming activities, but were doubtless supplemented from other sources, the average of the genuine farm incomes would be considerably higher.

Manufactures.-Sugar Creek has always been a purely agricultural town, having no mills or factories located within its borders though the settlers had the benefit of near-by mills. The village of Elkhorn, which occupies section 36 of the township in which Sugar Creek was located, served to supply the ordinary blacksmithing, repair, and machine shops needed by the people living in the southeast and east portions of the town. For many years there was a blacksmith's shop at Millard post office on the Janesville road, in section 8.

Villages, Post Offices, Schools, and Churches.Elkhorn was also, for the people of southern and eastern Sugar Creek, the most convenient trading point and post office. The Milwaukee-Janesville road, built in 1838, crossed the second tier of sections in northern Sugar Creek-12, 11, \(10,9,8\), and 7 -passing near the middle of the sections except in 12, where it entered from the northeast through a corner of section 1. Along that highway was gradually built up most of the institutional life of the town which remained distinct from the life of Elkhorn village. First, in 1839, was begun the Congregational church, which was given a location by the roadside in section 12, near the intersection with section 1.4 Later, a Methodist church and cemetery was established near the junction of the north and south road with the Janesville road in section 10. This church was also near the store, post office, and tavern called Tibbets, where was one of the public schools and, indeed, a center of social and business life from earliest times. Another near-by tavern was famous under the name of the Gravel Tavern. \({ }^{5}\) Another
There is a question as between that site and the site at Millard post office. The history fails to make clear the location of the Congregational church.
\({ }^{5} \mathrm{~J}\). H. A. Lacher, "The Taverns and Stages of Early Wisconsin," in Wis. Hist. Soc. Proceedings, 1914, 146.


Fig. 39. Town of Sugar Creek, 1915 After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company
center, for the northwestern part of the town, was at the roadside in sections 8 and 9 . There were a church and cemetery, a blacksmith's shop, and a store, with a school half a mile farther west. The post office at that point was known as Millard. Another church and cemetery was located in the south half of the town, at the intersection of sections 21 and 28.

It is said the first school in Sugar Creek was a public school, taught in 1840 by Adeline McCracken, who later married T. B. Edwards. \({ }^{\text {b }}\) The probability seems to be that this first school was held in the northern portion of the town, though the county history fails to locate it definitely. There were schools in sections 11, 8, 29, 34, and 23, with other joint districts the buildings for which were in adjoining towns. The homes in the north half of the town were thickly clustered along the Janesville road, only a small per cent of all landowners north of the river living away from the road. Millard is now a hamlet containing about 75 souls. The church at that point and the one in section 28 are the only country churches in the town. \({ }^{7}\) In the south the settlement is more scattering, the several historic roads however determining the locations of most of the homes. \({ }^{8}\) More than half the town, including all of the east half, has become tributary to Elkhorn in church matters, as well as in trade, in high school attendance, etc. \({ }^{9}\)

Population Changes.-In 1850 Sugar Creek had in its
- History of Walkoorth County (1882), 94.
\({ }^{7}\) Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Wisconsin, Research Bulletin No. 34 (Madison, 1915). The Social Anatomy of an Agricultural Com In
Ibid.
0 Ibid,
\({ }^{-}\)Ibid. \(, 7-8,10,11-14\).
population 107 American born heads of families to 36 foreign born, and 1015 natives to 213 foreigners. The total population was 1228. In 1920 the total was 876 -native, 763 ; foreign, 113. The number of American born heads of families was 161, foreign born 47. A glance at the table shows how rapidly, comparatively, the foreign element increased up to 1885, at which time foreign heads of families exceeded in number American born heads of families, though the largest proportion of foreign born was found in 1860. In the foreign element Scandinavians (Norwegians) at first, then Irish, predominated; and finally, in 1905, the proportion of Germans exceeded that from other countries. The Irish element virtually disappeared between 1860 and 1895, the space of a single generation.

Of equal interest is the decline in numbers of the group designated as natives of other states than Wisconsin, which for this town means the Yankee element. The drop from 813 to 461 and to 299 in twenty years indicates a very large emigration of Yankees, who commonly arrived as young people and would hardly have died off to the extent of 60 per cent in that period, even assuming a complete stoppage of immigration from the northeastern states. Of course, some were arriving continually, and we shall not be far wrong if we charge to the effect of emigration the equivalent of the net losses, decade by decade, of that type of settler.

A study of the plats issued periodically (1857, 1873, 1891, and 1907) proves that the American born immigrants-the Yankee element-who arrived first, took up the most favorable lands-the high rolling prairies and openings, together with patches of low prairie for meadow and pasture. When the Norwegians came to this town, practically the only cheap land left was the low swale and swamp land, together with fringes of dry ground. They took those lands, and an occasional high-land farm which could be bought cheaply. The later-coming Germans were not massed, but were scattered among other settlers in all parts of the town, showing that they bought farms whenever they found them in the market.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Yen} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Totas} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Ambricas} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Formiox} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Favirus} \\
\hline & & \({ }_{\substack{\text { Wis- } \\ \text { consin }}}^{\substack{\text { a }}}\) & Other
States & Total & Eng- & \({ }_{\text {Gerr }}^{\text {many }}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
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\end{aligned}
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\end{array}
\] & tal & \[
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\end{aligned}
\] & \({ }_{\text {For- }}\) Pign & Total \\
\hline 1850 & 1,228 & 202 & 813 & 1,015 & 28 & & & & & 213 & 107 & \({ }^{36}\) & 143 \\
\hline 1880 & 1,140 & 383 & 461 & 844 & \({ }^{46}\) & 31 & 111 & & & 296 & \({ }^{97}\) & 92 & 180 \\
\hline 1870 & \({ }^{997}\) & 456 & 299 & 755 & \({ }^{45}\) & 24 & 60 & & & 242 & \({ }^{98}\) & \({ }^{92}\) & 190 \\
\hline 1885 & 1,015 & & & 791 & 55 & 48 & 45 & & 18 & 224 & 114 & 140 & 254 \\
\hline 1895 & 1,023 & & & 841 & \({ }^{46}\) & 43 & 25 & & & 182 & 118 & 106 & 224 \\
\hline 1905 & \({ }^{932}\) & 641 & 100 & \({ }^{711}\) & 10 & 88 & 18 & & & 191 & 135 & 86 & 221 \\
\hline 1920 & 876 & \({ }_{693}\) & 70 & 783 & 14 & 50 & 10 & 32 & & 113 & 161 & 47 & 208 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\section*{W HITEWATER}

LOCATION.-The town of Whitewater, organized in 1841, is symmetrical and occupies surveyor's township number 4 north of range 15 east in the northwestern corner of Walworth County. It is bounded north by Cold Spring in Jefferson County, east by La Grange, south by Richmond, and west by Lima (Rock County). The town is fifty miles almost due west from Racine, and nearly sixty miles southwest from Milwaukee. Janesville, the nearest large town, lies twenty miles southwest on Rock River. Whitewater was surveyed in 1836 by H. Burnham, United States deputy surveyor general.

Surface and Drainage.-The topography of the town, as delineated on the original survey, shows as the principal drainage system Whitewater Creek, made up of two main branches which flow from the southeast and southwest respectively, uniting in section 5 . The mill ponds later caused such enlargements of both branches, near their junction, as to form a lake which occupies portions of sections 10 and 9 , as well as section 5. The easternmost branch had its heads in Lakes Whitewater and Bass, located in sections 34-35 and \(35-26-25\). The westernmost branch rises apparently in section 30. Each has a small tributary flowing from near the border of the township east and west respectively. Whitewater Creek empties into Bark River, an eastern affluent of Rock River.

The surface is diversified. Its features become clear by reference to the United States Geological Survey, Whitewater Sheet. This shows approximately one-fourth of the area of the township, in the south and southeast, to be hilly and broken; about an equal area in the south and in the northeast, wet prairie; and the remainder dry prairie, openings, and bottom land interspersed with frequent small tracts of swampy meadow. The hills attain an elevation of 1000 feet above sea level. They belong to a kind of range or chain which trends northeast and southwest, paralleling in part the "limestone ridge," which forms the westernmost outcrop of the Niagara limestone.

Types of Soil.-Whitewater is in the area of glacial drift. The soil, resting on limestone, is in general fertile, and was described as first-class by the surveyor, except the hilly portions and a small area of rolling land in the northeast, which were called second-rate. No soil survey of this town has yet been executed. The surveyor who made the original plat described the soil in most portions as first-rate. In the southeast-the hilly portion-and in some of the more
\({ }^{1}\) In describing the town of Whitewater we have had the unique advantage of excellent town histories, of which the volume edited by the late Albert Salisbury stands at the head. On this account we are able to depart somewhat from the解 much nearer our ideal of what town history should be.
swampy sections he called it second-rate. Whatever may be the scientific designation of the soil series, there is no doubt about the excellent quality of the soil on the high prairies, the openings, and such of the lowlands as are not too wet for successful cultivation. A portion of the lowlands is not merely wet, but the character of the subsoil offers obstructions to drainage. These lands are unreclaimed even now. The hill lands have good soil, but being rough and stony they are esteemed of less value than would otherwise be the case.

Timber.-There were no densely forested areas. The primitive timber growth was almost wholly oak-that resistant tree which often survived the Indian prairie fires when all else was cleared away. The oaks-burr, white, and yellowsometimes stood in the form of small wooded islands in the prairie, but more often constituted oak openings, in which good-sized trees or clumps of trees were scattered thinly over the surface, with scarcely any underbrush to hamper cultivation. The marshes were usually free from timber. Thus conditions were precisely such as most new settlers desiredtimber enough for immediate uses, but mostly open land ready for the plow, with wet meadows and marshes to furnish hay and pasturage for stock; and stock water in abundance everywhere.

Beginnings of Settlement.-A study of the land entries with reference to the character of the land as described by the surveyor, and as shown on the topographical map, reveals instructively how the early settlers avoided the very rough lands and the very wet lands. In all cases, the dry prairie and openings were entered first, mostly in 1839. \({ }^{2}\) The entries were made by English speaking persons, with but fourteen exceptions. These tracts went to Scandinavians. Moreover, the earliest entrymen were practically all settlers, a settlers' association having been formed to enable claim makers to buy their claims at the land sale in Milwaukee, which was held in February, 1839. Speculators were effectively suppressed by the association. In fact, it does not appear, from our data, that speculators ever secured an appreciable part of the lands in this town. That foreign names are found mostly in the southeastern part of the town plat is due, of course, to the fact that the more desirable lands had all been entered prior to the time of the Scandinavian immigration to that region, and those left-over lands in the heart of a settled and
\({ }^{2}\) Sections 2 to 10 , and 17 were wholly taken up at this time; also the greater portions of 18,31 , nd 32 with fractions of \(11,13,14,15,19,33,24,26,27\), and 30 Section 1 was taken later, due to its swampy character, as were 12 , most o
13 and 14 , also 19 to 22, 29, and 30 . The other sections that were entered ate, especially 34 to 36 , 24 , and 25 , were hill land, diversified also with lake and swale. Many of the tracts in the rough portion were taken as late as 1845 to 1855 The latest date for the entry of any land in the township is 1857. The accompany ing plat of the dates of entry of all government lands in the township should be
compared with the topographical chart.
prosperous community appeared to them more desirable that wild lands lying at the actual frontier.

Whitewater, in its origin, is one of the New EnglandNew York communities. The earliest settlers were nearly all of that tradition. They began to arrive early in the spring of 1837, the first authenticated party, that of Benoni Finch, reaching in April of that year Whitewater Creek at the site of the present city. This party opened the first trail through the township by following the Indian path which in those days wound its serpentine course through woods, marsh, and prairie, from Milwaukee to Galena. This first road was known for some years as Finch's Track. \({ }^{3}\) That season claims were made by William Barron, Samuel Prince, William and Leander Birge, Dr. Edward Brewer, and Norman Pratt. The first house, a log cabin twelve feet square, was built in July, on section 6, by Samuel Prince. Also, some ground was broken during the same season, and before winter set in some half a dozen cabins dotted the prairie, in several of which families were actually living. These first improvements were on sections 5, 6, 7, and 8, the northwest corner of the township. For their winter supply the settlers bought potatoes from a man who had begun farming near Janesville in 1836; and during the winter, flour and pork running low, they sent an ox team to Elgin, Illinois, for a load of these necessaries. \({ }^{4}\) It was customary for drovers to bring from Illinois both cattle and hogs for the purpose of selling to the new settlers in Wisconsin. The Walworth County pioneers were as early as 1838 supplied from such sources. \({ }^{5}\) Most of the land claimants, indeed, did not actually settle in the town until 1838, but in that year improvements were made in many sections, so that it could be said that they harvested sufficient "not only for home consumption but enough to divide with the stranger who should come, unprovided, among them."

The new crop rendered the question of a gristmill crucial. There was, supposedly, only one mill site on the creek, in the south half of section 4. Since the holder of that claim did not build a mill, the people raised a mass meeting and resolved that he must either give bonds to build or permit the land to go, at the forthcoming land sale, to some one who would give bonds to build a mill and have it in operation within a year. If the claimant refused to do either, he should be run off the claim. They appointed a committee to carry the resolution into effect. This committee secured, at a given price, a relinquishment of the claim. Then they sought and found a man (Dr. James Tripp) who gave bonds to build the mill pro-
\({ }^{\text {P Prosper Cravath, "Early Annals of Whitewater and Vicinity, 1857," in Early }}\) Annalsosper Cravath, "Eorly Annals of Whitewater and Vicinity, 1857," in Early
I8s7-67, edited by Albert Salisbury (Whitewater, 1906).
\({ }^{\text {B I Ibidi., }}\), 35. Also James Simmons, "Annals of Lake Geneva," in Early Annals lower Rock River in llinois to Fond du Lac hags was driven in forty days from
vided he secured the land. They went to the land sale in Milwaukee in February, and saw that this man obtained title. Work was begun forthwith, and on the twenty-seventh of June, 1839, the frame of the mill was raised amid a great concourse of settlers from four towns-all interested in its erection. An outdoor feast, followed by ball games on the prairie, concluded a day memorable in the pioneer annals of Whitewater.

The land sale at Milwaukee, in February, was an event of the highest importance to settlers through all the Milwaukee land district. It was the first sale held there, and had been advertised to occur in the previous November. However, so many of the settlers of the southeastern counties were unprepared to pay for their lands thus early, and petitioned so numerously for a delay, that three months' grace was given. The methods followed by the settlers in their claims association were in all respects similar to those described elsewhere. \({ }^{6}\) Cravath says that two money lenders \({ }^{7}\) from Chicago were present and made loans to many of the Whitewater people, as well as to others who had not the money to pay the government. He does not mention the rate of interest charged, but says they dealt fairly by the settlers in all respects.

There was as early as 1838 a sawmill on Bark River \({ }^{8}\) within reach of the settlers of Whitewater, and in the fall of that year a frame barn was erected, the first building in which sawed lumber was used. \({ }^{9}\) Another near-by sawmill was in operation by the end of the year 1840, and a year later Dr. Tripp had one running at Whitewater. But the products of these neighborhood sawmills, indispensable during the first years of the settlement, were soon discriminated against in favor of pine lumber from the northern forests. By 1845 the Whitewater people were drawing their building materialgood pine lumber-from Milwaukee, "as the time for using bass-wood and oak for siding was past." \({ }^{110}\) If the house of logs or clapboards is the symbol of frontier conditions, it may be said that the primitive period in Whitewater endured the briefest possible time. The gristmill by 1841 was selling flour of good quality as low as \(\$ 1.50\) per hundred. Two years before, it had cost settlers \(\$ 1.25\) per hundred to haul supplies by team from Milwaukee. Now they had an abundance of everything for their own use and a generous surplus to sell, albeit at low prices, to immigrants and for shipment east.

The territorial road, from Rochester in Racine County to Madison, passed through the northern tier of sections in Whitewater town, the thirtieth milepost being in the middle of Whitewater Creek. This road was laid out in the spring of 1839 and promptly improved. By means of it the settlers were soon able to reach a market at Racine, about fifty miles

TSee Introduction.
™
Martin O. Walker
- See diary of Frederick J. Starin in Wis. publication of this diary was begun in September, 1922, and completed in
March, 1923. March, 1923.
\({ }^{\circ}\) Cravath,
\({ }^{\circ}\) Cravath, 29.
\({ }^{10}\) Ibid., 71.
to the east, and at Milwaukee. Also, regular mail stages early connected Whitewater village with those two lake ports. It is said that by 1840 nearly every family in Whitewater received a copy of the weekly Milrwaukee Sentinel. \({ }^{11}\)

The village, by 1844, had become the local market for the farmers within a radius of twelve miles. Every effort was made to win new trade by devoting the resources of the village to aid the building of roads through the lowlands south, southeast, and southwest within the town. "Every one seemed interested in the work; merchants, millers, hotel-keepers, mechanics all subscribed liberally, while the farmers in the vicinity assisted by their labor. During the year not a dollar was expended upon the streets of the village, but all the funds were appropriated to the building of these highways across the lowlands." \({ }^{12}\)

Cravath gives us some statistics of the year 1844 which are interesting. There was assessed that spring 9980 acres of land to residents and 3560 to nonresidents, leaving 10,300 acres of government land. The farming lands were valued at \(\$ 33,137\), the nonresident holdings (probably wild land in most cases) at \(\$ 11,774\). The entire tax for the year was \(\$ \mathbf{3 4 2 . 5 3}\).

The local historians furnish data for a somewhat detailed account of the progress of Whitewater village, but this information we can take account of only so far as it reflects the changes in the condition of the rural population. The building of churches and schools in the village, which began contemporaneously with the settlement, affected the farmers in the vicinity, as did the organization of the town in 1841. The first town meeting was held the first Tuesday in April of that year. Of fundamental importance to them also was the building of the railway.

Conditions Affecting the Purchase of Lands.-As already stated, speculators appear to have gained no foothold in this town. Even the mill site, usually a bone of contention in the beginnings of new communities, made but a mild speculation in Whitewater; for it seems that the original entryman of the tract containing it sold his claim right for a small sum, and the actual builder of the mill bought the right for \(\$ 500\). The accompanying plat of the land sales (fig. 40), based on the topographic map of the town, reveals better than pages of description how the most favorably located and the best farm lands were taken promptly, while the inferior lands went more slowly.

Progress of Farm Making.-The country by 1850 was thickly settled, the census taker finding in the town 148 farms valued at \(\$ 182,540\), and including 6637 acres of cultivated land, with 14,991 acres uncultivated. Among the nine towns for which we have agricultural census statistics for the year,
\({ }_{11}{ }_{12}\) Ibid., 47.


Figure 40
Whitewater stood third in amount of improved land per farm. This town had 44 acres improved and 101 unimproved, as against 56 improved and 64 unimproved in Sugar Creek, Walworth County (which corners with Whitewater at the southeast), and 101 improved and 24 unimproved in Mount Pleasant, Racine County. Franklin, Milwaukee County, the next below Whitewater, had 41 acres improved and 68 unimproved.

The agricultural condition of the town in 1860 is partly disclosed in the chart which gives totals and averages (Appendix, Table II). The improved land had increased to 60 acres per farm on the average, as against 44 in 1850; and the unimproved stood at 66 as against 101 acres. The value of the average farm had risen from \(\$ 1233\) to \(\$ 2729\), or more than 100 per cent in the ten years, and the average acre of farm land was worth, by this reckoning, more than \(\$ 20\). There were in 1870, 178 farms having 16,238 acres of improved land and 2926 unimproved, or 91 and 16 acres respectively. Ten years later there were 145 farms, with 16,654 acres improved, or 114 acres to the farm; while the unimproved had gone down to 2890 acres, an average of 19 acres to the farm. For some reason, possibly through error, the 1885 census records a reduction to 9333 improved acres. In 1895 this became 17,183 acres. In 1905, 17,475 acres was reported improved and none unimproved.

Classification of Farms according to Area.-As early as 1850 Whitewater had 76 farms of 100 or more acres. Classifying by census periods we get the following results: In 1850 and 1860 there were no farms under 20 acres in size. In 1850 there were 18 farms between 20 and 49 acres, 54 between 50 and 99,45 between 100 and 174, and 29 between 175 and 499 acres. Two farms overran the 500 -acre limit-that of John M. Clark, with 1100 acres, and that of Henry J. Starin, with 1800 acres. It is obvious from the quantities of land entered by individuals, that a good proportion of the settlers had come with appreciable sums of money, or the credit which enabled them to obtain money. The founders of the town were persons of some financial standing in the communities from which they had emigrated.

In 1860 there were 24 farms between 20 and 49 acres, 40 between 50 and 99,42 between 100 and 174, and 30 between 175 and 499. The farm of John M. Clark had 800 acres and was valued at \(\$ 25,000\). In 1870 the largest number of farms, 69 , fell again in the group of 100 to 174 acres. There were 20 small farms of less than 20 acres, 34 in the class 20 to 49 acres, 31 in the class 50 to 99 , and 23 in that of 175 to 499. The farm of H. and C. Clark had 614 acres. Ten years later 6 farms were under 20 acres in area; there were 19 in class two, 33 in class three, 52 in class four, and 32 in class five. Three farms exceeded 500 acres-those of Charles Norton, 540 acres; Eric Erickson, 940 acres; and George Doubleday, 560 acres.

General Productions.-The average farm in Whitewater, with 44 acres under cultivation in 1849, was producing 179 bushels of wheat. All of this had to be hauled by team to Milwaukee-a long, expensive, and tedious process. One gauge of the miles which could be covered in a day by a loaded team was the distribution of taverns, whose principal customers were teamsters drawing grain, lead, etc. It is said these stood along the great road between Whitewater and Milwaukee to the number of fifteen-that is, four or five miles apart. When, therefore, the Milwaukee and Mississippi Railroad was projected, the farmers of Whitewater town were equally interested with the villagers in having it run through Whitewater, which it did, reaching there in the fall of \(1852 .{ }^{13}\)

Whitewater was fourth in wheat production at this period, being exceeded by Mount Pleasant with 375 bushels, Sugar Creek with 379, and Plymouth with 340. The average farm in Whitewater produced, besides wheat, 51 bushels of corn, 97 of oats, 18 of potatoes. It had 10 tons of hay, 71 pounds of butter, 7 of wool, and maintained 22 sheep, 6 cattle (one a working ox), and one horse. The value of the livestock was given at \(\$ 231\), which is the third highest of the nine towns, Mount Pleasant with a valuation of \(\$ 312\) being first and Sugar Creek with a valuation of \(\$ 247\) being second. Whitewater was first in number of sheep per farm, having more
\({ }^{2}\) Cravath, 89 .
than twice as many as Sugar Creek, her nearest rival. It appears that sheep and wool growing was an important industry in Whitewater. We find that one farmer, George R. Goodhue, had 900 sheep valued at \(\$ 1475\); another, John M. Clark, of Vermont, had 700; and Leander Birge, of New York, had 600. Several others had from 175 to 200 head, and 46 farms out of the 148 kept sheep to some extent. The statistics of wool production are incomplete, but by comparison with Sugar Creek the amount may be estimated at about 4000 pounds.

Wheat in 1859, while more abundant absolutely, represented a smaller yield than in 1849 in proportion to the tillable acreage. Other crops - corn, oats, and hay-were larger, yet not notably so, than ten years before. Milch cows had augmented in number until there were 4 to the average farm in 1860 , whereas in 1850 there had been but 2 , and "other cattle" had increased from 3 to 4 . Sheep were less numerous, only 2734 in the town as against 3282 , while the average per farm had fallen from 22 to 19. There was also a decrease in number of swine, of which in 1850 there were 851, while the 1860 schedules show 730, or an average of 5 to the farm. The production of butter had multiplied fourfold. In that item and in the item of pork we seem to have the key to the recent agricultural development of the town.

By 1869 wheat production had dropped to 167 bushels per farm, but more corn, oats, hay, wool, and other crops had come in to replace wheat. It appears probable that wheat as a staple crop had passed its period of maximum profitableness in Whitewater some years before 1860. The antiquarians speak of the years 1849, 1850, and 1851 as the "pink-eye" years, \({ }^{14}\) when crops grew progressively worse. After that there was a revival, and in 1855, the year in which wheat prices soared to \(\$ 1.55\) and more in Whitewater, the crop seems to have been good, and great prosperity prevailed. Nevertheless, there is evidence of much restlessness among the farmers during that decade, in the frequency of land transfers, which totaled 252 forties. In other words, approximately 43 per cent of all the land in the town changed hands between the years 1851 and \(1860 .^{15}\) No doubt the good prices due to the Crimean War and the project \({ }^{18}\) for building the Central Wisconsin Railway through Walworth County in 1854 and 1855 -both of which tended to advance the prices of land very markedly-were a fruitful cause of land transfers. In the early spring of 1854 spring wheat was worth \(\$ 1.25\) "at home," and the farmers were preparing to increase the acreage enormously. Land prices were going up, and prominent farmers of the county at that time sold their farms and moved away. \({ }^{17}\)

\({ }^{\text {B }}\) In no case was a transfer to a person of the same name, who might have been a member of the family, counted in the above total. It is, of course,
impossible to detect family relationship when the in
is Whibhe was to detect family rel carried out.
 from Vermont, sold out in 1854, removing to Warker, Towa, herere he engaged
in merchandising. He died there in 1867. Dr. Ansel A. Hemenway, of Sring in merchandising. He died there in 1867 . Dr. Ansel A. Hemenway, of Spring
Prairie, Walworth County, sold his farm about the same time and went to
Oregon. I. A. Dwinnell, History of Walkeorth County, MS.

The census of 1880 , as summarized by towns in our chart, discloses a condition of at least relatively high prosperity in the agriculture of Whitewater. First place was occupied by dairying, which from 8 cows brought the average farm 2548 gallons of milk and 420 pounds of butter. At 10 cents per gallon the milk would be worth \(\$ 254.80\); at 20 cents per pound the butter would yield an additional \(\$ 84\), or a total gross income of \(\$ 338.80\). This nets a large proportion of the \(\$ 799\) of total productions. Since the milk produced was apparently marketed at creameries or cheese factories, the above estimate may be too high. Still, it looks as if dairying were becoming well established.

There were 16 swine to the average farm, and this fact, supported by the comparatively large production of corn, 620 bushels, indicates that pork was a leading product of Whitewater farms in 1880. In 1885 Whitewater had on hand 2388 hogs, 3739 cattle, and only 1539 sheep (showing that the wool business was a vanishing industry). It produced 487,800 pounds of cheese valued at \(\$ 34,110\), and 39,990 pounds of butter worth \(\$ 7215\). There was also a crop of tobacco, 37,000 pounds valued at \(\$ 3700\). The value of hogs slaughtered during the year was reckoned at \(\$ 20,133\); of cattle and calves, \(\$ 25,099\); sheep and lambs, \(\$ 516\). Here is still another test to prove the decadence of sheep farming.

Ten years later, 1895, the farm lands were valued at \(\$ 966,940\) as against \(\$ 465,955\) in 1885 . Pork was a less important item in production, amounting to \(\$ 19,581\); cattle and calves on hand were valued much higher than in the preceding census, while those sold brought in only half as much. Sheep remained about as before. The amount of cheese produced was 323,500 pounds valued at \(\$ 21,113\); butter, 230,535 pounds valued at \(\$ 43,498\). Thus cheese and butter had exchanged places, and their combined value in 1894, \(\$ 64,611\), exceeded their combined value of \(1884, \$ 41,325\), by \(\$ 23,286\). Hence, dairying had become the agricultural specialty, as is also shown in the high valuation placed upon the cattle, 2987 head at \(\$ 64,490\). The majority of these animals must have been milch cows. In 1905 the number of milch cows was 2210, valued at \(\$ 58,215\). Milk produced amounted to 93,110 gallons valued at \(\$ 30,840\) (which seems impossibly high and suggests an error in printing) ; butter, 10,150 pounds valued at \(\$ 2235\). The above is the farm production. In addition, \(5,468,667\) pounds of milk yielding 244,768 pounds of butter went to four creameries, and brought to 94 farmers milking 1271 cows the net sum of \(\$ 53,487\). Besides, the creamery in the city of Whitewater paid to 30 farmers \(\$ 14,853\) for the milk from 350 cows. Apparently there were no cheese factories in Walworth County; at least none are listed. However, the combined totals of milk and butter foot up to \(\$ 101,415\), or approximately \(\$ 700\) per farm (there were 147 farms). The total cattle, 3492 head, were valued at \(\$ 78,360\), and those slaughtered at \(\$ 24,656\). Hogs slaughtered were worth \(\$ 39,960\), sheep and lambs a paltry \(\$ 238\).

Special Productions.-So far as appears from the census, specialization except in one particular was hardly as much in evidence as it had been ten years earlier. This is true of sheep. In 1870 the average per farm was 33 , with 190 pounds of wool; in 1880 the average was 22 , with 128 pounds of wool. Moreover, the total number of sheep in the town had dropped from 6030 to 3330 , and the total wool clip from 33,847 pounds to 18,660 . These statistics show a marked decline in the one branch of farming which seemed to be tending toward a specialty.

Value of Productions.-The total estimated values of farm productions in 1870 ranged from \(\$ 60\) (in a single case) to \(\$ 14,500\) (in a single case), with a liberal sprinkling of incomes exceeding \(\$ 2000\) and a large number over \(\$ 1000\). The one big income mentioned is the only case where total productions are valued at more than \(\$ 5000\), and in that case \(\$ 9000\) of the \(\$ 14,500\) was derived from animals "slaughtered or sold on the farm." Probably a large number of sheep, cattle, and hogs went into the aggregate. The farm in question, owned by two partners (the Clarks), contained 514 acres improved land and 100 acres unimproved, and was valued at \(\$ 50,000\). The machinery was valued at \(\$ 2000\). The owners paid out \(\$ 3000\) in wages. It was the closest approximation to the "bonanza farm" that one meets with in Whitewater, and it was a stock farm having on it chiefly purebred animals.

There were 74 incomes of \(\$ 1000\) and more, 38 from \(\$ 600\) to \(\$ 999,24\) from \(\$ 400\) to \(\$ 599,26\) from \(\$ 200\) to \(\$ 399\), and 16 under \(\$ 200\). It was obviously a community having in it a considerable number of very well-to-do families intermingled with those in poorer circumstances. The proportion of low valuations and also of low incomes increased in the rough lands and decreased in the more desirable sections-those which were entered first,-proving that the owners of the poorer lands were under a fairly permanent handicap.

The average value of the productions per farm for the year 1879 was \(\$ 799\), which places the town fourth in our list, those surpassing it being Pleasant Springs, Bangor, and Empire, the highest average being that attained by Pleasant Springs- \(\$ 1301\). The land was by that time practically all improved, only 19 acres on the average farm of 133 acres remaining unimproved. This shows that swamps must have been drained for the most part and the highlands brought under tillage. At this time there were 40 incomes of \(\$ 1000\) and over, 36 of \(\$ 600\) to \(\$ 999,34\) of \(\$ 400\) to \(\$ 599,21\) of \(\$ 200\) to \(\$ 399\), and 13 under \(\$ 200\). One farm reported no income. Seven incomes were \(\$ 2000\) and over, and 3 of these were \(\$ 5000\) and over. The largest was \(\$ 8000\), made by Truman Taft on a farm of 135 acres, of which 120 acres was cleared. The farm was valued at \(\$ 5000\), the livestock at \(\$ 1100\). The amount of milk sold or sent to creameries or cheese factories was 7000 gallons. There were 150 sheep on the farm. Mr. Taft raised 1000 bushels of corn, 200 bushels oats, and 100 bushels wheat. Five thousand dollars was made by Charles Clark on a
farm of 460 acres, 410 of which was cleared. It was valued at \(\$ 25,000\), the livestock at \(\$ 6000\). The productions were: 1000 pounds of butter, 3000 bushels corn, 1500 bushels oats, 400 bushels wheat. One hundred and sixty sheep produced 1200 pounds of wool. The sale of purebred cattle, sheep, and horses from this stock farm may explain the size of the income.

In 1904 the average farm income was \(\$ 1289\) and in 1919 it was \(\$ 2936\). There were 1260 milch cows in 1880 , and this number had increased by 1905 to 2210 and by 1920 to 2639 . The value of dairy productions in 1919 had advanced to \(\$ 1777\) from \(\$ 790\) in 1904 ; the value of other livestock productions to \(\$ 978\) from \(\$ 440\); and crop incomes to \(\$ 181\) from \(\$ 59\).

Social Conditions.-The recital just concluded testifies to the existence in Whitewater of a group of farm homes so well furnished with the pecuniary means of good living as to suggest that we may have here a model rural community. That question will turn upon the social use that was being made of the material resources, the housing, the education furnished the farm children, the religious, social, and intellectual opportunities of the people and the way these were used. On some of these points a little light can be thrown from general sources of information.

In the first place, our census report on the population in 1850 shows that the total number of persons of American nativity was 985 , of foreign nativity 245 . The foreign element included, however, 49 Irish, 51 English, 38 Canadians, 7 New Brunswickers, and 4 Scots, or a total of 149 English speaking persons. This left 96 persons or only 7 per cent non-English speaking foreigners. In this summary for 1850 no distinction is drawn between the village and the town, and the foreign element was no doubt concentrated mainly in the former, leaving the rural community English speaking and almost purely American, with the exception-already notedof a few Scandinavian families. The 1860 population census discloses a marked increase in foreign born persons; but, as in the former case, these were largely in the village, not on the farms. A glance at the plat will show that the farming community was still, as ten years earlier, predominatingly English speaking in character; and a count of heads of farm families as given in the census seems to show that only 25 of these were non-English speaking (mainly Norwegian), while 145 were English speaking. The English speaking group was divided as follows: from New York, 55; Vermont, 11; Massachusetts, 3; Connecticut, 3; Rhode Island, 1; New Hampshire, 1; Ohio, 3; Virginia, 1; Pennsylvania, 2; New Jersey, 1; Wisconsin 1-or 82 of American nativity; Ireland, 42; England, 16; Canada 3; Scotland, 2-total foreign English speaking, 63. In the non-English speaking group were 22 from Norway and 3 from Germany.

When we reach the census year 1870, we find the farm population of Whitewater divided between American born and foreign born, in the proportion of 813 American and 222
foreign-exactly 500 of the former being natives of Wiscon\(\sin\). Of the remainder (313), 200 were natives of New York, 31 of Vermont, and 19 of Massachusetts, while Ohio furnished 17, Connecticut 10, Pennsylvania 8, and Rhode Island 7. There were also 5 from Maine, 4 from Indiana, 3 each from New Jersey and Michigan, 2 from California, and 1 each from Alabama, Illinois, Maryland, and Tennessee. The foreign born were: 81 from Ireland, 58 from Norway, 45 from England, 18 from Germany, and 15 from Canada, while Holland furnished 4 and Scotland 1. It will be seen that if the English speaking foreigners are added to the American, the total English speaking element will be raised to 955 , leaving only 80 non-English speaking persons in the rural town, or less than 8 per cent.

We now move forward fifteen years, to the date of the state enumeration in 1885, when we find in the town of White-water-outside of the city-a total population of 838 distributed among 163 families. Of this number, 673 were born in the United States and 165 in foreign countries, as follows: Germany, 29; Great Britain, 38; Ireland, 45; British Amer-


Fig. 41. Town of Whitewater, 1915 After a drawing lent by the W. W. Hixson Company
ica, 11; and Scandinavia, 41. This gave an English speaking population total of 767 and a non-English speaking element of 71, or just over 9 per cent. The foreign element equaled 19 per cent of the entire population. Ten years later the families numbered 196, apparently, while the total population was only 832, 6 less than in 1885. The American born were 655, Germans 71, English 43, Irish 38, and Scandinavians 25. The Germans and Scandinavians together num-
bered 96, while the total of the English speaking element was 736. The most noticeable change was in the number of Germans, who increased from 29 in 1885 to 71, while the combined British and Irish element changed hardly at all, and the Scandinavian declined from 41 to 25 .

The last state census, that for the year 1905, gives the total population as 759, the native American as 650, and the foreign as 109. Of the native population Wisconsin was the birthplace of 594, other states furnishing only 56 in the total of 650 . The foreign born came, 1 from Canada, 19 from England, 56 from Germany, 18 from Ireland, 12 from Norway, and 3 from Scotland. Thus, of the 109 foreigners, 41 were English speaking and only 68 non-English speaking, or 8.9 per cent of the whole.

These statistics show that, from its beginnings down to recent years, the town of Whitewater regarded in its rural aspect has been a distinctively English speaking community, prevailingly American, and that in its social origins the New England tradition predominated strongly. One would expect to find there, in much perfection, the characteristic institutions of New England, especially her churches and schools. The New England leadership in local affairs-political, moral, intellectual, and communal-would doubtless be evidenced by local records. But the presence of a numerous Irish element may have influenced both religion and politics to a considerable extent, and it would be strange if the Norwegians in the southeastern part of the town did not have their separate church organization also.

The village (afterwards city) of Whitewater absorbed in a part of its activities-for example, the religious-some of the minor elements of the rural community. A Catholic church there served the needs of the Catholic farmers as well as of Catholics in the city. The county plat of 1873 shows four schoolhouses scattered through the town-one in the extreme south (section 33), one in section 20 , one in 9 , and one in 2. There was but a single country church building, in section 20 . The county map of 1859 fails to show a church, and there were at that time three of the four schoolhouses found in 1873 located as above. The 1891 county plat shows five rural schools, a Methodist church in section 20, and (apparently) a Norwegian church and cemetery in section 34.

These features, save the Methodist church, all reappear in the plat of the year 1907.

Tradition, very well authenticated in this case, speaks of the custom early established among many Whitewater farmers, of attending lyceums, lectures, singing classes, concerts, balls, etc., in the village. The Norwegians in the southeastern part of the town, however, appear to have led their own distinctive social life, centered largely at the local church. The village served most of the American families. \({ }^{18}\)

Political Conditions.-Walworth County, as was to be expected from the origin of its population, was inclined to go for slavery restriction as soon as that question arose. It is therefore not a matter of surprise, that this county in 1856 gave Fremont a majority over Buchanan of 2221. The vote stood: Fremont, 3518; Buchanan, 1297. At the same election, Whitewater voted 377 for Fremont, and 206 for Buchanan. This was the vote of the entire "town," including the village. No separate totals for country and village are given. \({ }^{19}\) But at the same election the town of Sugar Creek, a wholly rural town, gave Fremont 131, Buchanan 75. All local officers received in both towns about the same plurality as was given Fremont, and the same was true of Congressman (John F. Potter was elected) and members of the legislature.

It was claimed, by Republican papers, that nine-tenths of the newly made voters in Milwaukee voted the regular Democratic ticket, and it is true-as we saw in Newton and Manitowoc County-that the German vote was overwhelmingly Democratic in this period. The native Americanism of the southeastern counties is revealed in the large Fremont majorities in Walworth, Rock, Racine, and Kenosha counties, also in Winnebago and Columbia; while Milwaukee County, with over 4000 majority for Buchanan, and Washington, with nearly 2000, disclose the German immigrants' trend toward Democracy.

The results of the earliest elections cannot be given by towns, since only county summaries were furnished to the secretary of state. Yet, inasmuch as Whitewater was a fairly
\({ }^{18}\) It would be an interesting inquiry to what extent the farm boys sought work in the Esterly reaper factory, located in Whitewater for many years, in the ther manufacturing works, or in the important gristmill there.
\({ }^{19}\) Whitewater Gazette, Nov. 13, 1856.
typical town in Walworth County, the county votes will doubtless reveal something of the political tendencies in that town. In the election of 1848 this county voted for three sets of presidential electors - the Democratic, the Whig, and the Free-soil. The vote stood; Democratic, 550; Whig, 804; Free-soil, 1494, being a clear majority of 140 for the Freesoil ticket. In this matter Walworth aligned itself with Racine, \({ }^{20}\) these two counties being the only ones to give the third party a majority, though several others-Fond du Lac, Rock, and Waukesha-gave pluralities to the Free-soil electors. Four years later, Walworth gave a plurality to the Free-soil electors, the vote standing: Democratic, 1141; Whig, 965, and Free-soil, 1432. The next year, 1853, in connection with the general election for state and county officers, a vote was taken on the question of prohibiting the traffic in intoxicating liquors (the Maine Law, as it was called). On that question Walworth County voted yes by the very large majority of 1906 against 733. Rock County gave a larger majority- 2444 against 432-and Milwaukee opposed the measure by a vote of 1243 to \(\mathbf{4 3 8 1}\). Of twenty counties compared, only four-Dodge, Manitowoc, Milwaukee, and Richland-gave majorities against the bill, while sixteen voted in favor by from one vote (as in Crawford) to 2062 votes (as in Rock). From 1856 Whitewater has remained steadfastly Republican.

Whitewater-Population Statigtics
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Table I. Census of 1850-Agricultural Statistics
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\hline Eagle－Richland Co．．．．． & \({ }_{1}^{101}\) & \({ }^{2.729}\) & \({ }_{8}^{8,827}\) & \(\underset{\substack{11,160}}{100}\) & \(\underset{\substack{129,200 \\ 1,270}}{\text { a }}\) & ii & \({ }^{6,98}\) & \({ }_{1.8}^{19}\) & \({ }_{1.9}^{193}\) & 5 & 2．74 & 1．6 & \({ }_{8.7}^{887}\) & \({ }^{27,4771}\) & \({ }^{6,569}\) & \(6_{7}^{68}\) & \({ }^{26,220} 5\) & 4．066 40 & \({ }_{30}^{30}\) & \({ }_{4}^{4.5}\) & \({ }_{2,88}^{28}\) & & & & \({ }_{24,2459}^{24,25}\) & & 520 & & ． 01 & \({ }^{6,640}\) & 332 & \({ }^{1,1116} 1{ }_{11}^{10}\) & \(3_{326}^{32}\) & \({ }_{5,55}^{5,50}\) \\
\hline Empire－Pond du Lea Co． & \(\stackrel{119}{11}\) & \({ }^{9,217}\) & \({ }_{\text {7，139 }}^{7,13}\) &  & \({ }_{\substack{386,955 \\ 3,251}}\) & － & \({ }^{12,245}\) & \({ }_{1.8}^{21.5}\) & 4573 & \(\underset{1.8}{219}\) & \({ }_{5.2}^{622}\) & citat &  & \({ }^{39,985} 3\) & \({ }_{\substack{36,859 \\ 310}}\) & \({ }_{215}^{315}\) & \({ }_{\text {2，921 }}^{24}\) & \({ }^{23,2850}\) & 5，088 \({ }_{4}\) & ． \(0^{2}\) & \({ }^{5,799}\) & \({ }_{210}^{310}\) & \({ }^{13}\) & & \({ }^{28,380}\) & \({ }^{3,000}\) & \({ }_{2,3929}^{2,}\) & & & & & \({ }^{265}\) & & \({ }_{\text {5，030 }}\) \\
\hline  & \(\stackrel{199}{19}\) & \({ }^{10,500}\) & \({ }^{7,885}\) &  & \(\underset{\substack{553,480 \\ 2,781}}{ }\) & －－1．30 & \({ }_{\substack{26,392 \\ 132}}\) & \({ }_{2.2}^{444}\) & \({ }_{3.7}^{75}\) & \({ }_{1.3}^{260}\) &  & \({ }_{3.5}^{716}\) &  & \({ }^{56,0281}\) & \({ }_{\substack{24,243 \\ 121}}\) & \({ }_{73}^{73}\) & \({ }^{12,122} 6\) & \({ }^{32,788} 1\) & \({ }^{1,987}\) & & \({ }^{11,8759}\) & 360 & \({ }_{60}^{19}\) & ． \(0^{5}\) & \({ }_{64,0101}^{621}\) & \({ }_{300}\) & \({ }^{3,986}\) & & & \({ }_{14}\) & & 588 & \({ }_{10}^{14}\) & \({ }^{9,77_{49}}\) \\
\hline  & \({ }^{280}\) & \({ }_{10,515}^{10,5}\) & \({ }^{23,005}\) & \({ }^{33,520}\) & \(\underbrace{}_{\substack{336,260 \\ 1,201}}\) & \(\cdots\) & \({ }^{17,668}\) & 500 & 7．10， & 1.2 & \({ }_{2.7}^{77}\) & \({ }_{1}^{475}\) & \({ }_{\substack{2,097 \\ \hline 1.4}}\) & \({ }^{62.224}\) & \({ }^{47,9271}\) & & \({ }^{45,929} 10\) & \({ }_{\text {41，064 }}^{146}\) & \({ }_{610}^{610}\) & & \({ }_{\substack{11,728 \\ 41}}^{41}\) & \({ }^{255}\) & \({ }_{0}^{3}\) & & \({ }^{24,3787}\) & \({ }_{40}^{40}\) & 2，298 & & & & & & & \({ }^{10,597}\) \\
\hline \(\xrightarrow{\text { Lodi－Columbia } \mathrm{Co}^{\text {a }} \text { Average．．．}}\) & \({ }_{1}^{124}\) & \({ }^{\text {6，988 }}\) & \({ }^{9,447}\) & \(\underset{\substack{1,3851 \\ 1351}}{ }\) &  & 20 &  & \({ }_{2.2}^{273}\) & \({ }_{3.1}^{39.6}\) & \({ }_{1.2}^{161}\) & \({ }_{3.9}^{476}\) & 228．8 & \({ }^{467}\) & \({ }^{47,981}\) & \({ }_{\text {41，} 1,872} 3\) & \({ }_{150}^{150}\) & \({ }_{17}^{17,635}\) & \({ }^{20,988}\) & \({ }_{534}^{634}\) & \({ }_{1}^{18}\) & \({ }^{4,493}\) & \({ }^{1,124}\) & \({ }_{0} 5^{7}\) & \({ }_{0}{ }^{4}\) & \({ }^{26,729}\) & \({ }_{\text {1，385 }}^{1,10}\) & \({ }^{1,6,22}\) 13 & & & & \(\stackrel{122}{12}\) & 199 & & \({ }^{7,7661}\) \\
\hline Mount Pleasant－Racine Co． & \({ }_{2}^{25}\) & \({ }^{22,890} 9\) & \({ }^{2,924}\) &  & \(\stackrel{\mid c}{1,017,290} 4\) & \(\cdots\) & \({ }_{\substack{33,609 \\ 133}}\) & \({ }_{8.3}^{846}\) & ci， 1.64 & \({ }^{141}\) & （1，001．9 & \({ }_{\substack{1,711 \\ 6.7}}^{1 .}\) & \({ }_{3.2}^{9.3}\) & － & \({ }^{44,1975}\) & & \({ }_{\text {23，615 }}^{93}\) & \({ }_{\text {36，450 }}^{34}\) & \({ }^{4,681} 18\) & 284 & \begin{tabular}{|c}
471 \\
81 \\
\hline 1
\end{tabular} & 888 & \({ }_{218}^{214}\) & & \({ }_{\substack{74,743 \\ 296}}\) & 1，400 & \({ }^{6.562}\) ， & & & 700 & & \({ }_{150}^{150}\) & & \(\underset{\substack{11,208 \\ 44}}{ }\) \\
\hline ＊New Glarus－Green Co．．．．． & \({ }_{14}^{14}\) & \({ }^{10,306} 6\) & \({ }^{8,545} 5\) & \({ }_{\substack{18,849 \\ 126}}\) & \begin{tabular}{|c} 
209，385 \\
\hline 1,405 \\
\hline 105 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \(\cdots\) & \({ }^{1+, 889}\) & \({ }_{1.6}^{250}\) & \({ }_{5.6}^{87}\) & \({ }_{1}^{267}\) & \({ }_{5.4}^{813}\) & \({ }^{127}\) & \({ }_{4.4}^{617}\) &  & \({ }^{350665}\) & 1.1 & \({ }^{11,365}\) & \({ }_{\text {13，}}^{13,661}\) & \({ }_{3}^{36}\) & \({ }_{29}^{29}\) &  & 568. & & & \({ }^{34,150} 129\) &  & \({ }^{3,499}\) & & & & \(00^{2}\) & \({ }_{5}^{67}\) & & \({ }^{7,2965}\) \\
\hline Nemton－Manitwoc Co．．． & \({ }^{228}\) & \({ }^{5,160}\) & \({ }^{8.749}\) &  & ｜ 123,4801 & & 7，663 & \({ }_{32}^{78}\) & （1．7） & \({ }_{1.4}^{33}\) & \({ }_{1.1}^{268}\) & \({ }_{88}^{88}\) & \({ }_{2.2}^{513}\) & \({ }^{14,7784}\) & \({ }_{\text {c }}^{3,845}\) & \({ }^{10,063} 4\) & \(0_{1}^{3}\) & \({ }^{10,564} 4\) & \({ }_{113}^{115}\) & \({ }^{2,126}\) & 10，4295 & 1，041 & 0 & & \({ }^{13,157} 5\) & \({ }_{4}^{40}\) & 488. & & & \({ }_{812}\) & & & & \({ }^{2,279}\) \\
\hline Norma－Racine Co．．． & \({ }_{1}^{115}\) & \({ }_{\substack{12,250 \\ 106}}\) & \({ }^{84}\) & \(\xrightarrow{13,144}\) & \begin{tabular}{|c}
158,830 \\
1,379 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & －\({ }^{\text {i2 }}\) & \({ }^{8,574}\) & \({ }_{1.9}^{227}\) & \({ }_{650}^{58.8}\) & 1.2 & 585
4.8
4 & \({ }_{3.8}^{445}\) & \({ }^{345}\) & 20，640 \({ }_{\text {231 }}\) & \({ }^{19.7271}\) & 214 & 2，290 & \({ }^{12,603}\) 103 & \({ }^{1,2,36}\) & \({ }_{08}^{11}\) & \({ }^{4,045}\) & \({ }_{5}^{45}\) & \(\stackrel{28}{28}\) & ． 01 & \({ }^{29,2954}\) & \({ }_{4}^{50}\) & \({ }_{2,823}^{24}\) ． & & & & & 161 & & \({ }_{\substack{3,781 \\ 32}}\) \\
\hline \[
\overline{\substack{\text { Orion (Richmond) -Richand } \\ \text { Co. Average. }}}
\] & \({ }_{1}^{42}\) & \({ }_{\text {1，473 }}^{1,4}\) & \({ }^{3,772}\) & \({ }_{\text {c }}^{5} 5\) & \({ }_{\text {cose }}^{63,508}\) & i2 & 4，0566 & \({ }_{1.68} 1.6\) & \({ }_{2.5}^{9.6}\) & \({ }_{7}^{33}\) & \(2.2{ }^{9.1}\) & \({ }_{1.5}^{6.5}\) & \({ }_{6.1}^{254}\) & \({ }^{10,905}\) & \({ }^{3,929}\) & \({ }^{223}\) & \({ }^{10,0053}\) & 4，119 \({ }^{\text {98 }}\) & \({ }_{12}^{12}\) & \({ }_{98}^{89}\) & \({ }_{1}^{1,940}\) & & \({ }_{12}^{11}\) & & \({ }^{13,475}\) ， & & 413 & & & \({ }^{1,145}\) & \({ }_{8}^{8}\) & 1，6010 & 159 & \({ }^{2,300}\) \\
\hline  & \({ }_{1}^{145}\) & \({ }^{9,3,35}\) & \({ }^{10,029} 9\) & \(\underset{\substack{19,382 \\ 134}}{ }\) & \begin{tabular}{|c}
342,200 \\
2,360 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \(\cdots\) &  &  & \({ }_{3.6}^{522}\) & \({ }_{1}^{14}\) & \({ }^{4.9}\) & \({ }_{4.7}^{67}\) & \({ }_{3.1}^{56,1}\) & \({ }_{\text {cis }}^{45,898}\) & \({ }^{65,615}\) 452， & &  & \({ }_{\substack{24,643 \\ 168}}\) &  & \({ }_{.08}^{12}\) & \({ }_{5}^{5.810} 4\) & \({ }^{3,640} 25\) & & & \({ }_{\text {31，200 }}^{312}\) & \({ }_{96}^{910}\) & \({ }^{2,220} 15\) & & & & & & & \({ }^{6,645}\) \\
\hline  & \({ }_{1}^{147}\) & \({ }^{7,613} 5\) & \({ }^{5,981} 40\) & 13，5944 & \begin{tabular}{|c}
299,701 \\
2,011 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 22 & \({ }^{13,285}\) & \({ }_{1.5}^{22.5}\) & \({ }^{5.7}{ }^{537}\) & 1.1 & \({ }_{3.5}^{506}\) & \({ }^{5075}\) &  & \({ }_{\text {47，033 }}^{311}\) & \({ }^{3+2,264}\) & 1，23 & \({ }^{29,9836}\) & \({ }_{\substack{26,454 \\ 178}}\) & \({ }^{2,300}\) & \({ }_{1}^{16}\) &  & \(\stackrel{104}{6}\) & \({ }_{6}^{69}\) & \({ }_{31}^{41}\) & \({ }_{\substack{3,747 \\ 245}}\) & \({ }_{\text {1，} 11}^{1,35}\) & \({ }^{2,517}\) & & & & & \({ }^{1,713} 1\) & 102 & \(\stackrel{7,584}{7,58}\) \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Prairie du Chien-Crasford } \\
& \text { Co. Average............ } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \({ }_{1}^{40}\) & \({ }^{2,246}\) & \({ }_{\text {5，865 }}^{146}\) & \({ }_{\text {8，107 }}^{102}\) & 89，200 & 1 & \({ }_{\substack{\text { 5，755 } \\ 143}}\) & \({ }_{3.6}^{145}\) & \({ }_{3.4}^{138}\) & 1.7 & \({ }_{18.5}^{18.5}\) & 2.4 & \(\begin{array}{r}540 \\ 13.5 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \(\underset{\substack{17,228 \\ 430}}{ }\) & 5，\({ }_{1}^{5130}\) & \({ }_{15}^{15}\) & \({ }_{\substack{10,755 \\ 288}}\) & \({ }^{9} 9.626\) & \({ }_{3}^{131}\) & 493 & \({ }_{\text {c }}^{5.215}\) & 150 & \({ }_{2}^{201}\) & \({ }_{9}^{365}\) & \({ }^{8.225}\) & \({ }^{230}\) & \({ }_{18}^{78}\) & 17 & & \({ }_{16}^{670}\) & \({ }^{225}\) & \({ }_{23}^{93}\) ． & & \({ }^{3,845} 9\) \\
\hline  & \({ }_{1}^{116}\) & \({ }_{61}^{7,124}\) & \({ }^{8,422}\) & \({ }_{\substack{15,546 \\ 134}}\) & \(\xrightarrow{\substack{175,510 \\ 1,513}}\) & ii & \({ }_{\text {，}}^{7,7858}\) & \({ }_{1.7}^{192}\) & \({ }_{3.4}^{397}\) & （1．75 & \({ }^{4.5}\) & \％\({ }_{3}^{4.7}\) & \({ }_{3}^{4.6}\) & \({ }_{\text {3，}}^{3,589}\) & \({ }_{3}^{36,429} 3\) & \({ }_{1}^{135}\) & \({ }^{13,655}\) & \(\underset{\substack{11,86 \\ 102}}{ }\) & \({ }_{\substack{\text { a，} \\ 172}}^{\substack{27}}\) & \({ }_{20}^{32}\) & \({ }^{4,0,085}\) & 512 & & & \({ }^{33,230}\) & \({ }_{450}^{45}\) & \({ }^{2,322}\) & & & & & & 133 & \({ }^{5,538}\) \\
\hline  & \(\stackrel{139}{18}\) & \({ }^{5,664} 40\) & \({ }^{12,579}\) & （18，243 & \begin{tabular}{|c}
224,025 \\
1,611 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & i2 & \(\underset{\substack{16,961 \\ 121}}{19}\) & \({ }_{2.6}^{308}\) & \({ }_{2.7}^{370}\) & \({ }_{1.3}^{179}\) & \({ }_{3.1}^{431}\) & \({ }_{8}^{816}\) &  & \({ }^{44,887}\) 327 & \({ }^{26,3689}\) & \({ }^{1.841} 1\) & \({ }^{41,882}\) & \({ }_{\substack{19.5150 \\ 140}}\) & \(\underset{\substack{1,981 \\ 14}}{ }\) & \(\stackrel{58}{48}\) & \({ }^{6,193}{ }_{41}\) & \({ }_{1}^{240}\) & \({ }_{6}^{90}\) & & \({ }_{\substack{30,640 \\ 200}}\) & \({ }^{4,025}\) & \({ }^{2,1085}\) & & & \({ }_{2}^{38}\) & & \({ }^{1,10}\) & & \({ }^{8,1888}\) \\
\hline Sevatopol－Door Co．．． & \({ }_{1}^{17}\) & \({ }_{215}^{215}\) & \({ }_{1}^{1,730} 1\) & （12， 114 & \({ }^{9,550}\) & 4 & \({ }_{\substack{875 \\ 51}}\) & ．11 & 1.18 & 1．4．3 & \({ }^{2.56}\) & & \({ }_{1.9}^{1.3}\) & \({ }^{1,685}\) & \({ }_{13}^{236}\) & \({ }^{602}\) & \({ }_{24}^{408}\) & \({ }_{60}^{60}\) & & \({ }_{2}^{37}\) & \({ }_{1}^{2,125}\) & & & & \({ }_{33}^{575}\) & & \({ }_{1}^{17}\) & & & （ \({ }_{\text {，} 1135}\) & 336
10 & & & \({ }_{2}^{255}\) \\
\hline \({ }_{\text {Sparta }}\) Morroe Co．．．．．．． & \(\stackrel{109}{10}\) & \({ }_{5}^{5,480}\) & \({ }^{6,8888} 8\) & \({ }_{1}^{12,108} 10\) & \begin{tabular}{|c}
230,100 \\
2,111 \\
\hline 2
\end{tabular} & 19 & \({ }^{5,886} 5\) & \({ }_{1}^{170}\) & \({ }_{2.3}^{250}\) & 1.12 & 21．4 & 1 & 77.3 & \({ }^{25,2927}\) & \({ }^{22,2234}\) & \({ }^{1,147} 10\) & \({ }_{2}^{22,8285}\) & \({ }_{\text {23，202 }}^{210}\) & 06 & 19481 & \({ }^{8,788} 8\) & \({ }^{1,467}\) & 165 & & \({ }_{2}^{22,455}\) & \({ }^{1,917}\) & \({ }^{958}\) & & & & & & \({ }_{2}^{25}\) &  \\
\hline  & \(\stackrel{150}{10}\) & \({ }^{11,484}{ }^{816}\) & \({ }^{8,031} 51\) & \({ }^{19,465} 1\) & \({ }^{400,957}\) 2，635 & 20 &  & \({ }_{2.8}^{4.8}\) & \({ }_{4.1}^{620}\) & \({ }_{1.1}^{1.1}\) & \({ }_{4.5}^{666}\) & \({ }_{\text {15，6．}}^{2.35}\) & 1，056 & \({ }_{\substack{65,148 \\ 434}}^{\text {43，}}\) & \({ }_{5}^{57,533}\) & \({ }_{6}^{934}\) & \({ }_{121538}^{21,538}\) & \({ }_{41,240}^{427}\) & \({ }^{7,877}\) & \({ }^{10} 6\) & \({ }^{7,458}\) & \({ }^{4.015}\) & ． \(0^{7}\) & \({ }_{4}^{69} 4\) & \({ }_{4}^{44.254}\) & \({ }_{7}^{7.116} 4\) & \({ }^{2,689}\) & & & & \({ }^{48}\) & \({ }_{263}^{36}\) & ， & \({ }^{11,2017}\) \\
\hline Whitewater－Walworth Co．．
Average．．．．．．．．．．． & \({ }_{1}^{137} 1\) & \[
8,3,450
\] & 9，0560 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 17,404 \\
& 126 \\
& 124
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 2,202 \\
\hline
\end{array}\right.
\] & 22 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 11,454 \\
& 83 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \({ }_{2.3}^{359}\) & \({ }_{4.4}^{46}\) & \({ }_{1.1}^{158}\) & \[
\begin{array}{|r|r|}
554 \\
4
\end{array}
\] &  & \({ }_{5.3}^{730}\) & \[
\begin{gathered}
51,85 \pi \\
3,87 \|
\end{gathered}
\] & \({ }^{27,393}\)（190） & \[
\begin{gathered}
278 \\
2
\end{gathered}
\] & \(\xrightarrow{17.15}\) 124， & \({ }_{\substack{19,974 \\ 145}}\) & \[
\begin{gathered}
8,352 \\
60 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
48 \\
{ }_{3}^{3}
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
5,0,737
\] & \[
790 \mid:
\] & & \({ }_{4}^{40}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
42.500 \\
\hline 310
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 5,0022 \\
& 5821
\end{aligned}
\] & \({ }^{3,242} \times 1\) & & & & & \(\stackrel{341}{21}\) & \({ }^{100} 7\) & \({ }^{7,350} 5\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table III．Census of 1870－Agricultural Statistics
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Acres op Land} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Livestock} & \multicolumn{20}{|c|}{Products} \\
\hline Town &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Z } \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& \text { a }
\end{aligned}
\] &  & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 䭴 } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & & & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 墨 } \\
& \text { © }
\end{aligned}
\] &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { gin } \\
& \text { on } \\
& \text { 品 } \\
& \text { ib }
\end{aligned}
\] &  &  & \[
\frac{.}{\stackrel{\circ}{8}}
\] &  &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { o } \\
& \frac{0}{0} \\
& \frac{0}{0} \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
\] &  &  &  &  &  &  &  &  &  &  &  &  & \(\square\) &  &  &  &  &  \\
\hline Bangor－La Crosse Co． & \({ }_{1}^{115}\) & 7，937 & \({ }^{8,915}\) & （16，852 146 & \(\frac{8407,575}{8,545}\) & \＄24 & 816，250 141 & \({ }_{3.6}^{428}\) & \begin{tabular}{l|l|}
454 \\
3.8
\end{tabular} & \({ }_{3}^{30}\) & \({ }_{5.4}^{617}\) & \({ }_{\substack{1,407 \\ 12.2}}\) & \({ }_{4.1}^{472}\) & 867，685 58 & \({ }^{73,695}\) ， & & 8，650 & 27，339 \({ }^{237}\) & 3，8993 & \({ }_{2}^{20}\) & 3，517 & 12，083） 105 & \({ }^{1,942}\) & \＄300 & \(c24235210\) & \({ }_{2}^{275}\) & 1， 11 & & & & \begin{tabular}{|r}
105 \\
8 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \({ }^{104}\) & & \({ }^{813,361} 116\) \\
\hline Brookfield－Waukesha Co Average． & 320 \({ }^{32}\) & 13，476 & \({ }^{7,402}\) & \({ }^{20,878}\) 65 & \({ }^{1,394,550} 4\) & － 7.6 .6 & \(\underset{\substack{51,349 \\ 160}}{ }\) & \({ }_{2.3}^{779}\) & \begin{tabular}{c}
1,020 \\
3.1 \\
\\
\\
\hline 10
\end{tabular} & \({ }_{6}^{63}\) & \({ }_{1}^{477}\) & 2，568 & 1，159 3 & \[
\overline{156,0.057},
\] & \({ }^{47,748} 148\) & 2，702 & 19，500 60 & 33，993 \({ }^{106}\) & 9，752 & \({ }_{507}^{50}\) & \({ }^{35,578} 111\) & \({ }^{9,108} 28\) & \({ }_{2}^{923}\) & ｜ 3,788 & 80，630 251 & \({ }_{\substack{8,010}}^{8.0}\) & 4，\({ }_{13}\) & & & 5，175 & \({ }^{437}\) & \begin{tabular}{|c}
825 \\
2
\end{tabular} & & \({ }^{31,183} 97\) \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Castle Rock-Grant Co...... } \\
\text { (Blue River) Average. }
\end{gathered}
\] & \(\stackrel{86}{1}\) & 4，045 & 9，805 & res， 160 & \({ }_{\text {coser }}^{171,870} 1\) & 12 & 11，594 134 & \({ }_{2.1}^{182}\) & 313 & \({ }_{89} 1\) & 565
6.6 & \({ }_{2.9}^{250}\) & 940
10.9 & 32，312 & 23，7858 & \({ }_{3}^{99}\) & \({ }^{13,210} 1\) & 17，148 19 & \begin{tabular}{|c}
540 \\
6
\end{tabular} & \({ }_{4}^{46}\) & 4，996． & & 15
17 & 16
18
18 & 12,314
109 & & 356 & & & & \({ }_{2}^{20}\) & \({ }_{30}^{30}\) & & \begin{tabular}{|c}
11,182 \\
130 \\
\hline 1.15 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Eagle－Riehland Co． Average．． & \({ }_{158}^{15}\) & \({ }^{6,288}{ }^{39}\) & 8，883 \({ }_{56}\) & 15，171 & 238，700 1, & 15 & \({ }^{5,355} 5\) & \({ }_{2.1}^{324}\) & \({ }^{317}\) & \({ }_{4}^{40}\) & \({ }_{2.5}^{409}\) & 1，25．9 & \({ }_{8.4}^{1,316}\) & 35，524 & 17，8873 & & 34，202 216 & 8，657 & \({ }^{3,280}\) & & \({ }^{4,378} 2\) & \(\begin{array}{r}30 \\ 1 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \({ }^{89} 5\) & 172 & 15，430 \({ }^{\text {97 }}\) & & 669 & & & \({ }^{4,673}{ }_{29}\) & ，\({ }^{1886}\) & 1，090 & \({ }_{10}\) & \({ }^{14,582}\) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Empire－Fond du Lac Co \\
Average．
\end{tabular} & \({ }_{1}^{151}\) & 11，872 & 6，594 \({ }_{43}\) & \begin{tabular}{|c|}
18,466 \\
121
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline 846,370 \\
5,605 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \(\cdots{ }_{46}\) & \[
\underset{\substack{21,448 \\ 142}}{ }
\] & \({ }_{467}\) & \({ }_{3.6}^{554}\) & \({ }_{8}^{84}\) & \begin{tabular}{l|l|}
474 \\
3.1 \\
& \\
& \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & ［3，7324 & \({ }_{3.6}^{537}\) & \({ }^{72,192}\) & 54，948383 & \({ }_{4}^{621}\) & \({ }^{9,103}\) & \[
\stackrel{33,220}{220}
\] & \(\underset{\substack{16,565 \\ 109}}{ }\) & \({ }_{1}^{164}\) & 9，887 \({ }^{65}\) & \({ }_{96}^{912}\) & \(\stackrel{608}{4}\) & \({ }^{3,401}\) & 50，802 & 4，200 & 4，680 & & & & \({ }_{4} 9\) & & 50 & \({ }^{20,206}{ }_{133}\) \\
\hline Franklin－Milwaukee Co Average． & \({ }_{1}^{235}\) & 14，811 63 & \({ }^{4,710}\) & 19，521 83 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
983,490 \\
4,185
\end{array}
\] & 50 & \[
\overline{30,198} 1
\] & \({ }_{2.5}^{679}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 885 \\
& 3.8
\end{aligned}
\] & \({ }_{3}^{30} 1\) & \({ }_{3.1}^{744}\) & \({ }_{3.5}^{931}\) & \({ }^{1,1,59}\) & \[
\overline{123,185}{ }_{524}
\] & \[
\underset{\substack{37,37 \\ 154}}{ }
\] & 9，880 \({ }_{42}\) & \[
\underset{\substack{33,768 \\ 143}}{ }
\] & ¢ 51,471 & 1，304 & .\(^{8} 8\) & 20，835 & \({ }^{3,877} 1\) & 775 & \({ }_{988}^{98}\) & \({ }^{65,378}\) & \({ }^{600}\) & \({ }^{3,571}\) & & & & & \({ }_{06}\) & & 20，858 \\
\hline Highland－Iowa Co． Average．． & 360
1
1 & 23，470 & \({ }^{29,372} 81\) & \begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
52,842 \\
146 \\
\hline 18
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1,019,155 \\
& 2,830 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & 23 & \({ }^{65,988} 18\) & \begin{tabular}{|c}
1,293 \\
3.3
\end{tabular} & \({ }^{1,173}\) & \(\begin{array}{r}80 \\ . \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \({ }_{\text {c }}^{1.774} 4\) & （1，520 \({ }_{4}\) & \begin{tabular}{|c}
4.309 \\
11.9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 198，436 51 & 100，414 & \({ }_{14}^{14} 4\) & 101．2151 & \(\underset{\text { 84，} 234}{234}\) & ［，8837 & \(\stackrel{82}{2}\) & 18，487 \({ }_{51}\) & \begin{tabular}{|c|}
4,969 \\
\hline 13
\end{tabular} & \({ }_{26}^{96}\) & \({ }^{2,450}\) & 57，255 & & － \(\begin{array}{r}3,769 \\ 10\end{array}\) & \({ }_{05}^{18}\) & 8，135 & & \({ }_{2}^{265}\) & \({ }^{689} 1.9\) & \({ }_{3.3}^{1.20 .5}\) & \({ }^{95,724}\) \\
\hline Lodi－Columbia Co Average． & 170
1 & ［13，450 & 7，535 \({ }_{44}\) & \({ }^{20,985} 12\) & \(\underset{\substack{648,050 \\ 3,812}}{ }\) & \({ }_{31}\) & \({ }^{26,185}{ }^{2} 15\) & \({ }_{689}^{4}\) & \({ }_{3.3}^{564}\) & \({ }_{5}^{50}\) & \({ }_{411}^{711}\) & 2，384 \({ }_{14}\) & \({ }_{4.8}^{823}\) & \[
{ }^{125,555}, 738
\] & 56，7333 \({ }_{3}\) & 4，067 \({ }_{24}\) & \({ }^{33,272} 195\) & \({ }^{40,158}\) & 8，671 51 & 30
.17 & 7，637 4 & 5，384 & \begin{tabular}{l}
703 \\
4.1 \\
\hline 1
\end{tabular} & \({ }^{2,673}\) & \({ }^{37,575}\) & \({ }^{6,130} 36\) & \({ }^{2,531} 1\) & & & & 1 & 160 & & \(\begin{array}{r}24,839 \\ 146 \\ \hline\end{array}\) \\
\hline Mount Pleasant－Racine Co． Average． & \(\stackrel{259}{1}\) & 28，034 & 2，382 & － 30,416 & \[
\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{|c}
1,649,700 \\
6,369 \\
\hline
\end{array}\right.
\] & 54 & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
71,767 \\
277 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \(\stackrel{1,082}{4.2}\) & \begin{tabular}{|c}
1,119 \\
4.3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & .\(_{1}^{2}\) & \({ }_{2.1}^{736}\) & \({ }_{\substack{5,432 \\ 21.1}}\) & \({ }_{3.6}^{94}\) & \[
\underset{871}{223,050} \mid
\] & 29，576 110 & \({ }^{180} 8\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
40,784 \\
157
\end{array}
\] & （74，730 & 30，633 118 & & \({ }^{34,410} 132\) & \(\xrightarrow{63,841}\) & 1，177 & \({ }_{1}^{350}\) & \({ }^{92,426}\) ， & & \({ }^{9,886}\) 38 & & 7， 7 7，169 & 500
1 & \begin{tabular}{|}
10 \\
.03 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \({ }_{03}^{10}\) & & \(\xrightarrow{27,414} 105\) \\
\hline Muscoda－Grant Co Average． & 70 & 4，247 & 7，304 & \begin{tabular}{|c}
11,579 \\
164 \\
\hline 104 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \(\underset{\substack{165,600 \\ 2,365}}{ }\) & 14 & 12，208 & \({ }_{2.9}^{20.2}\) & \({ }_{3.6}^{252}\) & \begin{tabular}{|c}
77 \\
1.1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline 535 \\
7.6 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 552 \\
& 7.8
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 649 \\
& 9.2 \\
& 9
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\underset{\substack{33,144 \\ 473}}{ }
\] & 22，313 \({ }^{217}\) & 420 & 23，055，\({ }^{299}\) & \[
\begin{gathered}
15,189 \\
216 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & 2，106 & \({ }^{188}\) & 3，598 \({ }_{51}\) & & 85 & 85 & ［11，166 \({ }^{159}\) & \({ }_{20}^{20}\) & 1，008 14 & & 100 & & \({ }_{6}^{45}\) & 300 & & \({ }^{11,012} 15\) \\
\hline New Glarus－Green Co Average． & 119 & \({ }^{17,133} 14\) & 3．534 \({ }_{29}\) & \({ }_{\text {20，687 }}^{\substack{172}}\) & \(\underset{\substack{456,040 \\ 3,32}}{\substack{\text { a }}}\) & 22 & \({ }^{27,320}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 363 \\
& 3.1
\end{aligned}
\] & \({ }_{8.5}^{99}\) & \({ }_{1}^{18}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 975 \\
& 8.3
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
1.9 \\
1.9 \\
\hline 1
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{gathered}
905 \\
7.6
\end{gathered}
\] & \({ }^{83,147}\) 688 & \({ }^{39,089}{ }^{328}\) & & 20，610 & \({ }^{31,878} 287\) & \({ }_{7}^{935}\) & & \({ }^{6,371}\) & 340 & & \({ }_{2}^{25}\) & \({ }^{75,975}\) & \({ }_{\text {r }}^{14,475} 1\) & \({ }^{3,686}\) & & & & & & & \({ }^{21,099} 18\) \\
\hline \(\underset{\text { Newton－Manitowoc Co．}}{\text { Averane．}}\) & \({ }^{298} 1\) & \({ }^{8,401} 29\) & 6，813 22 & 15，214 \({ }_{51}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
450,420 \\
1,511
\end{array}
\] & 29 & 18，854 \({ }^{63}\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
34.2 \\
1.2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 542
1.9 & \({ }^{142}\) & \begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
356 \\
1.2
\end{tabular} & \({ }_{2.4}^{716}\) & \(\stackrel{600}{2}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
68,837 \\
230
\end{array}
\] & 24，030 80 & \({ }^{8,885}\) & \({ }_{.06}^{20}\) & \({ }^{23,785}\) & \({ }^{2,229}\) & 5，448 & \({ }^{6,242}\) & 2，190 & & \({ }^{215}\) & \({ }^{42,512} 10\) & & 1，539 & & & & & \({ }_{.05}^{17}\) & & \({ }^{9,930}\) \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Norway-Racine Co. } \\
\text { Average.... }
\end{gathered}
\] & 113 & ［14，874 & 120 & \[
\underset{\substack{14,994 \\ 132}}{ }
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
513,300 \\
4,542 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & 34 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
15,990 \\
141
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 313 \\
& 2.7
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
563 \\
4.9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \({ }_{1}^{18}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 505 \\
& 4.5
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline 1,200 \\
10.6 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \({ }_{3}^{427}\) & \[
\overline{91,240}
\] & 32，147 & 455 & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
18,605 \\
164 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \({ }_{\substack{24,887 \\ 220}}\) & \({ }^{3,665}\) ， & & \({ }^{7,773}\) & 1，\({ }^{1,246}\) & \(\stackrel{294}{2}\) & 308
2 & \({ }^{47,885} 421\) & & \({ }^{2,886}\) & & & & & & & 17,785
157 \\
\hline Orion－Richland Co Average．． & \({ }_{1}^{83}\) & \({ }^{2,472}\) & 6，887 & \({ }^{9} 9.311\) & \(\underset{\substack{138,100 \\ 1,663}}{ }\) & 14 & 6，968 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 127 \\
& 1.5
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 190 \\
& 2.2
\end{aligned}
\] & \({ }_{4}^{33}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 231 \\
& 2.8
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
799 \\
9.6
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
632 \\
7.6 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
25,099 \\
302
\end{gathered}
\] & \({ }^{6,125}\) & \({ }^{427}\) & \[
\begin{gathered}
17,265 \\
208 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & 7，514 & \({ }^{1,891}\) & & 4，844 & \({ }_{1}^{95}\) & \({ }^{609}\) & \({ }_{1}^{86}\) & \({ }^{12,5971} 1\) & & 500 & & & \({ }^{710}\) & \begin{tabular}{|c|}
250 \\
3 \\
3
\end{tabular} & 350 & \({ }^{575}\) & \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{r}
\hline \text { Pleasant Springs-Dane Co. } \\
\text { Average............ }
\end{array}
\] & 141 & \({ }^{9,890} 70\) & 7，630 \({ }^{7}\) & 17，520 & \(\underset{\substack{657,650 \\ 4,64}}{\text { cied }}\) & 37 & \({ }^{32,256}\) & \({ }_{3.6}^{531}\) & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
553 \\
3.9 \\
3 .
\end{array}
\] & .\(^{6}\) & \({ }_{3.3}^{462}\) & \(\underset{\substack{2.041 \\ 14.5}}{\text { a }}\) & \[
\begin{gathered}
703 \\
4.9
\end{gathered}
\] & \({ }_{\text {85，339 }}^{805}\) & \({ }^{82,698} 5\) & 750 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
30,980 \\
219 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & 40,817
289 & \({ }_{\text {，}}^{6,386}\) & ． 02 & 7，965 & \(\begin{array}{r}5,081 \\ \hline 68\end{array}\) & \(\begin{array}{r}82 \\ .5 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \({ }_{7}^{98}\) & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
33,651 \\
238 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \({ }_{1}^{150}\) & \({ }^{2,048} 14\) & & & & \({ }_{1}^{28}\) & \({ }_{20}^{40}\) & \({ }_{125}^{1.8}\) & \({ }^{26,578} 188\) \\
\hline Plymouth－Rock Co Average．． & \({ }^{165}\) & 12，841 & 5．643 \({ }_{34}\) & \begin{tabular}{|c|}
18,484 \\
111 \\
\hline 1
\end{tabular} & \({ }_{\substack{773,49 \\ 4,687}}\) & 42 & \({ }^{37,829}\) & \({ }_{3.3}^{54}\) & \({ }^{650} 8\) & \(\stackrel{32}{1}\) & \({ }_{4.3}^{703}\) & 1，1993 & \({ }^{1,24.5}\) & \[
\underset{\substack{111,213 \\ 674}}{ }
\] & \({ }^{41,366}\) & 1，899 & \({ }^{60,445}\) & －63，399 & 5，525 \({ }^{53}\) & \({ }^{274}\) & \({ }^{3,352}\) 20 & \({ }^{3,018}\) & \({ }^{1,938}\) & 2，690 \({ }^{2}\) & \({ }_{53,350}^{525}\) ． & & \({ }_{2,15}^{2,62}\) & & & & 339 & 1，061 & \({ }^{147}\) & \({ }^{29,303} 177\) \\
\hline  & 161 & \({ }_{6}^{6,495} 4\) & \begin{tabular}{|c}
21,366 \\
133
\end{tabular} & \({ }^{27,813} 173\) & \[
\begin{gathered}
316,806 \\
1,966 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & 11 & \[
\stackrel{{ }^{10,170}}{63} \mid
\] & \({ }_{2.9}^{477}\) & \({ }_{211}^{41.6}\) & \(\stackrel{53}{3}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 439 \\
& 2.7 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \({ }_{2.88}^{458}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 479 \\
& 2.9 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
65,035 \\
40
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
12,736 \\
78 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \({ }_{2}^{425}\) & \({ }^{27,591} 17\) & \begin{tabular}{|c}
20,950 \\
130
\end{tabular} & 929 & & \({ }^{7,887} 4\) & \({ }^{1,506}\) & \(6_{3}^{63}\) & 1，969 & 14，087 & & 1，435 & & & 400 & & \({ }_{5}^{930}\) & 521 & \({ }_{19}^{3,240}\) \\
\hline Primrose－Dane Co． Average．． & \({ }^{137}\) & \({ }^{9,902}\) & \({ }^{10,881} 7\) & \({ }^{20,763} 1\) & \({ }^{397,185} 2\) & i9 & \[
\underset{\substack{23,169 \\ 169}}{ }
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 586 \\
& 4.3
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 626 \\
& 4.6
\end{aligned}
\] & \({ }_{21}^{41}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 868 \\
& 6.3
\end{aligned}
\] & \({ }^{1,126} 8\) & \[
\begin{gathered}
777 \\
5.7
\end{gathered}
\] & 78，617 & \[
\underset{\substack{50,193 \\ 366}}{ }
\] & 143 & \[
\underset{\substack{20,126 \\ 146}}{ }
\] & 38，240 & \({ }^{3,479}\) & \({ }^{45}\) & 5，\({ }^{5,51}\) & \({ }^{2,608} 19\) & \({ }_{.21}^{42}\) & 214 & \({ }^{27,592}\) & 100 & \({ }^{2,746}\) & & & & ｜154 & \({ }^{270}\) & \begin{tabular}{|c}
318 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \({ }^{724}\) \\
\hline Pulsaki－Iowa \(\mathrm{Co}, \ldots\)
Average \(\ldots .\). & \(\stackrel{162}{1}\) & 8，167 \({ }^{80}\) & 12，515 & \begin{tabular}{c}
20,682 \\
127 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \({ }_{\substack{331,830 \\ 2,048}}\) & i6 & 14，288888 & \[
{ }_{3.1}^{496}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 513 \\
& 3.2
\end{aligned}
\] & \(\stackrel{65}{4}_{4}\) & \[
\begin{gathered}
789 \\
4.9
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
857 \\
5.3
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,569 \\
9.7
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
78,811 \\
486
\end{gathered}
\] & \(\underset{\substack{33,335 \\ 205}}{\text { ，}}\) & 1，242 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
36,820 \\
227
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
25,946 \\
160
\end{array}
\] & \({ }^{2,056} 16\) & 112 & \({ }^{10,442} 6\) & 885 & \(\stackrel{748}{4}\) & 1，323 & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
24,090 \\
148 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \({ }^{735} 4\) & \({ }^{1,711} 10\) & 02 & & & 1，248 & 2，645 \({ }^{2}\) & \(\begin{array}{r}109 \\ \hline 6\end{array}\) & \({ }_{\text {c }}^{26,541} 103\) \\
\hline Sevastopol－Door Co Average．． & \(\stackrel{48}{1}\) & 1，156 \({ }_{24}\) & \({ }^{4,114} 8\) & \({ }_{109}^{5,270}\) & cole \(\begin{gathered}54,200 \\ 1,129\end{gathered}\) & i0 & \({ }^{2,529} 5\) & \({ }_{4}^{21}\) & \(\begin{array}{r}83 \\ 1.7 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & （70） & \({ }_{2.1}^{99}\) & 10 & \({ }_{2.3}^{119}\) & \({ }^{9,375}\) & \({ }^{3,145}\) & \begin{tabular}{|c}
478 \\
9
\end{tabular} & 30
.6 & \({ }^{4,291}\) & \({ }^{37}\) & \({ }^{290}\) & \[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline, 195 \\
\hline 7
\end{array}
\] & 142 & & \(\begin{array}{r}75 \\ 1 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 3,881
80 & & 228 & & & \({ }^{1,035}\) 21 & & & 1 & \(\stackrel{2,112}{44}\) \\
\hline Sparta－Monroe Co Average．． & \({ }_{153}^{15}\) & 8，424 & 10，295 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
18,719 \\
122
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
356,400 \\
2,329 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & 19 & \[
\underset{\substack{15,387 \\ 100}}{ }
\] & 301
1.9 & \({ }_{2.5}^{375}\) & \({ }_{4}^{63}\) & \({ }_{2.6}^{394}\) & \({ }_{5.2}^{893}\) & 461 & \[
\underset{42,458}{62,}
\] & \({ }^{42,774}{ }^{279}\) & \({ }^{2,074}\) & \[
\underset{\substack{27,883 \\ 182}}{ }
\] & \({ }^{37,282}\) & 3，790 & \(4_{39}\) & 9，744 \({ }_{63}\) & \({ }_{2}^{252}\) & \({ }^{2,361}\) & 481 & \({ }^{41,588}{ }_{271}\) & \({ }^{1,160}\) & 1， 1,65 & & & & \({ }_{6}^{92}\) & 1，902 & \({ }_{14}^{265}\) & 18,303
119 \\
\hline  & 160 & \({ }^{11,168}\) & \({ }^{9,137} 5\) & \[
\begin{gathered}
20,297 \\
126 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
638,720 \\
3,979
\end{array}
\] & －．．．．． 31 & \[
{ }^{13,8166} 8_{86}
\] & \({ }_{2.7}^{435}\) & ［ \({ }_{3.2}^{527}\) & \({ }^{2}{ }^{2}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 74 \\
& 4.6 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
5.49 \\
34.1 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \({ }^{1,2,25}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
90,724 \\
53
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
39,511 \\
246 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \({ }^{2,259} 14\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
73,460 \\
459 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 45,111 \\
& 281 \\
& \hline 1
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
19,700 \\
123
\end{array}
\] & \({ }^{150} 9\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
19,0,059 \\
119
\end{array}
\] & 4，998 \({ }^{41}\) & \({ }^{1,300}\) & \({ }^{2,522}\) & \({ }^{30,200} 188\) & 8，000 \({ }_{50}\) & 2，806 17 & & & & & \(\stackrel{510}{3}\) & ［ \(\begin{array}{r}368 \\ 2\end{array}\) & \\
\hline Whitewater－Walworth Co．．
Average．．．．．．．．．．． & \(|\)\begin{tabular}{r|r|}
178 \\
1
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 16,238 \\
& 91 \\
& \\
&
\end{aligned}
\] & \({ }^{2,9266}\) & \({ }^{19,164} 10\) & 837， 4,754 & 43 & \[
\begin{gathered}
32,640 \\
183
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l|}
561 \\
3.2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 771
4.3 & \begin{tabular}{l}
30 \\
. \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l|l|}
678 \\
378
\end{tabular} & \({ }^{6030} 3\) &  & \[
\begin{array}{r}
112,155 \\
630
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
29,842 \\
167
\end{array}
\] & \[
\left.\begin{array}{r}
280 \\
1
\end{array}\right]
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline 3,679 \\
222
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
32,447 \\
182
\end{array}
\] & \({ }^{33,847} 10\) & \({ }^{1,105}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
16,880 \\
94
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,948 \\
10
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
928 \\
5
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,943 \\
16 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|}
40,940 \\
230
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline 400 \\
2 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \({ }^{468}\) & & & & \({ }^{1,107}\) & \[
1,264
\] & \({ }_{5}{ }_{5}\) & \(\xrightarrow{31,178}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table IV．Census of
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Town} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Acres of Land} & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Farm Valubs} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Labor} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{12}{|c|}{Livestock and Their Products} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Neat Cattle and their Products} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Sheep} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{慈} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Poultry} \\
\hline & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Z0 } \\
& 0 \\
& 0.4 \\
& \text { Ean }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ID } \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& \text { d } \\
& \text { In }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 玉. } \\
& \stackrel{\text { ®n }}{0}
\end{aligned}
\] &  &  &  &  & & &  &  & &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { g. } \\
& \text { 品 } \\
& \text { 品 } \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
\] &  & 毕 &  &  &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 发 } \\
& \text { 罠 }
\end{aligned}
\] &  & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 告 } \\
& \text { 首 } \\
& \text { 号 }
\end{aligned}
\] &  \\
\hline Bangor－La Crosse Co． Average． & \begin{tabular}{r|r|}
123 \\
1
\end{tabular} & 11，412 92 & 11,103
90 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
22,515 \\
182 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 418,000 \\
3,398
\end{array}
\] & 18 & \[
\begin{array}{|r|}
\hline \$ 16,557 \\
134
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 50,858 \\
413
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
\$ 8,798 \\
2 q
\end{array}
\] & ． 18 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 10,804 \\
87
\end{array}
\] & 1,622
13 & \[
\overline{\$ 118,010} 9
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 479 \\
& \mathbf{3 . 8}
\end{aligned}
\] & ．\({ }^{6}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 545 \\
& 4.4
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 999 \\
& 8.1
\end{aligned}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
14,595 \\
118
\end{array}
\] & 25
.8 & 530
4.3 & 5,879
47 & \[
\begin{gathered}
1,412 \\
11.4
\end{gathered}
\] & 2,604
81.1 & 4,868
35 \\
\hline Brookfield－Waukesha Co Average． & \(\begin{array}{r}343 \\ 1 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \[
\begin{array}{|r|}
\hline 25,331 \\
73
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,598 \\
10
\end{array}
\] & 28，929
88 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,692,295 \\
4,933
\end{array}
\] & 59 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
64,025 \\
186
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
107,055 \\
312
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5,469 \\
15
\end{array}
\] & 18 & \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline 96,190 \\
76
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 8,604 \\
& 25
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|}
218,130 \\
635
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 859 \\
& 2.5
\end{aligned}
\] & 1
.003 & 1，385 \({ }_{4}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 760 \\
& 2.2
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
181,078 \\
\hline 587
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
110,450 \\
322
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
18,850 \\
54
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,735 \\
5.1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
9,068 \\
26
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,617 \\
4.5
\end{array}
\] & 9,614
88 & 27，798 \\
\hline Castle Rock－Grant Co Average． & 112
1 & 10,659
95 & \[
\begin{array}{|}
7,544 \\
\hline 67
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
18,196 \\
162
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
153,410 \\
1,369
\end{array}
\] & 8 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
9,614 \\
85
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
38,845 \\
346
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,047 \\
36
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
10 \\
08 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,706 \\
33
\end{array}
\] & 674
6 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
51,586 \\
460
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 333 \\
& \mathbf{q . 9}
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
18 \\
.16
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 479 \\
& 4.3
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 617 \\
& 5.5
\end{aligned}
\] & ． 07 & \[
\begin{array}{|r|}
\hline 19,885 \\
177
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
120 \\
1
\end{array}
\] & 369
3.3 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,943 \\
17
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1,388 \\
& 12.3
\end{aligned}
\] & 4,146
37 & 13,498
120 \\
\hline Eagle－Richland Average． & \begin{tabular}{|r|}
196 \\
1
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
9,954 \\
50 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
8,927 \\
45 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
18,881 \\
\hline 95 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
368,455 \\
1,879
\end{array}
\] & 19 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
14,743 \\
75
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
59,503 \\
303
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,166 \\
91
\end{array}
\] & 04 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
9,553 \\
48
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{|r|r|r|}
1,461 \\
7
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
78,489 \\
400
\end{array}
\] & 577
8.9 & \({ }_{6}^{6}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 549 \\
& 8.8
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 917 \\
& 4.7
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 20 \\
& .10
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
39,526 \\
201
\end{array}
\] & 1，255 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,449 \\
7.4
\end{array}
\] & 5,256
96 & \[
\begin{gathered}
3,385 \\
17.2
\end{gathered}
\] & 7,368
37 & 17,769
90 \\
\hline Empire－Fond du Lac C Average． & \(\begin{array}{r}167 \\ 1 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 14，434 86 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,327 \\
25 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
18,761 \\
111
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
940,410 \\
5,631
\end{array}
\] & 50 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
30,949 \\
185
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
75,445 \\
451
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,906 \\
17
\end{array}
\] & 628
3 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
19,548 \\
117
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,056 \\
18
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
164,889 \\
{ }_{983}
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 624 \\
& 3.7
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 16 \\
& .09
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 634 \\
& 3.8
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,213 \\
7.3
\end{array}
\] & 900
5 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
63,780 \\
381
\end{array}
\] & 350
2 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 4,788 \\
& 28.3
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
29,806 \\
136
\end{array}
\] & 574
3.4 & 5,153
30.8 & 9,887
59 \\
\hline Franklin－Milwaukee C Average． & 259
1 & \[
\begin{array}{|r|}
\hline 15,813 \\
61 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5,513 \\
21 \\
\hline 1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
21,326 \\
\hline 82 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\hline 1,323,800 \\
5,111 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & 62 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
57,598 \\
222
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
110,835 \\
427
\end{array}
\] & 2,430
9 & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
9,788 \\
37
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,899 \\
7
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
203,325 \\
785
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
836 \\
3.2
\end{gathered}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,199 \\
4.6
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,158 . \\
4.5
\end{array} .
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
106,414 \\
410
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
18,285 \\
70
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,078 \\
4.1
\end{array}
\] & 5,643
91 & \[
\begin{gathered}
1,662 \\
6.4
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
9,376 \\
36.2
\end{gathered}
\] & 49,490
191 \\
\hline Highland－Iowa C Average． & \begin{tabular}{r|}
261 \\
1 \\
1
\end{tabular} & 19,181
73 & 16,691
63 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
35,872 \\
136
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
603,300 \\
2,311
\end{array}
\] & 16 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
37,880 \\
145
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
102,845 \\
394
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,975 \\
15 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & 190 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
10,333 \\
39
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,003 \\
7
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
147,856 \\
562
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
902 \\
3.4
\end{gathered}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,010 \\
3.9
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,121 \\
8.1
\end{array}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
54,310 \\
208
\end{array}
\] & 600
2 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,113 \\
4.2
\end{array}
\] & 4，191 \({ }_{15}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 5,536 \\
& 21.2
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
10,001 \\
38.3
\end{array}
\] & 43，967 \\
\hline Lodi－Columbia Co
Average．．．．． & \(\begin{array}{r}115 \\ 1 \\ \hline 1\end{array}\) & 10,946
95 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5,638 \\
\hline 49 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
16,584 \\
144
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
383,800 \\
3,337 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & 23 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
11,950 \\
97
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
59,615 \\
518
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,430 \\
91
\end{array}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
8,206 \\
71
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,484 \\
12
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
87,868 \\
764
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 408 \\
& 3.6
\end{aligned}
\] & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 798 \\
& 6.9
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
1,484 \\
12.9
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
101,185 \\
879
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
51,035 \\
443
\end{array}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,138 \\
9.8
\end{array}
\] & 5,390
46 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,207 \\
19.1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,683 \\
40.7
\end{array}
\] & 19，935 \\
\hline Mount Pleasant－Racine Co． Average． & \[
\begin{array}{r}
301 \\
1 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
24,868 \\
83 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,930 \\
6 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
26,798 \\
\hline 89 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\left.\begin{array}{r}
1,598,877 \\
5,310
\end{array} \right\rvert\, .
\] & 60 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
67,095 \\
223
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
158,230 \\
525
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,621 \\
12
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
558 \\
1.85
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
34,987 \\
116
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5,796 \\
19
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
229,814 \\
740
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,185 \\
3.9
\end{array}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,299 \\
4.3
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,353 \\
4.1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\left.\begin{array}{r}
78,649 \\
261
\end{array} \right\rvert\,
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
91,475 \\
303
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,500 \\
4
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
5,559 \\
18.4
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
26,074 \\
86
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,465 \\
4.8
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
19,466 \\
41.4
\end{array}
\] & 46,149
153 \\
\hline Muscoda－Grant Co
Average．．．．．．．． & \[
\begin{array}{r}
99 \\
1 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
8,556 \\
\hline 93
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
8,980 \\
97
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
17,536 \\
190
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
174,330 \\
1,894
\end{array}
\] & 9 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5,723 \\
62
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
33,441 \\
363
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
941 \\
10
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{|r|r|}
15 \\
.
\end{tabular} & \[
\left.\begin{array}{r}
3,224 \\
35
\end{array} \right\rvert\,
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
658 \\
7
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
51,054 \\
554
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 309 \\
& 3.3
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
14 \\
.15
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 384 \\
& 4.2
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
695 \\
7.5
\end{array} \text {. }
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
15,750 \\
171
\end{array}
\] & 200
2 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 210 \\
& 2.3
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,190 \\
12
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,116 \\
12.1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
3,096 \\
33.6
\end{gathered}
\] & 8,670
94 \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { New Glarus-Green Co } \\
\text { Average........... } \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
130 \\
1 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & 11,471
88 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
10,678 \\
82 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
22,149 \\
170
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
446,375 \\
3,433
\end{array}
\] & 20 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
16,290 \\
125
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
124,970 \\
955
\end{array}
\] & 2,453
18 & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
10,489 \\
80
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
1,982 \\
15
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
88,471 \\
680
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 437 \\
& 3.3
\end{aligned}
\] & \({ }_{02}^{2}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,080 \\
16
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 349 \\
& \mathbf{2 . 7}
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
679,093 \\
5,170
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
16,822 \\
129
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
68,850 \\
529
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 300 \\
& \& .3
\end{aligned}
\] & 1,609
12 & \[
\begin{gathered}
1,612 \\
12.4
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,297 \\
33.1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
30,964 \\
238
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Newton-Manitowoc Co } \\
\text { Average. . . }
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
292 \\
1 \\
1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\left.\begin{array}{r}
13,991 \\
47
\end{array} \right\rvert\,
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
9,508 \\
32
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
23,499 \\
79
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
799,550 \\
2,788
\end{array}
\] & 34 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
41,470 \\
142
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
57,665 \\
197
\end{array}
\] & \(\begin{array}{r}50 \\ . \\ \hline\end{array}\) & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,786 \\
12 \\
12
\end{array}
\] & 1，127 \({ }^{1}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
99,910 \\
342
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 700 \\
& 2.4
\end{aligned}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,155 \\
3.9
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 693 \\
& \mathbf{2 . 4}
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
145,700 \\
498
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
25,353 \\
86
\end{array}
\] & \[
220
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 634 \\
& 2.2
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,461 \\
11
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 793 \\
& 2.7
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,670 \\
12.6
\end{array}
\] & 7,563
98 \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Norway-Racine Co } \\
\text { Average....... } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
156 \\
1 \\
1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
21,499 \\
137
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,248 \\
97
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
25,747 \\
164
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
515,523 \\
3,304
\end{array}
\] & 21 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
22,404 \\
143
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
58,452 \\
374
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{|r|r|r|r|}
1,51
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,102 \\
13 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
6,879 \\
44 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,348 \\
15 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
75,393 \\
483 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 573 \\
& 3.6
\end{aligned}
\] & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 810 \\
& 5.1
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 781 \\
& 4.6
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,150 \\
14 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
45,597 \\
292
\end{array}
\] & & & \(\begin{array}{r}7,193 \\ 46 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,023 \\
6.5
\end{array}
\] & 5,943
88
8, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 25,134 \\
& 161
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Orion-Richland Co } \\
& \text { Average....... }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
102 \\
1 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5,202 \\
51
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
7,549 \\
74
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
12,751 \\
125
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
170,900 \\
1,675
\end{array}
\] & 13 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
10,198 \\
99
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
30,216 \\
296
\end{array}
\] & 3,134
30 & \(\begin{array}{r}185 \\ 1 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,595 \\
45
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
960 \\
9
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
48,288 \\
473
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 267 \\
& 2.6
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
4 \\
.04
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 263 \\
& 9.5
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 388 . \\
& 3.8
\end{aligned}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
21,812 \\
213
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
15 \\
.14
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 930 \\
& 9.1
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,123 \\
40
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1,314 \\
& 12.8
\end{aligned}
\] & 3,369
38 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
18,599 \\
189
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline Pleasant Springs－Dane Co Average． & \[
\begin{array}{r}
178 \\
1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
13,543 \\
76
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
8,858 \\
49
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
22,401 \\
125
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
743,550 \\
4,177
\end{array}
\] & 33 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
39,200 \\
220
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
95,804 \\
538
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
19,250 \\
108
\end{array}
\] & 100
.6 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
64,430 \\
361 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
17,952 \\
100
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
231,650 \\
1,301
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 716 \\
& 4.0
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
.95
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
902 \\
5.1
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,049 \\
5.9
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
960 \\
5
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
88,355 \\
496
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
44 \\
.24
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,520 \\
14.1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
13,865 \\
78
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
3,789 \\
21.3
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
6,787 \\
38.1
\end{array}
\] & \(\begin{array}{r}37,825 \\ \hline 218 \\ \hline 85\end{array}\) \\
\hline Plymouth－Rock Average． & \[
\begin{array}{r}
169 \\
1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
17,123 \\
101
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,848 \\
16 \\
\\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
19,971 \\
117
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
722,351 \\
4,274
\end{array}
\] & 36 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
33,675 \\
199
\end{array}
\] & \[
\left.\begin{array}{r}
103,301 \\
611
\end{array} \right\rvert\,
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
7,267 \\
43
\end{array}
\] & \(\begin{array}{r}30 \\ . \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
15,100 \\
89
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r|}
2,944 \\
17
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
127,012 \\
751
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 664 \\
& 3.9
\end{aligned}
\] & .\(^{6}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 758 \\
& \mathbf{4 . 4}
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,855 \\
10.9
\end{array}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
68,099 \\
402
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
450 \\
2 \\
2
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,703 \\
10.1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5,791 \\
34
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 4,305 \\
& 25.5
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
9,947 \\
58.8
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
35,993 \\
212
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline Prairie du Chien－Crawford Co． Average & \[
\begin{array}{r}
113 \\
1 \\
1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,839 \\
42
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
12,550 \\
111
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
17,382 \\
153
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
142,330 \\
1,259
\end{array}
\] & 8 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
13,500 \\
\hline 19 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
29,495 \\
261 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,862 \\
\quad 43 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5 \\
.04
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,293 \\
29
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
763 \\
6
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
37,745 \\
334 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 370 \\
& 3.3
\end{aligned}
\] & \(\begin{array}{r}8 \\ 1 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 316 \\
& 2.8
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 428 \\
& 3.8
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
9,900 \\
87
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
14,390 \\
127
\end{array} .
\] & & \begin{tabular}{l}
214 \\
1.9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,367 \\
12
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 448 \\
& 3.9 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\mathbf{2}, 845 \\
\mathbf{2 5 . 1}
\end{array}
\] & \(\begin{array}{r}1,275 \\ \hline 9 \\ \hline\end{array}\) \\
\hline Primrose－Dane Co Average． & \[
\begin{array}{r}
147 \\
1
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{|r|r|r|}
124 \\
84
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{gathered}
8,012 \\
54
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
20,473 \\
138
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
319,905 \\
2,176
\end{array}
\] & 15 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
11,689 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
77,918 \\
525 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,329 \\
29 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
112 \\
.7
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
10,149 \\
69 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
400 \\
2
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
64,908 \\
441 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 542 \\
& 3.7
\end{aligned}
\] & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 930 \\
& 6.3
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,342 \\
9.1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
114,112 \\
332
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
36,061 \\
845
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
300 \\
2 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
1,534 \\
10.4
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
10,125 \\
68
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,140 \\
14.5
\end{array}
\] & \[
\left.\begin{gathered}
5,077 \\
34.5
\end{gathered} \right\rvert\,
\] & 3，990 94 \\
\hline Pulaski－Iowa Co Average． & \[
\begin{array}{r}
179 \\
1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
12,378 \\
68
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
18,153 \\
73
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
25,531 \\
141 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
276,795 \\
1,537 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & 10 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
19,180 \\
106
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
55,180 \\
306
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,908 \\
16 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
10 \\
.05
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
8,349 . \\
46
\end{array} \text {. }
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
84,222 \\
467
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 584 \\
& 3.2
\end{aligned}
\] & \({ }_{01}^{2}\) & \[
\begin{gathered}
618 \\
\mathbf{3 . 4}
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,113 \\
6.2
\end{array}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
26,480 \\
147
\end{array}
\] & 555
3 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 734 \\
& 4.1
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5,659 \\
31 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,999 \\
16.6
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 6,091 \\
& 33.8
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
16,200 \\
\hline 90 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline Sevastopol－Door Co Average． & \[
\left.\begin{array}{r}
94 \\
1
\end{array} \right\rvert\,
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
3,282 \\
34
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5,216 \\
55 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
8,438 \\
89
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
128,630 \\
1,368
\end{array}
\] & 15 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,183 \\
43
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
12,851 \\
136
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
594 \\
6
\end{gathered}
\] & 216
2 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,898 \\
30
\end{array}
\] & \(\begin{array}{r}438 \\ 4 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
35,783 \\
380 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 116 \\
& 1.2
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
78 \\
.7
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 209 \\
& 2.2
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 284 \\
& 3.0
\end{aligned}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
14,618 \\
155 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 156 \\
& 1.6
\end{aligned}
\] & 895
8 & 334
3 & \begin{tabular}{|r|}
1,733 \\
18 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,979 \\
\hline \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Sparta-Monroe Co... } \\
\text { Average......... } \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r||r||r|}
196 \\
-1 \\
-\quad 1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
11,380 \\
58
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
11,024 \\
56
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
29,404 \\
114
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
398,425 \\
2,032
\end{array}
\] & 17 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
22,590 \\
114
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
60,512 \\
308
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,199 \\
21 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
161|\mid \\
.8
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
9,579 \\
48
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,734 \\
8
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
109,302 \\
557 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 531 \\
& 23.7
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 19 \\
& .1
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
594 \\
3
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 769 \\
& 3.9
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { 28,750 } \\
\hline 146 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
54,390 \\
277
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 570 \\
& 2.9
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,198 \\
6.1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
7,989 \\
40.7
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,640 \\
8.3 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
5,634 \\
28.7
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { 21,859 } \\
111 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline Sugar Creek－Walworth Co Average． & \[
\left.\begin{array}{r}
179 \\
1 \\
1
\end{array} \right\rvert\,
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
16,814 \\
93
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,878 \\
23
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
21,086 \\
117
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
701,149 \\
3,917
\end{array} .
\] & 33 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
26,498 \\
148 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
87,605 \\
489
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
6,856 \\
38 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 79 \\
& .4
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
18,002 \\
100
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
963 \\
5
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
128,344 \\
651 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 600 \\
& 3.4
\end{aligned} \text {. }
\] & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 761 \\
& 4.3
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,161 \\
6.5
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
57,060 \\
318
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
53,331 \\
\quad 897
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
50 \\
.27
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3,911 \\
& 21.8
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
29,599 \\
\hline 165 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,546 \\
19.8
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
9,454 \\
52.8
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
24,058 \\
134 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline Whitewater－Walworth Co． Average． & 145 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
16,654 \\
114
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,890 \\
19
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
19,544 \\
133
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
707,419 \\
4,878
\end{array}
\] & 36 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
95,806 \\
177
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
98,024 \\
676
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,643 \\
25 \\
\\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & 4.48 & 13,797
94 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,618 \\
18
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
115,869 \\
799
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
488 \\
3.4 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \({ }_{4}^{4}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,260 \\
8.7
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,199 \\
8.3
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
369,570 \\
\mathbf{q}, 548
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
61,908 \\
420
\end{array} .
\] & & 3,330
28.9 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
18,660 \\
128
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,448 \\
16.9
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
6,517 \\
44.9
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
16,690 \\
115
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

1880－Agricultural Statistics
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Grass Lands} & \multicolumn{23}{|c|}{Other Products} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Acreage} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Products} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Barley} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Buckwheat} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Indian Corn} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Oats} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Rye} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Whea} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{} & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Hops} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Potatoes} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{} \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 晨 } \\
& \text { R }
\end{aligned}
\] &  &  &  &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "० } \\
& \text { \#y } \\
& \text { H }
\end{aligned}
\] &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "̈ } \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
\] &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ㅇ } \\
& \text { By } \\
& \text { B }
\end{aligned}
\] &  &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ㅎ } \\
& \text { 哥 } \\
& \text { 品 }
\end{aligned}
\] &  &  &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \ddot{\circ} \\
& \text { 券 } \\
& \frac{\#}{3} \\
& \ddot{m}
\end{aligned}
\] & &  & &  &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "o } \\
& \text { 感 } \\
& \text { 勏 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { O} \\
& \text { \#5 } \\
& \text { en }
\end{aligned}
\] &  & & & \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,212 \\
9
\end{array}
\] & 989
8 & 2，191 17 & \begin{tabular}{l}
97 \\
.8 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & & \({ }^{231} 1\) & 5,033
41 & ． 03 & 36
.89 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
699 \\
5
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
23,854 \\
193
\end{array}
\] & 947
7 & \[
\overline{35,159} \begin{gathered}
985 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & 140
1 & \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline 1,940 \\
16
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
4,934 \\
40
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
50,645 \\
411
\end{array}
\] & & & 170
1 & & 19
.1 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
14,800 \\
180
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{|r}
49 \\
.4
\end{tabular} & 4,006
32 & 118
.9 & 15
1 & 1，887 \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline 4,263 \\
12
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,426 \\
7 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5,548 \\
16
\end{array}
\] & 1,156
3 & \begin{tabular}{|r|}
41 \\
.1
\end{tabular} & 1，790 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
61,401 \\
179
\end{array}
\] & ． 88 & \[
\begin{gathered}
74 \\
.8
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,390 \\
4
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline 53,954 \\
157
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|}
\hline 1,370 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
64,181 \\
186
\end{array}
\] & 237
.7 & \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline 4,921 \\
14 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & 2,485
7 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
43,641 \\
127
\end{array}
\] & 157
4 & & 395
1 & 500
1 & & & \begin{tabular}{|r|r|}
461 \\
1
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
39,789 \\
116
\end{array}
\] & \(\begin{array}{r}\text { 5，903 } \\ 17 \\ \hline 10\end{array}\) & 400
1 & 8，035 \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{r}
986 \\
8
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
8,959 \\
96 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & 1，104 9 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 313 \\
& 2.8
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
25 \\
.8
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
123 \\
1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline 1,947 \\
17
\end{array}
\] & ． 88 & \[
\begin{gathered}
32 \\
.88
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
920 \\
8
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\mathbf{8 6 , 8 3 5} \\
\mathbf{8 3 4}
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline 1,202 \\
10
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline 28,974 \\
858 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{c}
63 \\
.5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
881 \\
7
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,850 \\
16
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|r|}
\hline 20,948 \\
187 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \(\begin{array}{r}20 \\ .1 \\ \hline 1\end{array}\) & 1,053
9 & 191
1 & & & & \(\begin{array}{r}97 \\ .8 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5,961 \\
53
\end{array}
\] & 160 & 150
1 & \[
\overline{2,857}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,019 \\
5
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
559 \\
2
\end{array}
\] & 1，465 & 192
.9 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
19 \\
.09
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
2_{1} \\
.1
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
435 \\
8 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
10 \\
.05
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
160 \\
.8
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|r|}
\hline 3,300 \\
16
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
136,645 \\
697
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
550 \\
8
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
17,449 \\
88
\end{array}
\] & ． 08 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
183 \\
.6
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
8, \& 30 \\
11
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|r|}
\hline 36,019 \\
183
\end{array}
\] & 50
.8 & 345
1 & \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline, 305 \\
11
\end{array}
\] & 160
.8 & ．\({ }^{7}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
748 \\
\hline 3
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
102 \\
.5
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
7,849 \\
40
\end{array}
\] & 626
3 & \begin{tabular}{|r|r|r|r|} 
\\
\hline 188
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
6,673 \\
34
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,702 \\
\hline 28 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,351 \\
20 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,684 \\
28 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & 680
4 & \(\begin{array}{r}49 \\ .8 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
288 \\
1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
7,540 \\
45 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
31 \\
.18 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
234 \\
1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
635 \\
3
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
21,920 \\
131
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
974 \\
5
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
40,263 \\
941
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
31 \\
.1 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
567 \\
3 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,309 \\
25 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
62,893 \\
\hline 776 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
9.5 \\
.05 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & & & & & & \(\begin{array}{r}134 \\ .8 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
10,190 \\
61 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{|c}
1,028 \\
8
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{|r|r|r|r|} 
\\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \(\begin{array}{r}6,594 \\ \hline 99\end{array}\) \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{r}
5,203 \\
20 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
132 \\
.5
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5,826 \\
2 q
\end{array}
\] & 516
8 & & 226
.8 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5,606 \\
91
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
17 \\
.06
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
189 \\
.7
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,488 \\
5
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
47,611 \\
183
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|r|}
\hline 9,380 \\
9
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
99,002 \\
382
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
635 \\
8 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
11,793 \\
45 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & 2,091
8 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
30,564 \\
118
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
8 \\
.007 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
809 \\
3
\end{array}
\] & ． 83 & & & & 418
1 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
32,484 \\
125 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,888 \\
18 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & 689
2 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
12,304 \\
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\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
50,336 \\
\hline 555
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 386 \\
& 1.9
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,541 \\
\hline 23 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,458 \\
12 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
29,053 \\
148 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & 182
.9 & & \(\begin{array}{r}959 \\ 4 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & & \[
\begin{gathered}
10 \\
.05
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline, 449 \\
\\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
117 \\
.6
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
23,318 \\
\quad 118 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & 243 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 384 \\
& 1.9
\end{aligned}
\] & \(\begin{array}{r}4,892 \\ \hline 5.5\end{array}\) \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{r}
8,657 \\
14
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,168 \\
\\
\hline 17
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,737 \\
20
\end{array}
\] & \(\begin{array}{r}681 \\ 3 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
458 \\
8 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
648 \\
3
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
14,778 \\
82
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 77 \\
& .4
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
762 \\
4
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,736 \\
15
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
190,750 \\
1,065
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,760 \\
9
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
69,901 \\
390
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
171 \\
.9
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,048 \\
\hline 17 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,205 \\
12 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
26,786 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
196 \\
1 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \(\begin{array}{r}635 \\ 3 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,979 \\
7 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & & & & 104
.6 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
10,699 \\
59 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\left.\begin{array}{r}
1,841 \\
10
\end{array} \right\rvert\,
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,070 \\
11 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4,318 \\
\quad 24 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline \[
\left.\begin{array}{r}
4,471 \\
30
\end{array} \right\rvert\,
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5,241 \\
36
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5,699 \\
39
\end{array}
\] & 319
4 & \({ }_{9}^{93}\) & 103
.7 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,912 \\
13
\end{array}
\] & 20
.1 & \(\begin{array}{r}135 \\ .9 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,945 \\
13
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
90,026 \\
620
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
963 \\
6
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
36,698 \\
\quad 453
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{|r|}
162 \\
1
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2,357 \\
16
\end{array}
\] & \[
\left.\begin{array}{r}
1,113 \\
7
\end{array} \right\rvert\,
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
14,587 \\
100
\end{array}
\] & 174. & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,347 \\
9
\end{array}
\] & & ． 08 & 2，177 & 111
.7 & \begin{tabular}{|c}
9,848 \\
67
\end{tabular} & 988
6 & \begin{tabular}{|r|r|r|} 
\\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 8,378
57 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table V. Average Farm Income, Livestock and Crop-Census of 1905
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Town} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { NUMbER } \\
\text { of } \\
\text { FARMS }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{Livestock Productions} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Spectal Productions} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Surplus } \\
\text { GRAIN AND Hay }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Farm Incomes Total} \\
\hline & & Number of cows & Average cows per farm & Average product per cow & Average dairy pro-
duction per farm & Average number of
cattle sold per farm & Average value per farm of cattle sold & Other
livestock income per farm & \begin{tabular}{|c} 
Total aver- \\
age livestock \\
production \\
per farm
\end{tabular} & Tobacco & Sugar Beets & Apples & Potatoes & Beans, Peas,
Berries & Grain & Hay & \\
\hline Bangor, La Crosse Co. & 115 & 1,614 & 14 & \$33.50 & \$469.00 & 6.3 & \$127.50 & \$211.00 & \$807.80 & \$....... & & \$... & & & \$132.29 & & \$940.00 \\
\hline Brookfield, Waukesha Co. & 271 & 2,246 & 8.3 & 49.74 & 412.80 & 91 & 30.00 & 51.00 & 493.00 & & & & 105.00 & 13.00 & 109.00 & 33.00 & 753.00 \\
\hline Castle Rock, Grant Co... & 111 & 1,125
1,360 & \({ }_{8.8}^{10}\) & 25.50
30.68 & 255.00
270.00 & 9.1
10.6 & 132.00
170.50 & 150.00
370.00 & 587.00
810.50 & 20.00 & & 10.60 & 12.70 & & \begin{tabular}{l}
25.50 \\
53.50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & & 582.50
887.30 \\
\hline Empire, Fond du Lac Co & 152 & 1,200 & 7.9 & 39.24 & 310.00 & 7.9 & 130.50 & 137.00 & 577.50 & & & & & & 286.50 & & 884.00 \\
\hline Franklin, Milwaukee Co. & 278 & 2,134 & 7.7 & 44.41 & 342.00 & 6.7 & 105.40 & 95.00 & 542.40 & & & 20.00 & 80.00 & & 63.50 & 130.00 & 835.40 \\
\hline Highland, Iowa Co. . & \({ }^{246}\) & 2,773 & 11.2 & \({ }_{37}^{27.37}\) & 306.60 & 7.1 & 131.00 & 152.00 & \({ }_{790}^{590.00}\) & & & & & & \({ }^{34.00}\) & & 624.00 \\
\hline Mount Pleasant, Racine Co.. & 337 & 2,555 & \({ }_{7.6}\) & \({ }_{42.76}^{37.61}\) & 252.00
325.00 & 5.8 & 53.50 & 50.00 & \({ }_{428.50}\) & 117.50 & & & 52.50 & & 34.00
12.60 & 107.00 & 881.50
619.10 \\
\hline Muscoda, Grant Co & 79 & 895 & 11.3 & 29.20 & 330.00 & 9.5 & 107.00 & 176.00 & 613.00 & & & & & (berries) & 76.00 & & 689.00 \\
\hline New Glarus, Green Co. & 107 & 2,632 & 25 & 43.00 & 1,075.00 & 18.4 & 158.50 & 353.20 & 1,586.70 & & & & & & 56.00 & & 1,642.70 \\
\hline Newton, Manitowoc Co.. & 304 & 2,039 & 6.7 & 41.79 & 280.00 & 4.6 & 49.50 & 51.00 & \({ }^{380.50}\) & & & 13.00 & 15.00 & \[
75 .
\] & 164.00 & 33.00 & 680.80 \\
\hline Norway, Racine Co. & 162 & 1,583 & 9.8 & 40.81 & 400.00 & 8.6 & 112.80 & 202.80 & 715.60 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Orion, Richland Co........ & 131 & 1,369 & 10.5 & 31.43 & 330.00 & 8.2 & 106.00 & 202.30 & 638.30 & & & & 15.00 & & 52.00 & & \({ }_{705.30}\) \\
\hline Pleasant Springs, Dane Co... & 195 & 1,627 & 8.8 & 88.45 & 319.20 & 5.4 & 80.00 & \({ }^{150.00}\) & 550.00 & & & & & & 25.00 & & 1,161.10 \\
\hline Plymouth, Rock
Prairie du Co. Chien, Crawford & 187 & 1,754 & 9.4
4.4 & 28.19
20.45 & 265.00
90.00 & 7
3.2 & 118.00
74.00 & 230.00
64.50 & 613.00
228.50 & 195.60 & 41.70 & & 33.00
33.50 & & 53.00
43.00 & & \(1,1636.30\)
995.00 \\
\hline Primrose, Dane Co.......... & 128 & 2,305 & 18 & 43.00 & 774.00 & 14.3 & 171.00 & 636.00
380 & 1,281.00 & & & & & & 43.00 & & 1,321.00 \\
\hline Pulaski, Iowa Co. & 153 & 1,057 & 6.9 & 29.42 & 203.00 & 8.3 & 110.30 & \({ }_{202.60}\) & \({ }_{516.00}\) & & & & 35.50 & & 55.50 & & \({ }^{1,307.00}\) \\
\hline Sevastopol, Door Co. & 225 & 1,202 & 5.3 & 33.01 & 175.00 & 3.4 & 43.00 & 40.00 & 258.00 & & & 8.00 & 25.50 & 152.00 (peas) & 56.00 & & 517.50 \\
\hline Sparta, Monroe Co......... & \({ }^{244}\) & 1,711 & 1 & & & & 43.50 & 110.60 & 358.00 & & & & 15.00 & 18.00 (berries)
56.00 & 59.00 & & 488.00 \\
\hline Sugar Creek, Walworth Co...
Whitewater, Walworth Co & 176
147 & 2,479
8,210 & 14.1
15 & 56.59
58.66 & 798.00
790.00 & 8.5
8.9 & 100.00
168.00 & 255.00
872.00 & 1,153.00 & & & & 38.00
18.45 & & 195.50
40.50 & & \[
1,380.50
\] \\
\hline Whitewater, Walworth Co.. & 147 & 2,210 & 15 & 52.66 & 790.00 & 8.9 & 168.00 & & 1,230.00 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table VI. Average Crop Income-Census of 1920
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Town} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Crop } \\
\text { Income } \\
\text { Total }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Value of Grand Sold} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{|l}
\text { Value of } \\
\text { Hay } \\
\text { Sold }
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Value of Tobacco Produced} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Value of Sugar Produced Produced} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Value of Potatoes Sold} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Value of
Apples
Sold} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Value of Green Peas and Green Raised For Sale} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Value of Small Fruits Sold} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{Average Value per Farm of Selected Items} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Total Average Crop Income} \\
\hline & & Corn & Wheat & Oats & Barley & Rye & & & & & & & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Grain } \\
& \text { Sold }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Hay } \\
& \text { Sold }
\end{aligned}
\] & Tobacco Produced & \begin{tabular}{|c} 
Sugar \\
Beets \\
Produced
\end{tabular} & Potatoes
Sold & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Apples } \\
& \text { Sold }
\end{aligned}
\] & Green
Peas and
Green
Beans
Raised
For Sale & \begin{tabular}{l}
Small \\
Fruit \\
Sold
\end{tabular} & \\
\hline Bangor, La Crosse Co & \$15,800 & \$8,009 & \$5,918 & \$2,720 & \$945 & \$3,208 & \$7,885 & \$5,784 & & \$368 & \$232 & \$9,674 & \$2,681 & \$124.40 & \$62.09 & \$45.55 & & \$2.90 & \$1.83 & 876.17 & & \\
\hline Brookfield, Waukesha Co & 28,434 & 2,977 & 15,802 & 6,239 & 1,445 & 1,971 & 26,141 & & 13,398 & 64,593 & 3,308 & 409 & 1,877 & 96.06 & 88.31 & & 45.26 & 218.28 & 11.18 & 1.38 & 6.34 & 467 \\
\hline Castle Rock, Grant Co. & 1,081 & 528 & & 553 & & & & 10,991 & & & 32 & & 15 & 8.32 & & 8.45 & & & 25 & & . 12 & 17 \\
\hline Eagle, Richland Co.... & 96
97 & & 15,701 & 3,993 & & \({ }_{1891}^{96}\) & & & & \({ }_{19}^{46}\) & 1,220 & & 123 & \({ }_{11}^{63}\) & & & & 30 & 7.97 & & . 80 & 10 \\
\hline Franklin, Milwaukee Co & 24,860 & 4,640 & 1,647 & 13,549 & 3,746 & 1,278 & 23,571 & & & 127,738 & 2,114 & 195 & 55 & \({ }_{117}^{200.26}\) & 111.18 & & & 89.04
130.84 & 5.80 & & & 365 \\
\hline Highland, Iowa Co. & 12,194 & 3,840 & 3,317 & 3,531 & 1,250 & 256 & 3,929 & & & 658 & 218 & & 196 & 48.97 & 15.78 & & & 8.64 & 9.98 & 9 & \({ }_{79}\) & \({ }_{69}\) \\
\hline Lodi, Columbia Co. & 6,660 & 795 & 743 & 808 & & 4,384 & 391 & 50,182 & 858 & 897 & 1,432 & & 195 & 55.50 & 3.26 & 418.18 & 7.15 & 7.47 & 11.93 & & 1.63 & 505 \\
\hline Mount Pleasant, Racine Co & 13,716 & 1,003 & 9,977 & 959 & 838 & 939 & 7,108 & & 73,183 & 9,660 & 890 & 11,805 & 3,648 & 64.70 & 33.53 & & 345.20 & 45.57 & 4.20 & 55.68 & 17.12 & 566 \\
\hline Muscoda, Grant Co. & 14,949 & 6,453 & 1,440 & 2,380 & 338 & 4,338 & 626 & & & 46 & & 26 & & 189.23 & 7.92 & & & . 58 & & . 33 & & 198 \\
\hline New Glarus, Green Co. & 101
11,894 & & 1,712 & 221 & 11
459 & 9,502 & 912
4,416 & & 352 & \({ }_{15,194}^{108}\) & 9,174 & & 9 & . 78 & 7.07 & & & 84 & & & 07 & \\
\hline Norway, Racine Co. & 7,217 & 1,378 & 2,507 & 162 & Q,573 & 597 & 2,124 & 330 & & 20,824 & 458 & 39 & 100 & 40.32 & 11.87 & 1.84 & 1.26 & 116.44 & \({ }_{8} 56\) & ........ & \({ }^{1.56}\) & 174 \\
\hline Orion, Richland Co. & 576 & & 576 & & & & 460 & 88 & & 690 & 100 & & 1,353 & 4.50 & 3.59 & 69 & & 5.39 & . 78 & & 10.57 & 26 \\
\hline Pleasant Springs, Dane Co & 3,200 & 1,190 & 1,485 & 374 & 151 & & 608 & 357,210 & & 1,277 & 26 & & 60 & 14.48 & 2.75 & 1,616.34 & & 5.78 & 12 & & . 29 & 1,640 \\
\hline Plymouth, Rock Co..... & 23,799
19,593 & \begin{tabular}{|c}
4,899 \\
5 \\
5974
\end{tabular} & 14,686
4,086 & 1,411 4 & \({ }_{68}^{992}\) & 2,411
2959 & 2,329 & 97,612 & 1,012 & 711
1,795 & \({ }_{336}^{136}\) & & 189
979 & 125.92 & 12.32 & 516.47 & 5.35 & 3.76 & . 78 & & . 68 & \({ }^{665}\) \\
\hline Prairie du Chien, Crawford & 12,583 & 5,974 & 4,086 & 43 & 68 & 2,352 & 460 & & & 1,725 & 336 & & 279 & 142.31 & 5.23 & & & 19.60 & 3.82 & & 3.17 & 174 \\
\hline Pulaski, Iowa Co.. & 6,778 & 1,305 & 1,553 & 1,900 & 2 & 2,000 & 1,758 & 770 & & 478 & 110 & & & 45.80 & 11.88 & 5.20 & & 3.19 & 74 & & & 17 \\
\hline Sevastopol, Door Co & 13,307 & & 1,384 & 357 & 242 & 11,374 & 2,185 & & 99 & 16,592 & 24,140 & 20 & 5,008 & 53.44 & 8.78 & . 09 & 40 & 66.63 & 96.95 & 08 & 20.11 & 246 \\
\hline Sparta, Monroe Co & 9,837 & 2,081 & 2,768 & 935 & 351 & 3,702 & 11,201 & 2,625 & & 4,041 & 1,972 & \({ }^{20}\) & 29,016 & 35.90 & 40.88 & 9.58 & & 14.75 & 7.20 & 07 & 105.90 & 214 \\
\hline Sugar Creek, Walworth
Whitewater, Walworth Co & 20,254
8,007 & \begin{tabular}{|l|}
147 \\
87
\end{tabular} & 12,947
6,086 & 85 & 6,885
1,451 & & 2,624 & & 1,287 & 1,037
288 & 110
32 & 45
16,655 & 104
49 & 115.08
50.04 & & & & 5.89
1.80 & .62
.20 & 104. \({ }_{\text {. } 26}\) & \({ }^{.59}\) & 181 \\
\hline Whitewater, Walworth & & & & & 1,451 & & & & & & & 10,655 & & & 16.40 & & 8.04 & 1.80 & . 20 & 104.09 & . 31 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table VII. Average Farm Income, Livestock and Crop-Census of 1920
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{Town} & \multirow{3}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Nouber } \\
\text { FAR } \\
\text { or }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Nomber or Cows
( \(\mathbf{2}\) years old and over) \()\)} & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{Value of Datry Products \({ }^{\text {a }}\)} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Cattle Sold in 1919} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
AVERAGE \\
VALUE PER \\
FARM or \\
Domestic \\
ANIMAIS \\
SOLD or \\
SLAGGH- \\
TERED \\
\hline TERE
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Value of other Livestock Producta} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{} & \multirow{3}{*}{} & \multirow{3}{*}{Avrrage
Farm In
come
come} \\
\hline & & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Total} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Dairy} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Beef} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Average } \\
\text { parm } \\
\text { parm }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Total} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Average } \\
\text { per } \\
\text { Farm }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Average } \\
\text { per } \\
\text { Cow }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Number} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Average } \\
& \text { Value per } \\
& \text { Farm }
\end{aligned}
\]} & & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Total} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Average } \\
& \text { per Farm }
\end{aligned}
\]} & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & Total & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Average per } \\
\text { Farm }
\end{gathered}
\] & & & & & & & \\
\hline Bangor, La Crosse Co. & \({ }_{296}^{197}\) & \({ }_{\text {q, }}^{\text {q, } 1097}\) & \({ }_{\text {q }}^{2,095}\) & \({ }_{19}^{78}\) & \({ }_{9}^{16.6}\) & \$180,103 & 81,418 & \({ }^{885.48}\) & 1,432 & 11.3 & 8407 & \$544 & \$14,141 & 8111 & \$2,480 & \$334 & \$8,814 \\
\hline Castle Rock, Grant Co. & 130 & \({ }_{\text {l }}^{1,503}\) & \({ }_{1}^{1,459}\) & & 11.5
19.9 & \({ }^{399,647}\) & \({ }_{1}^{1,318}\) & \({ }_{\text {134.97 }}\) & & & & \({ }_{292}^{264}\) & \begin{tabular}{c}
24,541 \\
13,120 \\
\hline 180
\end{tabular} & & \({ }_{\substack{1,974 \\ 1,376}}\) & & 2,411 \\
\hline Eagle, Richland Co.. & 153 & 2,2,28 & q,228 & & 14.5 & 253,162 & 1,655 & 113.63 & 1,369 & 8.9 & 342 & 418 & \({ }_{15,474}\) & 101 & \(\underset{q, 516}{1,516}\) & 10 & \(\underset{q, 586}{\substack{\text { a }}}\) \\
\hline Empire, Fond du Lac Co & 137 & 2,113 & 2,131 & 2 & 15.5 & 259,531 & 1,843 & 118.39 & 1,210 & 8.8 & 459 & \({ }^{544}\) & 14,357 & 105 & 2,951 & 365 & 3,316 \\
\hline Frankin, Mil waukee & 249 & \(\underset{\substack{2,186 \\ 3,49}}{ }\) & ¢,181 & \({ }_{7}^{5}\) & & 292,934 & 1,882 & 134.00 & 1,156 & 5.5 & 260 & 309 & 16,237 & 77 & 2,028 & 370 & q,398 \\
\hline Lodi, Columbia Co. & 120 & 1,480 & \({ }_{783}\) & 697 & \({ }_{12}{ }^{14.8}\) & 20,098 & 1 & \({ }_{81} 81.07\) & 2,9889 & \({ }_{8.2}^{9.7}\) & \({ }_{304}\) & \({ }_{448}^{397}\) & 26,474 & 106
138 & 1,937 & \({ }^{69}\) & 2,006 \\
\hline Mount Pleasant, Rac & 219 & 1,644 & 1,624 & 20 & 7.8 & 209,036 & \({ }^{986}\) & 127.15 & 903 & 4.3 & 228 & 319 & 12,158 & \({ }_{57}\) & 1,590 & \({ }_{566}\) & \({ }_{8,156}\) \\
\hline Muscoda, Grant Co. & 79
129 & \({ }_{3,166}^{1,099}\) & 1,099
3,166 & & 13.9 & \({ }^{87,389}\) & 1,106 & 79.52 & \({ }_{664}^{64}\) & 8.4 & 304 & 377 & 5,655 & 72 & 1,859 & 198 & q,057 \\
\hline Newton, Manitowoc C & 279 & 2,706 & \({ }_{q, 706}\) & & \({ }_{9.7}\) & - & \(\underset{\substack{1,999 \\ 1,909 \\ \hline}}{1}\) & \({ }_{114.23}^{158.93}\) & \({ }_{\substack{1,475 \\ 1,485}}^{1}\) & 14.3
5.3 & \({ }_{235}^{728}\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
633 \\
308 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & -8,415 & \({ }_{80}^{67}\) & cis & 19 & \(\stackrel{5,388}{ }\) \\
\hline Norway, Racine Co. & \({ }_{198}^{179}\) & \({ }^{1,989}\) & 1,908 & 81 & 11.1 & \({ }^{209,658}\) & \({ }_{1}^{1,171}\) & 105.41 & \({ }_{1}^{1,164}\) & 6.5 & 293 & 365 & 27,815 & 155 & 1,984 & \({ }_{174}^{174}\) & \({ }_{2,158}^{2,146}\) \\
\hline Orion, Reasathand Springs, Dane Co & \({ }_{221}^{198}\) & q, \({ }_{q, 326}^{2,000}\) &  & 1 & 15.6
10.5 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
211,234 \\
167,68 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \({ }_{1}^{1,657}\) & \({ }_{71.91}^{105.62}\) & 边 & \({ }_{6.5}^{9.9}\) & \({ }_{810}^{370}\) & \({ }_{908}^{401}\) & 15,862 & 184 & \({ }^{2,545}\) & 26 & 2,571 \\
\hline Plymouth, Rock Co. & 189 & 2,202 & q,188 & 14 & 11.7 & 219,219 & 1,160 & 99.55 & \({ }_{\text {1, }}^{1,305}\) & 6.9 & 266 & 298
397 & \({ }_{\text {e6,006 }}^{19,380}\) & \(\stackrel{87}{138}\) & - & \begin{tabular}{l}
1,640 \\
\hline 685
\end{tabular} &  \\
\hline Prairie du Chien, Cra & \(\begin{array}{r}88 \\ 138 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \({ }_{\text {8 }} 901\) & \({ }^{897}\) & 4 & 10.9 & 51,451 & \({ }^{585}\) & \({ }^{57.10}\) & 724 & 8.2 & 284 & 315 & 8,455 & \({ }_{96}\) & 1,280 & 174 & 1,394 \\
\hline Pulaski, owa Co. & 148 & \({ }_{\text {q,151 }}^{\text {8,151 }}\) & \({ }_{q, 151}\) & & 29.8
14.5 & 356,079
180,45 & \({ }_{\text {¢ }}^{1,219}\) & \({ }_{83.89}^{117.67}\) & \(\xrightarrow{1,699}\) & 18.9
9.5 & \begin{tabular}{l}
548 \\
\hline 48 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 559
402 & 14,687
17,824 & 111
118 & li, \({ }_{\text {3,983 }}\) & \({ }_{67}^{1}\) & ¢ \(\begin{aligned} & 8,924 \\ & 8,150\end{aligned}\) \\
\hline Sevastopol, Door Co & 249
974 & ¢, & - & \({ }^{24}\) & 8.1 & 208,110 & 836 & \({ }_{108}^{103.64}\) & \({ }_{\text {l }}^{1,1388}\) & \({ }_{8}{ }^{4} .6\) & 185 & \({ }^{232}\) & \({ }_{\text {c, }}^{\text {9,10 }}\) & 37 & 1,290 & 246 & 1,536 \\
\hline Sugar Creek, Walworth & \({ }_{176}{ }^{174}\) & \({ }_{8}^{2,766}\) & \({ }_{\substack{2,741}}^{2,84}\) & \({ }_{25}\) & 10.5
15.7 & \({ }_{\substack{259,574 \\ 324,219}}^{2}\) & & & \(\xrightarrow{1,688} 1\) & 6.8
9.1 & \({ }_{459}^{258}\) & \({ }_{481}^{381}\) &  & 119 & 1,613 & \({ }^{914}\) & 1,827 \\
\hline Whitewater, Walworth Co. & 100 & 9,646 & 2,639 & 7 & 16.5 & 284,967 & 1,777 & 107.48 & 1,514 & 9.5 & \({ }_{405}\) & 480 & \({ }_{44,544}\) & \({ }_{153}\) & ¢, \({ }_{\text {¢ }}^{2,755}\) & 181
181 & 3,931
8,936 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\({ }^{1}\) Milk, cream, butter fat, and butter sold, and cheese produced.
\({ }^{\mathbf{s}}\) Exclusive of "average value per farm of cattle sold."
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\hline Tallmadge, Nathaniel P., 19, 46, 49, 50. & Tiedeman, Johannes, 7, 118. & Underwood, P. C., 59. & Walker, Thomas, \(10,15,102\). & Welch, Edmund, 34, 36, 66. \\
\hline Tangner, Michael, \(30,84\). & Tierney, Ed., 33. & Underwood, P. M., 119. & Walker, William, 24, 102. & Welch, Freeborn, 10, 14, 16, 23, 136, \\
\hline Tashnear, Gottlieb, 30, 31, 118. & Tierney, James, 33. & Underwood, Thomas, 34,5 & Walker, William H., 14, 46. & Welch, H. A., 35, 140. \\
\hline Taube, Daniel, 4, 84. & Tiffany, Comfort, 28, 72, 25, 118. & Underwood Creek, 59, 119. & Walker, William L., 10, 66. & Welch, Huley, 26, 136. \\
\hline Taycheedah, 47, 49. & Tilden, S., 23, 28. & Urie, J. B., 21, 98. & Wall, David, 21, 52. & Welch, Joseph, 23, 136, 137. \\
\hline Taycheedah Creek, 47. & Tilden, Samuel J., 17, 18, 87. & Utter, Joseph, 31, 140. & Wall, Robert, 7, \(8,58\). & Welch, Lawrence, 31, 84. \\
\hline Taylor, Benjamin, 25, 36, 40. & Tillon, F. R., 99. & & Wall, Thomas, 16, 18, 58. & Welch, Patrick, 16, 140. \\
\hline Taylor, Charles, 11, 21, 28. & Titus, George, 51. & Vaal, F., 4, 28. & Wallis (village), 121. & Welch, S., 36, 66. \\
\hline Taylor, E. C., 12, 102. & Titus, W. A., 49-51. & Vail, Henry, 122. & Wallschealager, H., 2, 84. & Welch, Samuel B., 27, 66. \\
\hline Taylor, Henry, 36, 40, 15, 46. & Tjenbland, Torbjorn, 34, 112. & Vail, Henry Sherman, 122. & Walrath, Edward, 131. & Welch, Sarah H., 14, 94. \\
\hline Taylor, Hiram, 4, 136. & Toas, Henry, 31, 66. & Vail, James W., 122. & Walrath, Rev. Frederick, 24, 36, 130, 131, & Welch, Thomas, 31, 84. \\
\hline Taylor, Luther, \(25,94\). & Tobacco, 16, 96, 99-101, 105. & Vail, Myra, 122. & 132, 135. & Welder, J., 31, 94. \\
\hline Taylor, Mary, 108. & Tobey, Miles, 16, 66. & Vail, Rebecca, 122. & Walrath, J. J., 36, 130. & Weldon. See Wheldon. \\
\hline Taylor, Samuel, 22, 28. & Todhunter, J., 24, 28. & Valmy (village), 127. & Walrath, Sarah, 133. & Weldy, -, s1, 94. \\
\hline Taylor, Stephen, 74, 119. & Toepell, August, 14, 52. & Van Alstine, John, 21, 102. & Walterbach, D., s1, 84. & Weldy, James, \(33,40\). \\
\hline Taylor, William O., 13, 14, 124. & Tollefson, Gunder (Gunof), 6, 7, 98, & Van Alstine, Thomas, 22, \(26,102\). & Waltermire, George, 35,90 & Wellauer, Henry, 36, \(28,32\). \\
\hline Taylor Orphan Asylum, 70. & \(16,21,23,112,113,116\). & Van Antwerp, J., 25, 26, 102. & Waltermire, Sarah, \({ }^{\text {a }}\), 90. & Wellauer, Jacob, 32. \\
\hline Teague, D. C., 25, 130. & Tollefson, Ole, 16, 112 & Van Buren, Charles, 37 & Walthart, Caleb, 27, 34, 72. & Wellauer, R., 36, 28, 32. \\
\hline Teasdale, Frank, 134. & Tomelty, Patrick, 9, 52. & Van Buskirk, Ira, 10, 13, 24, 124. & Walworth County, 137-139, 141-145. & Weller, William, 13, 94. \\
\hline Teasdale, Howard, 134. & Tomeson, H., 5, 90. & Van Cott, Al., 7, 66. & Walz, John G., 25, 26, 72. & Wellner, Anton, 2, 84. \\
\hline Teasdale, John, 134. & Tompkins. See Thompkins. & Van Gelst, John, 21, 48. & Wambold, F. A., \({ }^{\text {c }}\). \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & Wells, -, 22, 94. \\
\hline Teasdale, Joseph, 134. & Tonty, Henry de, 125. & Van Houle, David, 33, 52. & Wandell, William, 12, 52. & Wells, Benjamin, 29, 32, 98. \\
\hline Teetshorn, C., 30, 140. & Topp, John, 23, 26, 34, 1, 58. & Van Kuren, H., 1, 46. & Wanek, Charles, 38. & Wells, Bernard, 50. \\
\hline Teetshorn, H., 30, 140. & Torbenson, Guttorm, 12, 13, 98. & Van Kuren, H. J., 2, 11, 46. & Ward, Daniel, 20, 84. & Wells, Daniel Jr., 31, 32, 58. \\
\hline Teetshorn, John, 30, 140. & Torbenson, T. T., 7, 90. & Vanneman, W. J., 8, 14, 19, 40. & Ward, F. B., \(32,28\). & Wells, David Jr., 32, 58. \\
\hline Tefft, David, 14, 66. & Torbin, Joseph, 6, 136. & Vanneman, William, 3,40 & Ward, John, 4, 28, 5, 58. & Wells, George M., 6, 58. \\
\hline Tegler, J., 24, 78. & Torgerson, Regnai, 12, 98. & Van Ness, I., 19, 62. & Ward, John L., 31, 136. & Wells, Henry S., 7, 130. \\
\hline Teitgen, August, 4, 84. & Torgeson, Halvor, 17, 98. & Van Ness, Peter, 18, 19, 62. & Ward, Thomas, 30, 124. & Wells, I. C., \(8,62\). \\
\hline Temby, Peter, 36, 118. & Torgeson, John, 17, 98. & Van Slyke, James, 21, 112. & Warding, William, 18, 66. & Wells, Ira, 22, 28. \\
\hline Templeton, Alexander, 126. & Torstenson, Jacob, 28, 136. & Van Vleck, -, 29. & Warehausen, H. W., \(6,84\). & Wells, James, 34, 46, 50, 51. \\
\hline Tendlev, J., 29, 78. & Tosten, Jacob, 21, 136. & Vaughan, William W., 21, 66. & Warmly, Mary, 11, 62. & Wells, L., 16, 62. \\
\hline Tendrick, Bernhardt, 28, 84, 89. & Townshend, Arba, 7, 8, 102. & Vedder, John, 13, 118. & Warner, Anson T., \(6,140\). & Wells, Louis, 22, 58. \\
\hline Tendrick, Peter, 89. & Tracey, E., 26, 62. & Vedder, John G., 1, 118. & Warner, David H., 34, 140. & Wells, Newton, \(10,40,44\). \\
\hline Teninger, -, 25, 78. & Tracy, Patrick, 35, 36, 46. & Veenendaal, William, 33, 52. & Warner, H. A., 10, 66. & Wells, Owen A., 50. \\
\hline Tennessee emigrants, 9, 41, 43, 95, 97, & Trap, William, \(18,130\). & Veglie, N. O., 32, 102. & Warner, Hannah, \(3,66\). & Wells, Sarah, 20, 98. \\
\hline 110, 144. & Tratt, John, 20, 140. & Verhaalen, Theodore, 16, 52. & Warner, J. R., 1, 26, 130. & Wells, T. D., \(16,62\). \\
\hline Tenney, E. B., 103. & Travis, John, 4, 62. & Vermilyea, Charles H., 1, 62. & Warner, James A., 10, 58. & Wells, T. S., \(6,62\). \\
\hline Tergenger, C., 36, 78. & Treadwell, James B., 16, 17, 66. & Vermont emigrants, 24, 31, 71, 76, 95, & Warner, M., \(16,62,36,78\). & Wells, William L., \(9,16,62\). \\
\hline Terhorst, Steve, 20, 52. & Tredway, W. W., \(5,112\). & 97, 110, 121, 122, 128, 133, 144. & Warren, S., 16, 28. & Welsh immigrants, \(9,24-26,31,55\), \\
\hline Terry, John B., 18, 58. & Tregonning, Sampson, 3, 58. & Vernon, Anna M., 1, 12 , & Warrick, -, 19, 58. & 71, 95. \\
\hline Tew, -, 19, 28. & Trelevan, John, 31, 46, 51. & Vertefeuille, François, 108. & Warrick, Ludwig, 29, 84. & Weltzel, J. G., 22, 52. \\
\hline Tew, Henry, 19, 28. & Trelever, John, 19, 46. & Vetter, Henry, 1, 46. & Wasbush, M., 31, 52. & Weltzin, Carl F., 29, 112. \\
\hline Texido, Joseph A., 24, 46. & Tremper, William, 29, 136. & Vickerman, Job, 26, 118. & Washburn, Cadwallader C., 95. & \\
\hline Thacker, Thomas, \(9,52\). & Trent, Rev. Stephen, 61. & Vicktora, Martin, 2, 34. & Washburn, R., 36, 102. & \[
116 .
\] \\
\hline Tharlson, Tharl, \(36,112\). & Trepouier, Abraham, 108. & Vicktora, Wenzel, 2, \(3,10,11,34\). & Washington, C., 8, 58. & Wendt, J. A., 2, 52. \\
\hline Tharson, A., 34, 98. & Trieshmann, J. A., 10, 52. & Viehover, O., 32. & Washington Island, 125, 127. & Wentz, B., \(5,40\). \\
\hline Thayer, A., 12, 130. & Tripp, Dr. James, 141, 142. & Viles, Joseph S., \(30,136\). & Wasson, N. B., 12, 46. & Wepkin, John H., 16, 20, 58. \\
\hline Thayer, F. A., 5, 7, 124. & Tripp, N. W., 36, 102. & Vincent, James, S, 22. & Water, Thomas, 59. & Werner, George, 36,52 . \\
\hline Thayer, M. A., 132. & Tripp, Rosepha, 4, 10, 140. & Vincent, Lewis, 5, 140. & Waterbury, Alonzo, 63. & Wescott, Jefferson F., 30, 31, 78. \\
\hline Thayer, M. P., \(38,46\). & Trogner, Joseph, 34, 78. & Vinton, David, 15, 46, 51. & Waterford, 70. & West, E. H., 2, 72. \\
\hline Thayerville, 125. & Trondson, Lars, 11, 12, 90. & Vinton, David Jr., 16, 46. & Waters family, 41. & West, Quincy P., 15, 23, 52. \\
\hline Thibouret, Jean, 8, 106. & Troxel, Jacob, 9, 40, 44. & Virginia emigrants, 31, 41, 43, 97, 110, & Watherick, P., 22, 124. & West, S. G. Jr., 1, 12, 136. \\
\hline Thielen, Mary, 88. & Truax, Elizabeth, 133. & 115, 116, 121, 133, 144. & Watkins, Aaron S., 88. & West, Thomas Jr., 34, 52. \\
\hline Thill, Charles, \(5,46\). & Truettner, Fred, 85. & Viroqua, 131. & Watkins, Caroline, 14, 52. & West Wisconsin Railway, 133. \\
\hline Thomas, -, 64. \({ }^{\text {c }}\), \(112,115,116\) & Trumpy, H., 24, 78. & Vliet, Garret, 28, 29. & Watkins, F. W., \(4,21,130\). & Westervelt, H., 32, 46. \\
\hline Thomas, David, 20, 21, 112, 115, 116. & Tubesing, F., 3, 90. & Vogel, August, 36, 28, 32. & Watkins, S. E., 27, 130. & Westervelt, Ira, 3, 34. \\
\hline Thomas, Mrs. E. B., 30, 46. & Tuck, Amos, 18, 30, 112. & Vogel, J. H., 24, 84. & Watson, Ebenezer, 20, 58, 5, 102. & Westervelt, J. Y., 49. \\
\hline Thomas, George B., 115, 116. & Tucker, E. G., 18, 130. & Volney, Miles, 2, 84. & Watson, J., 20, 94. & Weston, Charles, 27, 118. \\
\hline Thomas, H., 8, 136. & Tucker, E. H., 33. & Vorkees, Francis, 25, 72. & Watson, James T., 11, 5, 102, 104. & Weston, Edward, 27, 118. \\
\hline Thomas, J. W., 10, 22. & Tucker, Ed., 33. & Voss, Franz, 1, 52. & Watson, Thomas E., 18. & Westrom, M., 7, 40. \\
\hline Thomas, Jacob, 22, 58. & Tucker, H., 16, 28. & & Watts, George, 11, 140. & Wethington, E. M., 9, 140. \\
\hline Thomas, James, John, 14, 168. & Tucker, James,
Tucker, O.
O.,
33. & Wade, William, 19,40 . & Waugh, Samuel W., 7, 102. & Wettleson, Ole, 34, 98. \\
\hline Thomas, John J., 14, 22. & Tucker, T. W., 33. & Wadsworth, Charles L., 33. & Wead. See Weed. & Whalen, Patrick. See Whelan. \\
\hline Thomas, John L. V., 14, 17, 24, 102, 104. & Tuete, Nicholas, 14, 46. & Wadsworth, F. W., 6, 58. & Weage, F. A., 29, 90. & Wheatly, John, 15, 28. \\
\hline Thomas, M. J., 50. & Tulifson, Gunif. See Tollefson, Gunder. & Wadsworth, J. S., 16, 28. & Weaver, Joel, 27, 40. & Wheaton, Homer, 17, 18, 20, 46. \\
\hline Thomas, R., 8, 136. & Turtle Creek, 137. & Wadsworth, Milton, 33. & Weaver, Nelson, \(9,17,18,136\). & Wheaton, William P., 11, 14, 34. \\
\hline Thomas, Samuel B., 8, 9, 17, 62. & Tuttle, Berri W., 14, 118. & Wadsworth, W., 29, 66. & Weaver, Ruby, 18, 136. & Wheeler, D. P., 10, 130. \\
\hline Thomas, family, 115., & Twin Bluffs, 97. & Wagner, Christian, 2, 10, 58. & Webb, John F., 17, 72. & Wheeler, Daniel, 5, 6, 98. \\
\hline Thomason, Hans, 34, 140. & Two Rivers, 127. & Wagner, Rev. E., 86. & Webb, L. E, , 130 . & Wheeler, Daniel R., 4, 10, 130. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Wheeler, Henry, 22, 58.
Wheeler, J. G., 11, 28.
Wheeler, J. G., 11, 28.
Wheeler, James, 31, 40.
Whelan, J, ,5,22.
Whelan (Whalen), Pat
26, (W8,
Wheldon, Griffith, 22, 27, 22, 25 .
Wheldon (Weldon), John, 5, 22, 25.
Wheldon (Weldon), Richard, 5, 26, 22,
Wheldon (Weldon), R
Whis party, 145 , 25
Whilingert, D. W., 8, 94
Whinfield. See Winfield
White, Benjamin, \(28,36,46,51\).
White, Esther B., 21, 62 .
White, Herbert, 33.
White, John, 5, 46, 9, 17, 52
White, Joseph, 22, 28, 21, 22, 118.
White, Joseph, Mrs. Lydia N., 20, 206.
White, 118.
White, Mathew, \(5,28\).
White, Miles, 4, 21, 23, 26, 34, 94.
White, Robert, 113 .
White, Roger, \(30,84\).
White, William, 5, 46, \(8,52,23,130\).
White, William A., 19, 40 ,
White, William A., 19, 40.
Whitefish Bay, 125, 127.
Whitehead, James, 30, 31, 102, 104.
Whiteside, N. E., 22 .
Whitewater, \(141-145\).
Whitewater (city), 17, 18, 4, 5, 140
Whitewater Creek, 141.
Whitewater Lake, 141.
Whitford, C., 26, 40.
Whitford, J. C., 2, 28
Whiting, Thomas A., 2, 3, 62.
Whitmore, Hill, 22, 140 .
Whitney, H. A., \(2,62\).
Whittlesey, L. H., 24, 94
Whitworth, John, 35,90 .
Wiant's Creek. See Fish Creek.
Wiak, A., 11, 52.
Wicker, J. C., 4, \(5,90\).
Wicker, J. C., 4, 5, 90.
Wicktora. See Vicktor
Wiebold, P. W., 4, 84.
Wigeland, Arens, \(12,13,90\).
Wiggins, W., 10, 29, 62 .
Wigham, William, \(26,27,58\)
Wigham, William, \(26,27,5\)
Wigland. See Wigeland.
Wiker, Sarah, \(5,94\).
Wilber, S. P., \(32,130\).
Wilcox, Chauncy, \(28,62\).
Wilcox, Chauncy, 28,
Wilcox, Elisha, 9, 46.
Wilcox, Elisha, 9,4,
Wilcox, J. S., \(6,52\).
Wilcox, Martha, 28, 62.
Wild, Hilarius, \(26,78,80\).
Wild, Joshua, 14, 25, 78
Wiley, Grace, 20, 40.4
Wiley, Josiah, 17, 40.
Wiley, O. S., \(7,112\).
Wilford, C., 35, 102 .
Wilharms, Christian, 5,84
Wilkins, Charles, \(33,124\).
Wilkins, D. T., 31,140 .
Willey, Lewis, 22, 58.
Willhelmy, L., 11, 14, 102.
Williams, Barrett, 24, 118.
Williams, Charles, \(1,12,40\).
Williams, Daniel, 1, 94, 4, 9, 136.
Williams, David J., 11, 12, 22.
Williams, E., \(11,40\).
Williams, Edgar, 16 , 17, 34.
Williams, George G., 8, \(23,24,28,29\),
140 .
Williams, George N., 12,
2
Williams, George N., 12, 66
Williams, Henry, \(31,28\).
Williams, J. J., 19, 98..
Williams, John, 9, 22, 25.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Williams, N. D., \(6,140\). & Winfield, J. W., 16, 46. & Wolf, M., 9, 28. & Woodmansee, & Wright, S., 15, 130. & , 118. \\
\hline Williams, P. H., \(21,140\). & Wingville, 35, 36. & Wolf, R., 2, 84. & Woodmansee, Louis, 2, s, 29, 31, 32, 130. & Wyktora. See Vicktora. & Zettel, Albert, 16, 124. \\
\hline Williams, Robert, 9, 22. & Winne, George, 33. & Wolf family, 25. & Woodmansee, P., 5, 130. & & Zettel (Zettle), Joseph, 27, 34, 124, 125- \\
\hline Williams, S. P., \(26,34\). & Winnebago Lake, 47, 50. & Wollmer, N., \(25,84\). & Woodruff, Ebenezer, 18, & Yahara River, 99. & 127. \\
\hline Williams, Samuel, 14, 22. & Winslow, F. C., 104. & Wolter, F., 2, 52. & Woodruff, J. D., 15, 102. & Yale, Augustus, 32, 28 & Zigler, Richard, 30, 40. \\
\hline Williams, T. W., \(6,140\). & Winsor, Clarinda, 11, 11 & Wolters, H., 34, & Woodsinger, H., 2\%, 22. & Yankees. See New England. & Zimmermann, A., 10, 22. \\
\hline Williams, Thomas, \(14,58\). & Winter, J. B. L., \(23,25,72\). & Wolters, J. H., 3s, 52. & Woodward, Adam, s, 58. & Yanty, Matt., 32. & Zimmermann, D., 31, 32, 78. \\
\hline Willieh, William, 29, \(30,90\). & Wintermeyer, V., 1, 84. & Wonewoc, 134. \({ }^{\text {d }}\), 10 & Woodward, Thomas, \({ }^{\text {Woodward William }}\), 29,5 & Yeager, Samuel, 28, 40. & Zimmermann, Fred, \(29,78\). \\
\hline Willingham, W. W., 11, 124. & Wintermute, Septer, 14, 15, 140. & Wood, Calvin, 16, 140. & Woodward, William A., 6, 7, 34, & Yeilding. See Yielding. & Zimmermann, G., s, 78. \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Willis, Amos, 20, 136. \\
Willis, John, 33, 40.
\end{tabular} & Winters, John, 134, 135.
Winters, John Jr., 134. & Wood, E., 31, 34. & Woodworth, S., 11, \({ }^{\text {Wool growing, } 14,150} 19,48,50,70,100\), & Yellow Creek, 85.
\[
\text { Yielding, R. M., 3, } 72 .
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Zimmermann, H., 29, 32, 78 \\
Zimmermann, J., 10, 22.
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Willis, Robert, 26, 46. & Winters, Wilhelmina, 134. & Wood, Eunice, 31, 34. & 143, 144. & Yielding, William M., 4, 72. & Zimmermann, Joseph, 15, 22 \\
\hline Wilmann, A. C., 27 , 84. & Winzenried, Christian, 32. & Wood, Isaiah, 31, 34. & Wooster, Julius, 29, 34. & Yockey, Mary, 65. & Zimmermann, P., 12, 52. \\
\hline Wilson, George S., 24, 46. & Winzenried, John, 32. & Wood, John, 34, 58. & Wordley, John, 17, 18, 62. & Young, Charles, 25, 36, 140. & Zimmermann family, 25. \\
\hline Wilson, Henry, 9, 94. & Wiota, 73, 113, 115. & Wood, John G., 6, 136, 36, 140. & Wright, C. S., 2, 112. & Young, D. B., \(66,94\). & Zinger, Henry, 26, 22. \\
\hline Wilson, Johanas, 29, 90. & Wisconsin Central Railway, 143. & Wood, Martin, 36, 140. & Wright, Charles, 4, 72, 1, 12, 24, 106. & Young, E. P., 36, 94. & Zinsz, Conrad, 21, 28, 72. \\
\hline Wilson, Peter, \(26,78\). & Wisconsin River, 10, 19, 35, 41, 44, 59, & Wood, N. H., 11, 62. & Wright, Charles W., \(3,4,15,16,72,19\), & Young, Ernst G., 11, 106. & Zollekopfer, \(0 ., 17,78\). \\
\hline Wilson, Thomas, 4, 12, 102. & 63, 73, 75, 95-97, 107, & Wood, R. E., 27, 52. & 118. & Young, F. T., 29, 94. & Zweifel, A., 24, 78. \\
\hline Wilson, William, \(12,78\). & Wiswell, Christ, 24, 136. & Wood, S. A., 1, 84. & Wright, E. H., 15, 94. & Young, J. H., \(35,136\). & Zweifel, Henry, 8, 78. \\
\hline Wilson, Woodrow, 17-20, 87, 88. & Woelfl (Woelfel), Frederick, 23, 28, 32. & Woodard, William A., \(25,46\). & Wright, Enoch, \({ }_{\text {Wright, }}\) Francis, 135. & Young, Mary, 8, 94. & Zweifel, Jost, 20, 78. \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Wilton (village), 131 \\
Wind Lake, 91-92.
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Woelfl (Woelfel), George, 23, 28, 32 \\
Woelfl (Woelfel), John, 23, 28, 32.
\end{tabular} & Woodard, William S., \({ }^{\text {Woodhull, }}\) C., 18, 40.46. & Wright, Francis, \({ }^{\text {Weorge, }} 22,46\), 46 , 51, & Young, Morgan, 13, 40. & Zweifel, Peter, 20, 78. \\
\hline Windsor, Emily, 15, 130. & Woelfl, John Jr., \(23,28\). & Woodley, Mathias, \(16,62\). & Wright, H. A., 110. & Young, O., 19, 78. & Zwicker (Zwickey), Casper, 22, 23, 7 \\
\hline Winegar, M., \(19,22\). & Woelfl, O., 23, 28. & Woodley, Samuel, 7, 62. & Wright, James, 18, 46. & Young, Valentine, 27, & Zwicker, George, 19, 78. \\
\hline Winfield (Whinfield), Charles W., 10, 15, & Woelf, Ulrich, 32. & Woodman, Cyrus, \(10,10,17,20,40,11\), & Wright, Lyman, 1, 140. & Younger, Joseph, 5, 6, 28. & Zwicker, Jacob, 25, 78. Zych, Wensel, 88. \\
\hline 16, 46. & Wolf, Andrew, 6, 7, 15, 22. & 72, 73, 26, 35, 94, 95, 2, 3, 118. & Wright, 0. J., 110. & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}```


[^0]:    Wis. Mag. of Hist., vi, $125-145$.

[^1]:    10. At least, they were not so
    included a larger area until 1857 .
    n A
    ${ }^{1}{ }^{1}$ Brod arfer area until 1857 . Ned as to afrect the above result. Newton Brooktied in 1880 was credited with about 9000 acres more land than at
    any other census date. This explains the increase in number of farms, as also the average census date, which was 83 acres as against 65 acres in 1870 and 81 in 1860 . the average size, which was 83 acres as against 65 acres in 1870 and 81 in 1860 . ${ }^{2}$. ${ }^{\text {Cf. }}$ Carl Frederick Wehrwein, History of the Towen of Nevoton. (MS. Thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1915). Especially p. 25.
[^2]:    ${ }^{10}$ There was a village，Bangor，in the town，which explains the discrepancy

[^3]:    ${ }^{2}$ History of La Crosse County, Wisconsin (Chicago, 1881), 719

[^4]:    ${ }^{3}$ History of La Crosse County, $720,723$.
    ${ }^{1}$ Ibid., $720,724$.

