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INTRODUCTION

Jody, a ten-year-old boy, respectfully demanded of his grandfather: “Tell about Indians.” John Steinbeck’s character, Jody Tiflin, lived on a ranch in the foothills above Salinas, California, and imagined an America which no longer existed, one of Indians and buffalo and men who crossed the plains. Jody’s grandfather told stories directed at a generation that had not lived through the heady era of westward migration. The old man set his tales in the Great Plains but he used his adventure-filled stories to fuel his own nostalgia and feelings of loss. He reminisced over the days when migrants fulfilled the nation’s destiny by moving west and brought American ways with them. Repopulating the West with hardy settlers gave the grandfather a sense of national purpose. In Steinbeck’s fiction and in actuality, transplanted Americans recreated homes and farms, giving life to a generation of California-born residents.¹

Through the characters of the “Red Pony,” Steinbeck described the significance of America’s fascination with moving west and the impact of its conclusion—the American conquest of land. For the grandfather’s generation, crossing the plains meant starting life again in a wholly new place, an event he viewed as a momentous time for himself, his kith and kin, and the country. While the tales he crafted titillated Jody’s imagination, they only annoyed his son-in-law who knew little else but his life as a “native” of Salinas. Jody’s father, Carl Tiflin heard the reminiscing of an old man, not the emotional loss felt by his father-in-law. Jody’s grandfather viewed the Pacific Ocean as a barrier to the “crawling beast.” The settlers of the crawling beast searched out the geographical boundaries of the continent, while the nation’s leaders negotiated new political borders.

From the Atlantic to the Pacific, Americans and immigrants spread out west while the countries of Canada and Mexico provided constraints in the north and south. Jody and his father lived only knowing the final outlines of the U.S., while Jody’s grandfather and his contemporaries had been instrumental in helping draw these lines in the nineteenth century.²

Migrating farm families drove Manifest Destiny as politicians debated the merits of expansion in the halls of Congress. Many Americans imagined the West to be a place of opportunity and hope for those striving to improve the lives of their families. Good farm land figured prominently in the plans of easterners, midwesterners, and southerners looking to move on from New York, Ohio, and Missouri. They searched for good soil and a better climate, pushing past each successive frontier for the next best destination. But the ocean signified the end of the West and the end of westering. The Pacific Coast had become the geographical bulwark of westward migration as well as the last stop for many Americans such as Jody’s grandfather, a fictional, but indicative, icon for the American settler in California. As Steinbeck indicated in the “Red Pony,” westward expansion profoundly affected the lives of real people, often forgotten when discussing the grand forces of economic change and territorial acquisition.

Nineteenth-century Californians referred to the state as a “summer land,” a “promised land,” and a “sunset land” because it offered a good climate, new opportunities in gold and land, and a place to retire.³ Older couples retreated from winter lands with the hope that California’s climate would release them from the months of

² Ibid.
³ John Todd, The Sunset Land; or, the Great Pacific Slope (Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1870); George W. Pine, Beyond the West (Utica, N.Y.: T. J. Griffiths, 1870), 439.
snow and frigid temperatures in the winter and humidity and pests in the summer.

Clarissa Burrell wrote home to Ohio entreating her sister to join them. Burrell wrote, “Indeed sister Lucy I think this is an admirable place for one to reast [sic] in their declining years, you can have just as little company as you please and if you are lone some you can go and hold converse with the beautiful and sublime in nature.” This was the third and last frontier for Burrell, and her family enjoyed the daily comforts of a mild climate and occasionally ventured through the mountains to the ocean to explore the spectacular landscapes of Santa Cruz County, California. 4 Moving from frontier to frontier required Herculean efforts, and the Burrells, among others, knew their days of building and rebuilding were over. California’s climate offered a “friendlier frontier” for aging farmers and farmwives, who in the East had worked hard in humid summers and survived cold winters. In this sense, California settlers enacted the final phase of the nation’s Manifest Destiny.

For those who had spent much of their lifetimes building farms and providing for their children, California was the Sunset Land. It represented the final stage in their life cycles. As John Mack Faragher demonstrated in Women and Men on the Overland Trail, families seeking land in California in the 1830s and 1840s had established farms on two or three previous frontiers, and my research indicates the same for later immigrants such as the Burrells. 5 Uprooted Americans tired of leaving their communities to face years of crude conditions for the sake of the family’s future prospects. Josephine Crawford recorded this sentiment in simple terms. After living in California for almost thirty years, Crawford explained to her distant aunt in 1889: “I have had all the experience in pioneer

---

life that I desire, and am contented to spend the remaining days allotted me here in San Jose.” The sun set in the West and as did the lives of many westering men and women. Both the Burrell and Crawford women died in California without visiting their relatives beyond the boundaries of the Golden State.  

These older, pioneering families that settled California, however, raised children who stayed in the state to continue farming or moved into towns during the early twentieth century. Many of these natives became the subjects of discussion as the Depression wracked the nation, and both John Steinbeck and Carey McWilliams drew America’s eyes to the sins of the large-scale growers in the Salinas Valley, obscuring the state’s rural past. In 1939, these authors published The Grapes of Wrath and Factories in the Field: The Story of Migratory Farm Labor in California in an attempt to bring some type of justice to the migrant laborers subjugated by western growers. Consequently, historians have constructed their narratives of California agriculture, following in the footsteps of Carey McWilliams. They have, in essence, traced the state’s problems back from the present, using McWilliams’s themes of labor exploitation. Agribusiness in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries seems to be inextricably linked to the state’s past. Mexican land grants morphed naturally into large-scale enterprises such as John Bidwell’s ranch or the Miller & Lux operations, which then set precedents for the oppressiveness of growers during the depression and so on. For historians of California, the state’s agriculture and land were predestined to become no more than tools of capitalists.

---

9 Josephine Crawford to “aunt,” 15 June 1889, folder 14, box 10, SMCII collection, California History Room, California State Library, Sacramento [hereafter CSL].
But many Americans immigrating to California did not know of the state’s destiny, and assumed that they arrived on a frontier as any other. During the first fifty years of statehood, a number of families came to California to live and farm. They expected to work hard while waiting for markets and transportation networks. Americans understood the frontier and its transformation into “civilization” over time. Families built schools and churches, maintained roads, and created communities. Then many of these families watched their neighbors leave or left themselves to start this process all over again. On each frontier, families started from almost nothing, building homes and putting in crops, while adjusting to a new landscape, whether that was in upland Virginia, the prairie lands of Illinois, or the swampy lands of Missouri. No frontier matched the physical landscape of the homes the settlers left, but this gave Americans the impetus to import their customs and lifeways to make life familiar in an era of mobility and constant change.

California’s rural districts shifted and developed over time, but when John Steinbeck was born in 1902, a generation of children from farm families took over the land, farming as the Tiflins or building large-scale operations that defined California agriculture for years to come. In Steinbeck’s short stories and novels, readers find two Californias, one rural and one agricultural. He saw the unconscionable injustice of growers toward migrant laborers, but he also witnessed the ordinary unfairness of life on a family farm. Steinbeck never lost sight of rural California, and he exposed the frustration and disappointment of his characters within the bucolic backdrop of rural Salinas.
In each of the “Red Pony” stories, Steinbeck focused on one event to make a series of discrete points about rural California and indirectly documented the diurnal patterns of life and work of the Tiflins and their hired hand. In doing this, Steinbeck interwove the gendered divisions of labor on the ranch into his narrative as skillfully as any rural historian. Ruth Tiflin quietly cooked eggs and ham, mended socks, and made cottage cheese. As she spooned clabbered milk into a bag to hang over her sink, she watched the world of men through her window. Her husband, his hired hand, and the Tiflin boy milked the cows, slaughtered pigs, and raked hay. Jody Tiflin went about his daily chores helping his mother in the beginning, feeding chickens and filling the wood box. As he got older, he spent less time helping her, and he spent his free hours away from school with his father and the hired man. Steinbeck defined each character by the nature of his or her work, and as a boy in his early teens, Jody’s rite of passage showed his growth by transitioning from the house to the fields. These are all the same chores that men, women, and children performed in California in 1854, 1884, and even 1924. What might seem banal to modern readers was, in fact, necessary to survival in rural California.

No matter where Americans moved, they could not avoid the physical and emotional strains of work. This project examines how immigrants made California a place of farms and rural communities instead of just mines and service towns. This transformation came about because gold seekers left the mines to return to agriculture or start farms for the first time. Some men had dreams for their lands as big as they had for the mines and started large-scale operations. The Steele Brothers established dairies in the coastal counties inspiring awe in their contemporaries, but the operation became too
large and unwieldy as book keeping and lawsuits harried the Steeles, who eventually dismantled the business. Others wanted an honest return for honest work and desired to build families and communities. They wanted to recreate the settled life they had forsaken for a chance at unearthing riches. After miners-turned-farmers demonstrated the fertility of the soil, others arrived to farm and build homes. This is their story, and I recount the reasons for giving up mining for farming in Chapter One. In Chapter One, I argue that the solitary life of the mines fostered melancholia, and men yearned to live again in the midst of families. While some men enjoyed the freedom and adventure of the gold rush, others wanted to reorder society and truly “settle” the unruly West and their lives.

Several themes emerge from this project, especially that of work. Lonely miners described their fruitless efforts and Sunday chores in the diggings, and farmers reported to kin about the types of crops they raised and for how much they sold. Despite the fact that thousands of men and women worked hard, California gained a reputation for idleness. Miners squandered gold in the vice districts and wandered about the countryside instead of settling down. The state’s promoters idolized the virtues of hard work and focused their attentions on farmers. In Chapter Two, I identify how boosters and residents entered a dialogue with prospective immigrants about the virtues and imperfections of the state. Writers of the promotional literature practically begged farm families to come to California and ameliorate perceived problems in the Land of Promise.

While boosters penned numerous tracts to attract rural people, farm families established homesteads in the mountains, on the coast, and in the valleys. Work represented a reality for immigrants on these farms, and an ideal for boosters who wanted
to see California’s countryside burgeoning with industry and the purported values it bred. They hoped small farms and the operators would buttress a strong economy and stable social environment. After the gold rush, California’s land and sun provided untapped resources ready to be released by an army of rural people willing to plow, harvest, and send their products to markets.

I continue with work as a theme in Chapter Three, in which I describe the labors of men, women, and children on their farms. California farm families assigned tasks based on sex and age as did farming folks in other states. In California, farmers added vineyards and orchards to their operations, and they spent their time in these sections of their farms as well as their fields of hay grasses, wheat, or corn. Additionally, wives supported the commercial aspects of their husbands’ work in the farm house. The days of farmwives on the Pacific Coast were as varied and tiresome as most nineteenth-century women who had to wash clothes and cook while raising children. Many wives and children added to the household economy by producing dairy and poultry products. Children helped their parents with typical chores appropriate for their ages. I have tried to identify how men, women, and children worked as groups and how the three labored together in order to demonstrate the skills and structures of farm life that Americans brought to California. At the same time, I examine how they adapted to the climate and market demands found in the state.

In Chapter Four, the topics of Chapters Two and Three combine in my discussion of the colony system in the 1880s and 1890s. Landowners subdivided land for farms, boosters advertised them, and families and single farmers moved onto the small acreages created for them. After years of promoting the state, landowners and boosters channeled
their energies into constructing places that were physically and psychologically appealing. Colony agents sold land, but they also promised water rights, assisted settlers with new crops such as grapes or citrus, and guaranteed transportation and marketing networks for specialty products. More than just a place to grow crops, colony rules and community building also made these places into social organizations where families and single women could live without gambling halls and saloons. In these tamer communities, men and women actually settled and worked much as the boosters had hoped. Colonists built churches and schools after breaking ground to raise both subsistence and market crops. The colony system worked so well that eventually the colonies became too popular. Towns such as Anaheim and Pasadena are now bustling urban areas. Only in Fresno can visitors find the visual reminders of the colony system. Driving through Fresno, one can still see the strict grid pattern of the streets originally laid out by its founders. The irrigation canals that brought farmers water remain like semi-healed scars on the land, not fully functioning but still evident to the naked eye.

The farm families and many of the single farmers discussed in the first four chapters struggled to secure good incomes and homes, sometimes succeeding to make comfortable lives for themselves and sometimes not. While historians have often focused on the successful individuals of both mineral and agricultural California, there were many failures. As younger men and women, Californians found ways, even in the worst of times, to find food and shelter. Family members helped each other to survive, but a

---

7 The Fresno Audubon Society sends bird watching enthusiasts to the Fancher Creek Canal, one of the few working canals that have not become a sterile, lifeless environment. “Birding Sites in the Fresno Area,” Fresno Audubon Society, http://www.fresnoaudubon.org/sites.htm, accessed 20 August 2006.
number of people in the state lost their ability to care for themselves and had no one to support them.

Miners, laborers, prostitutes, widowed men and children, orphans, and the aged who lost that ability ended up in county hospitals and poor farms funded by tax payers. There were numerous institutions for the destitute in 1880s California. Young women with children went to lying-in hospitals; orphans found homes in the state orphan asylum; and male veterans and railroad workers had their own hospitals. Yet the county hospitals and poor farms became the destination for individuals from all of these categories. I argue that the poor farm system demonstrates how important the institution of family was to surviving in California, a fact the boosters proclaimed throughout the 1870s, 1880s, and 1890s.

The topics of these chapters cover a broad range, from the gold rush to poor farms, but like Steinbeck, it has been my intention to uncover the simple but ephemeral nature of rural life in California. Overall, I argue three interrelated points about California that are fundamental to understanding the experiences of the nineteenth-century Americans who went there. First California had a rural, countryside, in which individuals negotiated between the familiar and the extraordinary. Climate, landscape, and history combined to create a unique place, in which newcomers struggled to establish their homes.

Second, Americans brought a variety of social institutions and customs to help them adapt to their new environment. Families built schools and churches, but they also imported other ways of ordering society. They borrowed models from U.S. states,
especially Iowa and New York, for forms of county and state government. Moreover, men built lodges and poor farms to care for their fraternal “brothers” and the downtrodden. Women joined clubs and assisted other women in protective societies, granges, and suffrage meetings with connections to national organizations. It would be impossible to prove that California lacked distinctiveness yet evidence indicates that Americans in the state freely integrated it into the Union at many levels.

Third, as Carey McWilliams brought the plight of farmworkers to light during the early to mid twentieth century, he imbued California’s past with a strictly capitalistic interpretation of the actions of its nineteenth-century residents. In fact, my research indicates that many of the men and women who sojourned or settled in the state struggled with the economic transitions taking place in the second half of the nineteenth century. Their motives for coming to California were far more complicated, and the immigrants fled from failures at home and often searched for one last chance to make life a little better before they died. It is in their attempt to wrestle a living out of the countryside in an era of markets and monopolies that they looked to reestablish the rural values of hard work and community responsibility.

California’s rural past has been difficult to uncover, in part, because it is so difficult to define “family farm” in the context of a market economy. Recently, a set of

---

H-Rural postings demonstrates why scholars struggle with this. On April 20, a New Zealand professor started the thread by asking: “Help wanted! Can anyone please suggest to me the source for some up to date figures on the number of family owned and operated farms as opposed to corporate owned and operated farms in the USA?” Several agricultural historians responded, dutifully giving him appropriate titles but also issuing caveats about the initial question.9

The respondents wanted to clarify the difference between “family farm” (mentioned in the subject line) and family owned/operated farms. Joseph L. Anderson warned, “One thing worth remembering is that most corporate farms in the US are family operations, in contrast to relatively small number of massive corporate farms.” Jess Gilbert added to the conversation by posting the numbers of individually/family operated farms in 2002 (89.7 percent), but conceded “that’s probably not what you really want to know.” The nature of original email begged the question, as Gilbert recognized, what defines a “family farm” especially in the context of modern, corporate America. This set of emails fascinated me because everyone asks me what do I mean by the term “family farm” and how many of them were there. In an age of modern technology and statistical methods, this task is difficult. Gilbert noted that “‘Family farm’ is something else again, and not so easily counted.” How right he was.10

For my study, my working definition of a family farm is an agricultural operation managed by a farmer who used family labor in the fields and house. In some of the more successful cases I examined, farmers and their wives chose to hire various hands to assist

---
9 Tom Brooking, email posted to the H-Rural list, 21 April 2006.
10 Joseph L. Anderson email reply to Brooking, 21 April 2006; Jess Gilbert email reply to Brooking, 21 April 2006.
them indoors and out. Generally, these families started with just the labor of family members and personally managed ranch hands, milkers, cooks, or harvest hands. In Chapter Three, I present several cases to demonstrate the range of family operations. Nineteenth-century Californians arranged for additional labor, and I have spent most of my time in examining forms generally excluded from the current literature, including labor exchanges with neighbors and sharecropping. Several historians have already examined the most exploitive labor practices, and scholars interested in how growers manipulated Indian and Mexican labor should consult the works of Carey McWilliams, Richard Street, Albert Hurtado, Gilbert Gonzalez, and Matt Garcia. I only wish to add my contribution to the knowledge they have given us.¹¹

The census records for the nineteenth century tell us no more about the number of authentic family farms in California than does the 2002 agricultural census cited by Jess Gilbert. Census enumerators were constrained in their gathering of information by narrowness of categories provided on the preprinted forms supplied by the U.S. Census Bureau. As a result of the decennial censuses, we know that there were 872 farms in 1850 California, 14,044 in 1860, and 72,542 in 1900. Yet these figures are inherently flawed and even more difficult to interpret. After comparing the agricultural and population censuses for the mining districts, it became exceedingly clear that men assigned to these areas were less than interested in their tasks. Early California residents

searched for reliable laborers for farms and hospitals, but gold camps and saloons called too many able bodied men from the ranks (see Chapters One and Five). Surely, wandering the countryside to count its inhabitants at 2¢ per head lacked the adventure or perceived glamour of the gold rush. Moreover, the questionnaires filed by these men failed to give any qualitative data. For most of the nineteenth century, census forms only asked about the market productions of men, excluding poultry and home gardens. Only by comparing the population census to the agricultural forms can one find any information about the laborers living on the property, which then excludes labor exchanges and seasonal hired labor arrangements.

It is for this reason that I have relied on the sources left by farm families. In as many cases as possible, I have compiled data on families who left letters and diaries, accessing the census, local histories, genealogies, newspapers, county histories, and agricultural society reports to excise additional information. In some cases, I have been able to amass quite a bit of information on certain individuals, families, and communities. I have spent much of the last few years trying to reconstruct the lives as lived by the Healds, the Cockrills, and the Townsends, and thus their stories give vivid color to the text of this project. In most cases, individuals appear in the historical record and disappear just as quickly. Elvira Gnagi, for instance, lived in California for three years to restore her health. A diary recording one year of that stay survived the passage of time, yet its contents confirm my findings from better documented families.

All of these families I examined left some evidence of their work, and immigrants before and after the gold rush relied on the economic security provided by farming. Men balanced the immediate needs of their wives and children through subsistence agriculture,
adding market crops as time progressed. Farms allowed families to adjust to the economic environment, returning to or abandoning market production as needed. These strategies cannot be derived from the census but in the letters and diaries passed over by so many historians because of banal entries such “planted tomatoes.” As historian Laurel Thatcher Ulrich demonstrated with her study of midwife Martha Ballard, mundane diaries have value. For historians who want to uncover the daily lives of individuals, farmers’ calendar diaries hold a wealth of information about how they adapted to the climate, soil, and markets. Milton Frank Kemble dutifully recorded when he planted his tomatoes, when he was able to pick the first ripe ones, and what he expected to receive for them in the San Francisco markets.12

Throughout the project, I use the term “family farm” to indicate agricultural operations based on family labor and the term “rural” to understand the social economy in which these farm families lived. A rural area can be described quantitatively as “open country and settlements with fewer than 2,500” by the Census Bureau but that is still quite vague. It is often easier to determine rural in juxtaposition to urban areas. Those areas that are not urban or suburban and have farms must be rural. Even the researchers of the Economic Research Service in the U.S. Department of Agriculture use a nomenclature based on urbanity, identifying “metropolitan” and “nonmetropolitan” areas.13 In nineteenth-century California, there were a number of large towns, including


Sacramento and Stockton. San Francisco remained singular in its size and activity, and for that reason became known as “The City” to most visitors and residents. In California rural areas were marked by isolation and lack of services. Mountain ranges, rivers, and poor transportation meant most communities of farmers were rural even if they lived near a small town or port.

Terminology has been important to the historiography of California. Steinbeck referred to the Tiflin homestead as a “ranch,” and this custom started soon after statehood. It might seem logical that the term indicated a different type of farm, peculiar to the state or at least the Far West. Moreover, Americans in the state often referred to the large grants assigned during the Spanish and Mexican eras as “ranchos,” which implied these plots were large and under-cultivated. Yet residents and visitors used less precision in their terminology to describe farms. In 1859, Mary Ann Meredith left a diary in which she recorded her trip into the northern mines to meet her husband. From the steamboat leaving Sacramento, she noted the scenery translating it into California jargon. She wrote, “There are some splendid ranches (or farms as we call them) on the Sacramento.”14 One can imagine her anticipation, reuniting with her husband and creating a new home in this new land, so much so that she made sure to use the local phraseology. Throughout the sources I examined, diarists and letter writers depicted the lands on which they lived with much detail for distant relatives. They drew pictures of ordinary lives on the frontier and employed the words “farm” and “ranch” interchangeably.

---

14 Mary Ann Harris Meredith, Diary of Mary Ann Harris Meredith, pp. 27, 1925, typescript, CSL.
Rural Californians shared labor, socialized together, and bartered goods within the communities they built around their farms and ranches. Nationally, not just in California, farmers increasingly relied on the market yet maintained many aspects of rural life in terms of form and function. Because California’s rural past has been obscured, scholars have argued that the state did not have the capacity to sustain the values of agrarian life. Cletus Daniel wrote that the “large-scale agriculture of California did not represent a departure from the dominant family-farming tradition in America for the simple reason that California was never a part of that tradition.”15 Yet in the time period Daniel examined, California’s farm families continued to pursue family labor strategies despite the existence of large-scale enterprises.

Cletus Daniel’s work is redolent of Carey McWilliams because the former journalist inspired several generations of scholars to examine the dysfunctions of the state’s economy and the human toll of unrestrained capitalistic growth. In his books, McWilliams marked out the outlines of California historiography for years after his books were published. As a result, scholars understand the power and control wielded by growers against a large number of laborers. At Wheatland in the 1910s or on the lands of the DiGiorgio Corporation in the 1960s, agricultural producers manipulated capital and local politics to their benefit, ignoring the most basic needs of the men and women who picked hops or fruit. Union activists and state legislators are still wrestling with this legacy. It would be naïve to argue against the value of these studies or to ignore the significance of California’s large-scale enterprises.

This project is meant to shift the focus toward the rural people who knew nothing about the future. Daniel Heald had no idea that the land on which he raised his cows would be transformed into corporate wineries nor did Elvira Gnagi expect San Jose to be overrun by concrete and computer engineers. The wine industry of Sonoma and the technological innovations coming out of Silicon Valley both represent modern California. The current economic condition tells us little about the nature of life in nineteenth-century California, but it was the children of these settlers with the help of new immigrants who together guided the state into the twentieth century. Thus it is time to rely less on McWilliams whose interpretations were skewed by the present he tried to explain. McWilliams, in essence, created a mythological place in the form of historical California, and historians rarely question his line of thought. Without the farmers and their families in the rural districts in the mountains and valleys, we lose the chance to reconstruct California as it was before 1900. I ask that instead of examining the state’s past from the factory-like fields of the twentieth century, we can stand on the front porches of the families in the 1800s and see the world from their vantage point.
CHAPTER 1. FOR THE LOVE OF GOLD AND GRAIN: THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE SINGLE MAN’S FRONTIER

In 1851, Asa Cyrus Call arrived in Placerville, California, known to miners as “Hangtown.” Just two years before, residents of the town witnessed the first recorded incident of mob violence in the mining districts. Miners lynched two Chileans and one Frenchman accused, and irrevocably convicted, of theft and murder. In January 1849, Hangtown was a part of the wild California frontier as its name signified. Call, however, reached the area during a quieter time after the community rid itself of the barbarous name. By 1851, Placerville residents had built an Episcopal church, started a newspaper, and supported at least one regular stagecoach line.16

Asa Call left his family in the Midwest to pursue mining in order to return home and buy a farm, but he had little to say about his time mining and discontinued his search for gold by 1852. In that year, he obtained a small plot of land near several mining camps on the Merced River and commenced farming. For more than one year, this single man became accustomed to living day-to-day without women, thereby doing all or most of the household chores necessary in the 1850s. He started a journal to document his woes, which included the paucity of women, his miner’s diet, and the peculiar nature of California’s climate. Another former miner, “Mr. Maxwell,” joined Call, hauling goods to the mines as Call watched his vegetables grow and lizards crawl about his cabin. Tired of habitually eating a diet rich in “slap-jack and molasses,” Call determined that the only

---

16 Originally known as Dry Diggings, miners referred to the town as Hangtown after January 1849 when this event occurred. Zoeth Skinner Eldredge, History of California, (New York: Century History Co., 1915), 3:407: “The first hanging as punishment for theft occurred at the dry diggings on a branch of Weber creek, which William Daylor had discovered in 1848, and near the present town of Placerville.”
solution involved marrying one of the local Missouri girls, as long as it was not the one everyone referred to as the “Old Heifer.”

Single men such as Call and Maxwell pursued farming near the California mines as an alternative to mining. Over the course of the 1850s, as more people joined the ranks of California miners, a number of men shifted from searching for gold to planting crops. Single-minded in their pursuit of gold, droves of argonauts needed provisions, and the miners-turned-farmers found ways to procure seeds, land, and rudimentary equipment to farm for this new and growing market. Additionally during this period, women and children came to the state in increasing numbers, joining husbands and fathers already in the mines or coming within intact families. The story of the gold rush does not end with the depletion of the placers but continues as former miners farmed, formed families, and proved the fecundity of California’s soil. The events of 1848 and 1849 sparked a male-oriented immigration led to a wild and unstable single man’s frontier. By 1860, men and the women together had transformed the state into a family frontier.

The events of the gold rush turned the world of “Alta California” upside down, from a place of ranchos and coastal outposts into a mountain-focused landscape teeming with young men. New arrivals bypassed the missions, presidios, and pueblos planted

---

17 John Call and Vanessa Call, eds., The Diaries of Asa Cyrus Call, March 28th, 1850 - December 26th, 1853 (N.p., 1998). The Call family decided to publish the gold rush diary of their ancestor, ignoring the manuscript diary by Ambrose Call in which describes life in Algona, Kossuth County, Iowa. The Call brothers founded the town and their own farms there, using, in part, Asa’s income from California. See Ambrose A. Call papers, 1862-1904, C13, Special Collections, State Historical Society of Iowa, Des Moines.

18 Alta California was a part of Mexico’s northern frontier until February 1848 when Nicholas Trist negotiated the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo with Mexico to end the war and define the new boundaries of Mexican and American territories. The U.S. acquired Alta California, representing the area within the state boundary from San Diego in the south to present day Oregon in the north. Without the gold rush, however, the U.S. territory looked about the same as it did as when it belonged to Mexico with rancheros who owned large acreages, or “ranchos” on which most Californians raised cattle.
by Mexicans for the ports of call, provisioning towns, and mining camps. Men from around the world arrived on ships in San Francisco, a sleepy little town known for its sand hills and cold winds. Americans also entered California from the East, bringing their wagon trains over the Sierra Nevada Mountains. Neither group concerned themselves with the fact that Mexican-Americans and Indians made the area home, nor did these men worry about the destruction they were about to cause to the local environment. They were ready for a fevered pursuit of wealth before they returned to the comforts of home.¹⁹

Residents living in California prior to annexation took advantage of their proximity to the mines, being the first to hear of John Marshall’s gold discovery in January 1848.²⁰ John Sutter, Peirson B. Reading, and John Bidwell, among others, used supplies from their ranchos to sustain their employees as the latter mined.²¹ By the summer of 1848, people from the Hawaiian Islands, Oregon, South America, and Mexico

¹⁹ Gold seekers from several countries, including France, China, and Australia for example, did not always come voluntarily and thus could not leave voluntarily. See Walter Nugent, Into the West: The Story of its People (New York: Vintage Books, 1999), 58-65. For an exhaustive treatment of the French, see Malcolm Rohrbaugh’s forthcoming book, and, of course, Malcolm J. Rohrbough, Days of Gold: The California Gold Rush and the American Nation (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 220-29. I am generally considering Americans and American residents of foreign birth who chose to come to California. The gold seekers from around the world, however, contributed to the atmosphere of California.

²⁰ The Spanish and Mexican government granted land for settlement purposes to individuals to reward them for military service or to maintain population on the distant frontier. The Mexican government confiscated mission land, provided for by the Spanish government to the priests, and redistributed much of the church’s acreage through the land grant process. From 1841 to 1846, American families crossed overland into the Mexican territory, and a number of non-Mexican immigrants received several large grants. While citizens of both Spanish and non-Spanish heritage acquired land and ran their ranchos in Alta California, only the Hispanics were referred to as “californios.” See William Deverell, Whitewashed Adobe: The Rise of Los Angeles and the Remaking of its Mexican Past (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 17.

joined them. Historians estimate that the population remained low; only 20,000 non-Indians resided in California by the end of the year. This changed over the next years as the population rose to more than 100,000 in 1849 and doubled over the next two years. This was the male, mining frontier. Prior to 1850, some estimate that men made up more than 90 percent of the population. In 1850, the sex ratio remained significantly skewed at approximately twelve men for each woman. In the words of historian Albert Hurtado, “Men rushed to California; women ambled.”

Food became a significant issue to the men as they traveled by ship or wagon and as they arrived in California. Men taking the various routes to California generally spent four to eight months at sea or crossing the plains. Ship captains taking eastern goods to California during its Mexican era (1821-1848) regularly charted the seas on the route rounding Cape Horn, but storms or layovers extended trips on occasion. Some were able to afford the passage for the sea route via the Isthmus of Panama, which reduced the

---


23 Yankee traders and whalers had the most experience traveling around Cape Horn generally and to California specifically. Many Yankees familiar with the trip were quick to respond to the news of gold on the Pacific Coast. For maritime accounts of trip to California before the gold rush, see Richard Henry Dana, Jr., *Two Years before the Mast* (1840; reprint, New York: Westvaco Corp., 1992); Thomas J. Farnham, *Travels in the Californias, and Scenes in the Pacific Ocean* (New York: Saxton & Miles, 1844). For an example of a Yankee who took advantage of the maritime routes to mine in 1849, see Allen Family Papers, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley [hereafter Bancroft Library]. Oliver Allen made enough money during the gold rush return to Connecticut and “fetch his family.” The Allen family built a successful dairy operation in the Sonoma/Marin area. In Connecticut, he invented a shoulder gun for whaling and received a U.S. Patent for a gun-fired bomb lance and another for a harpoon capable of being shot out of the same gun. For an extensive discussion of the evolution of whaling apparatus, see [http://www.whalecraft.net/Shoulder_Guns.html](http://www.whalecraft.net/Shoulder_Guns.html), accessed 5 March 2006. See also the story of D. J. Locke in San Joaquin County. *An Illustrated History of San Joaquin County, California* (Chicago: Lewis Publishing Co., 1890), 132, 487-98, 661. For a comprehensive discussion of the argonauts taking the Cape Horn route, see Charles R. Schultz, *Forty-Niners ’Round the Horn* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999).
trip to approximately thirty-five days if all went well. At the same time, few could afford passage on a ship and were too far inland to reach ports quickly. Overland emigrants experienced many of the same travails as those taking the Cape Horn route, save the sea sickness. Americans in the Midwest and parts of the South often chose to join a “company” to cross the plains and southwestern deserts in groups. The trip by land lasted for months as wagon trains generally proceeded at a rate of ten to thirty miles per day, depending on the size of the group and number of livestock they took. John Johnston left Iowa in May 1852, arriving in Placerville by September. After seeing a man drown in front of his wife and children while fording a river, Johnston recommended that gold seekers take the sea route: “I would not advise any man to go to California by land it is an awful trip.”

In actuality, most of the routes to California might have been deemed awful, as diarists consistently remarked about sickness, death, poor food, and a dearth of fresh water. Jared Coffin Nash of Maine and W. Stevens of New York both proceeded on the Cape Horn route. On the Belgrade from December 1849 to June 1850, Nash watched as a fever debilitated at least forty passengers and took the lives of three. He told his wife in

24 John Mack Faragher, Women and Men on the Overland Trail (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), 7; Thomas F. Andrews, “Satire and the Overland Guide: John B. Hall’s Fanciful Advice to Gold Rush Emigrants,” California Historical Society Quarterly 48 (June 1969): 99-111; Rohrbough, “No Boy’s Play,” 33; Lansford W. Hastings, Emigrant’s Guide to Oregon and California (Cincinnati: G. Conclin, 1845); Joseph E. Ware, The Emigrants’ Guide to California (St. Louis, Mo.: J. Halsall, 1849); J. A. Butler, Journal of Trip to California, April-September 1856, ed. Marlin L. Heckman (La Verne, Calif.: University of La Verne, 1993), 68. For more information on the faulty preparation of guidebooks, see Ray A. Billington, “Books that Won the West: The Guidebooks of the Forty-Niners & Fifty-Niners,” American West 4, no. 3 (1967): 25-32, 72-75. Faragher says that 20 miles per day was a good goal but not always attained. Gold rush trail diaries, however, indicate that some did as many as 40 miles in a day, see J. A. Butler’s account. Clearly, an animal could not make that distance everyday, but much of the stock crossing the plains was pushed to the point of being lame due to the urgency felt by the gold rushers.

a letter, “It was enough to fill the stoutest heart with fear and dread lest he too might be the next victim.” The fever eventually infected more of the passengers, and Nash became so ill he immediately reboarded a ship in San Francisco to return home. Stevens, in contrast, complained about multiple issues related to life on a ship. From the beginning it seemed to him that the trip was doomed: “I believe we’re destined to adverse winds. The fates are against us, and have been since we’ve had an existence.” On this ship, they faced storms, high winds, not enough wind, snow, ice, and generally cold temperatures. He traveled in steerage, where there were few fires for warmth yet many thieves and lice to make the trip even less pleasurable.

Bad weather and illness notwithstanding, men found the meals on ships ranged from bad to inedible. Enos Christman and his fellow passengers on the Europe tired of the bad meals and finally complained to the captain, especially about the bread. Christman described the bread as a “little musty” and “very badly cooked.” Many loaves contained worms at least a half an inch long. The captain finally acquiesced and told complaining passengers to “flog the cook next time” they received bad bread. Christman described this captain as “whole-souled” for taking measures toward improving the meals. Not all captains were as helpful. In W. Stevens’s diary, Stevens described Captain Evans as “downright tyrannical” and a “hypocritical old fool.” After months at

---

sea, Stevens found it surprising that the passengers were “obliged to eat bread and salt meat or starve” while the captain had pies openly delivered to his stateroom. At times, there was just not enough food for all the passengers. D. R. Ashley described this problem on his trip in April 1849. His fellow passengers had to eat in three services, and everyone scrambled for the first setting. Otherwise, the unfortunate latecomers sat down to a “nibbling such as is reported to make ground squirrels weep.”

Travelers complained, joked, and worried about the food on these trips because the meals sustained their physical health over the short and long term. On board, outbreaks of cholera and fever spread because men lived in close proximity to one another and were weak from poor diets. Ship passengers also understood their diets related directly to their health in terms of food- and water-related ailments such as scurvy and diarrhea. On 2 May 1852, just three months after leaving New York, Stevens reported the end of the potato stores. Ten days later, the cook finally served some onions along with the meat and cornbread, but Stevens noted in his diary, “I begin to have some fears about the scurvy.” For men expecting to land in California for the purpose of finding gold and returning home, any illness created an obstacle to this goal.

---

27 Enos Christman, One Man’s Gold: The Letters & Journal of a Forty-Niner (New York: Whittlesey House, 1930), 7-18, 30-31; Delos Rodeyn Ashley, “Documents for the History of California, 1827-1860,” BANC MSS C-B 101, Bancroft Library. The accounts of miserable conditions on ships abound, see also Samuel Curtis Upham, Notes of a voyage to California via Cape Horn, together with scenes in El Dorado, in the years of 1849-50 (Philadelphia: n.p., 1878), 116: “To-day there has been no fire in either galley, consequently all hands have been compelled to subsist on low diet – raw salt pork and hard-tack!” For a doctor’s account and analysis, see Tyson, Diary of a physician in California, 11-49.

Once in California, food continued to concern gold seekers, especially since few wanted to farm but all needed to eat. Thus miners spent hard earned gold dust on high priced groceries and often ate poorly. On the male mining frontier, new arrivals cooked daily meals in camps near the mines. Men, mostly unfamiliar with cooking on a daily basis, made simple meals to fulfill their basic needs. For example, Howard C. Gardiner, left New York City for San Francisco in March 1849, arriving four months later. By August, he and his friends arrived in Hawkins’ Bar where, as he described it, they “commenced housekeeping under such economical conditions that for a while we lived more like pigs than human beings.” This group wanted to make as much money as possible in the mines before going home and refused to waste their income on groceries. They survived off of food of the “cheapest and coarsest description,” mainly a corn mush fried in a pan with pork gravy. This meal fulfilled their minimal expectations—sustenance, ease of preparation, and low cost.  

Laborers were accustomed to back breaking work but not without sustenance. Placer miners panned sand and rock for gold as they stood knee deep in icy mountain streams. During the 1850s, as miners looked for deposits located underground, they


Placer mining required little capital and much labor. Forty-eighters and forty-niners both profited from this type of mining, which Americans abandoned as the claims “dried up.” Charles Nordhoff, California: For Health, Pleasure, and Residence (New York: Harper & Bros., 1873), 93: “Placer-mining was that in which the deposits of loose gold in the alluvial soil were washed out by cradles and other inexpensive expedients. Thus a large region of country about Sonora has been denuded, and lies still a rocky desert. Placer-mining is not now much followed in California, except by Chinese, Mexicans, and Indians, who are going over the old tailings.” The term placer was derived from the Spanish word (‘placer”) for shoal, sandbank, or gravel bed.
removed trees and brush and built flumes and ditches to redirect water. Mining, plainly, was hard work; miners required approximately 4,000 calories per day to sustain their bodies under this type of exertion. Conditions were primitive in 1849 and 1850, and many new arrivals lived in tents and used bushes to construct rude shelters. As they camped near the streams and hills where they hoped to find gold, men often subsisted on flapjacks, beans, fried pork, and hard bread. These meals were not meant to sustain their long term health, or even short term happiness, but gold seekers hoped to minimize time spent on meal preparation in order to maximize their time pursuing gold.\(^3\)

Observers regularly described the unhealthy diet of salt pork and flour-based foods. Some miners ate the same meal three times per day, ignoring their physical need for vegetables due to scarcity or cost of such items. Health conscious miners improvised using local plants and spruce bark to stave off scurvy. One day Pilsbury Hodgkins and his fellows from Maine hunted the hills for a “mess of greens.” Hodgkins related a day in February 1850 when “we all started out, each took a different plant, picked, cooked and ate their own choice—then waited to see if anyone was poisoned. They were all palatable and proved healthy food. After that we had greens every week.” Improvisation saved their health while in Jackass Gulch, but miners preferred to eat familiar foods more than mysterious plants found in the strange environment of the California mountains.\(^3\)

While miners stirred their beans or flipped their pancakes, they ruminated over their new roles, doing what was generally considered as “women’s work.” New to the “kitchen,” single men learned to cook on their own or from miners’ wives. Some even wrote home for “receipts” for dishes they remembered but were unable to prepare and

\(^{31}\) Conlin, Bacon, Beans, and Galantines, 7.
\(^{32}\) Pilsbury Hodgkins, “Chips,” ca. 1892, transcript, pp. 8-9, BANC MSS 95/206c, Bancroft Library.
bought vegetables “no matter what the price.” Moreover, it became clear that cooking was real work that these men previously took for granted. After one young man complained about having to cook his “own supper,” his mother replied, “We think it would be quite amusing to see you with your hands in a batch of biscuit.” Married and unmarried men lived with other men, which they referred to as “bachelor’s hall.” Both missed the labors of female relatives; back home, wives and daughters orchestrated the domestic chores for married men, while William Peters and other bachelors relied on their mothers and sisters to shoulder the burden of daily meals and other housekeeping chores. William Peters wrote home to Pennsylvania confiding in his father, “I never knewed the use of females before I arrived here.” As a result, Peters resolved to “fetch” himself a wife as soon as possible. Eating their own cooking day after day, William Peters, Asa Call, and other men in the mining districts looked forward to marriage and the end of their gastronomically deficient adventures.

To save time, men in camps shared duties, rotating their terms as cooks or leaving the chore to one in the group who excelled. In general, most diarists and letter writers complained of poor meals, especially before 1850. But during the 1850s, traders and packers hauled more vegetables to the mines, and a few miners gardened to supply camp

---


34 Edmund and Sarah Elliott to Wilson Elliott, 10 April 1855, folder 5, box 956, Elliott Family Papers, 1854-1960, CSL; Abraham Schell Diary, 13 January 1849-5 April 1851, BANC MSS C-F 222 FILM, Bancroft Library; William T. Peters, “Letters to his Parents, from Marion Ranch, Sacramento County, Calif.,” BANC MSS 90/196c, Bancroft Library.
tables. They purchased pork when available, and some men hunted for local game. Even
the most unimaginative cook had the ability to transform these items into hearty meals.
The one-pot stew sustained many families on numerous frontiers, and women cooked
these stews using the simplest utensils, similar to the ones transported to the mines.
Cooks needed little more than a Dutch oven and a fire to make such stews. Other miners
learned to cook more complicated meals, enjoying their newly acquired skills and
pleasing their camp mates. In general, however, most men complained of bland meals,
scarce commodities, and high prices while in the mines.

Six days a week, miners searched for gold, but on Sundays they left their camps
to go to the nearest trading tent or town for supplies, mail, and news. In addition, women
set up impromptu restaurants in these places or cooked in hotels. Knowing this, men
sought out the meals of women cooks. During these gastronomical respites, they
purchased traditional American dishes and enjoyed the comfort of familiar smells and
tastes. Mary Ballou provided thousands of plates of food to miners boarding with her and
her husband in a camp known as Negro Bar. In her list of meals, she described the most
common American dishes, including baked chicken, boiled cabbage and turnips, mince
pies, apple pies, and blueberry pudding. Ballou hated her life in California because of the
endless work, her disorderly kitchen, and the outbreaks of violence, but she worked with
her husband and received good money for her womanly skills as a cook and nurse.35

In addition to working as boarding house cooks, a number of women set-up
kitchens in various mining camps, baking pies and cakes while their husbands mined. In

35 Mary Ballou, “I Hear the Hogs in My Kitchen”: A Woman’s View of the Gold Rush,” in Let Them
Speak for Themselves: Women in the American West, 1849-1900, ed. Christiane Fischer (New York: E. P.
the northern mines, “Mrs. Phelps” moved to Nevada City and sold dried apple pies for one dollar along with coffee at ten cents per cup. On Sundays, she always found men waiting to sit at her tables. Bradner and Kezia Curtis worked together as the Phelps couple did, choosing the southern mining district after they landed in 1851. Near Sonora (Tuolumne County), Bradner Curtis mined and traded goods to miners in an area that became known as “Curtis Creek” or “Curtisville.” Miners traded with Curtis, but also feasted on his wife’s baked goods. Kezia Curtis made a number of American desserts, including “Gold and Silver Cake,” “Orange pie,” and “Snow balls.” So many miners came to visit the Bradners that Curtisville became a post office during the mid-1850s. Ballou, Phelps, and Curtis represented the small number of women in the mining districts. They cooked for miners who desired familiar dishes and desserts, which resulted in significant incomes for the women and comfort food for the miners.  

Most miners went into small, local towns on Sundays, but occasionally men traveled farther to larger provisioning towns or San Francisco to exchange their gold dust for more than pies and cakes. Historians have well-documented the adventures of miners in the saloons and brothels. Miners also spent much of their hard earned gold on meals in 

---

San Francisco where the polyglot culture of the gold rush inspired a cosmopolitan atmosphere among the sand hills of the state’s biggest seaport, replete with upscale restaurants. One visitor found the mixture of the state’s epicurean habits and rough and tumble frontier lifestyle remarkable: it seemed every California town needed its own whiskey saloon, billiard hall, and French restaurant. While some miners splurged on extravagant meals occasionally, all ate their daily meals near their claims.37

Food provided miners with more than relief from boring meals in the mines. After months on ships or in wagons, many immigrants came in a weakened state due to the conditions of travel and a dearth of antiscourbutic foods. Many developed scurvy at sea, but land scurvy might have claimed as many as 10,000 men in California. In addition, ship passengers also brought debilitating and infectious diseases, such as malaria and cholera, spreading the latter from ports to the interior. A cholera outbreak in late 1850 decimated city populations.38 As plagues and fevers raged in towns, newly arrived miners worked in the mines forgoing the expense of the foods they needed to fight scurvy, especially in the years 1848 to 1850. During the winter of 1849-1850, a number of men fell ill with bad cases of scurvy in Sonora, and town officials arranged a temporary hospital for the suffering men. By this point, Americans in California approved a state constitution but waited for Congress to admit the territory to the Union.

In the meantime, local towns adopted American forms of government or allowed the
alcalde (the mayor under the Mexican system) to continue administrating affairs, including rudimentary social welfare.\textsuperscript{39}

In the case of Sonora, the alcalde, C. F. Dodge, worked along side a group of men who organized to form a temporary town government, called the “council of seven,” which acted much like a board of supervisors. Dodge and the council needed funds to pay for the hospital’s expenses, so they surveyed land to sell lots. Because of Sonora’s distance from provisioning towns such as Stockton or Sacramento, they needed more money than “charitable individuals” were prepared to spend on sick strangers. They kept the hospital running for six months, purchasing lime juice at $5 per bottle and potatoes at $1.50 per lb. and paying servants $8 per day. Considering the average day laborer in the eastern states received $1 per day, labor costs were high. The Sonora leaders, however, raised money for services normally taken care of by female kin, not other men.\textsuperscript{40}

On the single man’s frontier men were unable to rely on women or community members during times of illness. This situation continued into the 1850s. After statehood, legislators approved funding for doctors and hospitals to care for the “indigent sick,” mostly miners who fell ill on arrival or while in the mines. Without families or


\textsuperscript{40} Shinn, Mining Camps, 207; Call and Call, The Diaries of Asa Cyrus Call; Rodman Wilson Paul, Mining Frontiers of the Far West, 1848-1880, rev ed. by Elliott West (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2001), 35.
family-based communities, single men depended on the state or charitable groups for their care. By 1850, the lack of fruits and vegetables in the mines had serious affects on miners’ bodies as well as their, and the state’s, pocketbooks. Too many miners were unable to pay doctors’ bills as can seen in the case of Sonora. Local officials instigated these impromptu acts of social welfare, but they were temporary solutions to the health problems in the mines. Eventually, men who tired of mining abandoned the streams to plant gardens, helping to fulfill the demand for fruits and vegetables. Before that happened, merchants seized the opportunity to “mine the miners” and imported canned and fresh food from eastern states, countries such as Chile or the Hawaiian Islands, and ranches in California.

Even though California’s borders encompassed millions of acres of arable land, the mines were located in the northern interior of the state, far from the established towns and centers of agriculture. Prior to the gold rush, Californios and non-Mexican landowners raised their own food, purchased goods from the traders, and obtained supplies from the mission gardens and fields. Before war and the news of gold, 8,000 to 10,000 non-Indians lived in Alta California. Californios lived on the most northern, western frontier of Mexico and adjusted to living in an isolated region. Before annexation, much of the economy focused around the hide and tallow trade within a barter-based economy. Ranchers traded hide and tallow with the merchants in town or

---

41 This topic will be discussed fully in chapter five. See “An Act to Provide for the Indigent Sick in the Counties of this State” and “Act concerning passengers arriving in the ports of the State of California” in The Statutes of California Passed at the Sixth Session of the Legislature (Sacramento: B. B. Redding, 1855).

42 Merchants imported canned fruit from Philadelphia, fresh oranges from Tahiti, and limes from Acapulco to meet the needs of miners. See Carpenter, The History of Scurvy and Vitamin C, 111; Conlin, Bacon, Beans, and Galantines, 17.
directly with ship captains who brought goods from the East Coast of the United States. Americans brought everything from wine to windows, items not made in Alta California.\textsuperscript{43}

Most of the Mexican population in Alta California, however, lived in the southern part of the frontier and along the coast. Mexican citizens were eligible to receive land grants from the government, and officials in Mexico City approved various grants to guarantee settlement on the distant frontier. Mission fathers planted their churches from north to south on the coast as well. After California became a state in 1850, Americans supplanted Californios in political, social, and civic functions in the north. From 1850 to 1870, 85 percent of the California population lived in the north, leaving a small percentage in the south where most of the occupants were Mexicans and Indians living in ranching communities. Ranchers in southern California attempted to profit from the large, northern markets by sending beef and agricultural products. Not all Californios, however, were able to take advantage of the growing northern markets. In San Diego County, historian Charles Hughes discerned that many San Diego ranchers needed to focus on providing food for local markets first because all of the imports went to the distant mining districts. Additionally, Californios faced many obstacles to maintaining possession of their lands after statehood. Overall, the Californios were too far away and

\textsuperscript{43} On the hide and tallow trade and Mexican culture prior to American annexation, see Dana, \textit{Two Years before the Mast}; Douglas Monroy, \textit{Thrown Among Strangers: the Making of Mexican Culture in Frontier California} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990); Alfred Robinson, \textit{Life in California during a Residence of Several Years in that Territory} (1846; reprint, Santa Barbara: Peregrine Smith, 1970); Doyce B. Nunis, Jr., ed, \textit{The California Diary of Faxon Dean Atherton} (San Francisco: California Historical Society, 1964); G. P. Hammond, \textit{Introduction to The Californian, Volume One: Facsimile Reproductions of Thirty-eight Numbers, a Prospectus, and Various Extras and Proclamations, Printed at Monterey Between August 15 1846 and May 6, 1847} (San Francisco: John Howell Books, 1971).
too beleaguered by the economic and political displacement to have a significant impact on the food supply problem in northern California.\footnote{Charles Hughes, “The Decline of the Californios: The Case of San Diego, 1846-1856,” \textit{Journal of San Diego History} 21 (Summer 1975), available online at http://www.sandiegohistory.org/journal/75summer/decline.htm, accessed 18 April 2006.}

Northern residents relied on shipments from outside the state and small supplies from ranches established before the gold rush. As a result, they paid high prices for food and supplies. Provisions were expensive at times, but as increasing numbers of merchants outside of California shipped goods, prices periodically fell. Merchants witnessed the events of the gold rush, and increasing numbers of single men, with hopes to profit from the peculiar situations. As a result, the number of ships arriving in San Francisco jumped from 47 in 1848 to more than 1,000 in between April and November of the next year. This meant that miners and residents in towns and cities faced a fluctuation of prices and access to goods. Either there were too few goods or too many to maintain a stable market, let alone diet. Getting goods to the mines required patience and strength since the gold laid in “them thare hills.”\footnote{Conlin, \textit{Bacon, Beans, and Galantines}, 96, 98; Irene D. Paden, \textit{The Wake of the Prairie Schooner} (New York: Editions for the Armed Service, 1943).}

Merchants, ranchers, and small farmers relied on teamsters to transport goods from towns and rural areas to the mines. Packers, teamsters, or haulers, as they were variously called, moved goods from cities and towns, often using the same routes miners traveled to get to the “diggings.” These men used teams of oxen or mules to pull wagons up treacherous mountain roads from towns and ferry stops below the mines. Small boats traveled up the rivers from San Francisco, Sacramento, and Stockton, carrying passengers, food, and durable goods. Haulers might have picked up goods in town or at
the ferry stops, but in either case, the teamster and his beasts of burden braved the trails into the mining districts.\textsuperscript{46}

Teamsters charged for their services, and freighting accounted for much of the expense of food in the mines. One Wisconsin miner described the work of the teams going into the mines in 1850 before wagon roads were built: “The sure footed & plodding mule is the main reliance of the trader for transportation. The trails followed ascend the steep & rocky side of the mountain in a zig-zag way often rounding a projecting cliff 1500 or 2000 feet above the river, which like a crouching serpent winds its way from side to side across the narrow valley.” Clearly taking pack animals and teams into the mountains was dangerous and explained the additional expenses added to the cost of food in the mines. As these men hauled food, their fees added 60 to 70 cents per pound prior to 1850.\textsuperscript{47} At many of the bars and gulches, traders pitched tents to use as makeshift stores for the goods transported on these animals’ backs.\textsuperscript{48}

When provisions reached the mines, traders often took over the work of selling goods. A number of disgruntled miners set up stores near mining camps to attract local business. James Warren, a Boston seed dealer, started mining in August 1849, but within

\textsuperscript{46} Edwin F. Bean, \textit{Bean’s History and Directory of Nevada County, California} (Nevada [City], Calif.: Daily Gazette Book and Job Office, 1867), 353; L. C. Branch, \textit{History of Stanislaus County, California} (San Francisco: Elliott & Moore, 1881), 80, 102;

\textsuperscript{47} Otis E. Young Jr., \textit{Western Mining: An Informal Account of Precious-Metals Prospecting, Placering, Lode Mining, and Milling on the American Frontier from Spanish Times to 1893} (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1970), 107; Alonzo Delano, \textit{Alonzo Delano’s California Correspondence} (Sacramento: Sacramento Book Collectors Club, 1952), 122; Conlin, \textit{Bacon, Beans, and Galantines}, 103. For comparison, freighting in 1861 added two cents per pound. Those freighting in 1849-1850 charged as much as the market allowed, knowing miners had few other choices. \textit{History of Nevada County, California} (Oakland: Thompson & West, 1880), 203-05; Branch, \textit{History of Stanislaus County}, 102.

six months, he reestablished himself as a trader. To attract customers, Warren posted advertisements for his “big tent on the hill” near Mormon Island. Since tents substituted for homes in the mines, it seemed logical to arrange a store in one. He traveled to town occasionally, most likely Sacramento, to obtain goods and miners’ mail. Moreover, large camps supported several traders.\textsuperscript{49} Sam Brannan, the infamous Mormon leader, had a trading post at Mormon Island as did several others. In conjunction with teamsters and local farmers, these traders supplied miners’ demands for food and other supplies, and men who tired of mining transitioned into becoming provisioners.\textsuperscript{50}

Trading posts also served social functions, much like general stores in small towns, which rural Americans in the mines recognized. On Sundays, men gathered at these stores to trade but also to pick up mail and socialize. The “Expressman” acquired mail in port cities and delivered it, on contract, to traders’ tents and rural post offices. Once a month, the Expressman took lists of subscribers who preferred to spend their days in the mines. Men were desperate for news from home and paid for this service.

Historian Andrew Rotter argues that miners acquired a “new consciousness of the practical and emotional roles women and families played in their lives.” Letters provided


\textsuperscript{50} On the American River (Sacramento County), Mormon Island was the first typical gold camp after Sutter’s Mill. There are several accounts of life in the camp. See for example Teggart, “The Gold Rush Extracts from the Diary of Chester Smith Lyman, 1848-49,” 181-20 and Erwin G. Gudde, ed., Chronicle of the West; the conquest of California, Discovery of Gold, and Mormon Settlement; as Reflected in Henry William Bigler’s Diaries (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962).

When the Expressmen arrived, miners dropped their picks and pans eager for their letters. Traders’ stores on the bars and in mining towns became the center of local commerce and community. They thus served as a centralizing force until normal town development ensued.\footnote{R. R. Taylor discontinued mining because of his health and worked in James Warren’s store. He described Mormon Island as place as “quiet & orderly as a New England village,” even in 1849. See John Walton Caughey, ed., Seeing the Elephant: Letters of R. R. Taylor, Forty-niner (N.p.: Ward Ritchie Press, 1951), 69.} As farmers produced crops, they transported fruit and vegetables to the nearest towns, bartered with traders, or sold his products to his gold digging neighbors directly. Later, as the Central Pacific Railroad Company planned its stops, some of the towns established during this period became permanent cities, while others died a natural death from want of transportation.\footnote{Conlin, Bacon, Beans, and Galantines 95; Alonzo Delano Alonzo Delano’s Pen-Knife Sketches, or Chips of the Old Block (San Francisco: Grabhorn Press, 1934). In the southern mines, goods were treated in a similar manner but started from Stockton.}

Despite the effort of merchants and residents to supply miners, the transportation problems continued to add costs and problems. A number of miners saw the opportunity, as the merchants and teamsters had, to make money by growing truck, dairy, and grains to supply the mining districts. As Jesse Smart, a farmer from Maine, said, “these places are crowded with hungry men.”\footnote{Jesse Smart to “son,” 12 May 1853, Correspondence of Jesse Smart, 1852-1866, Huntington Library.} Entrepreneurial agrarians started farming near the mines, and they benefited from their proximity to miners yet often needed the services of the teamsters. For that reason, Asa Call, the lizard-watching, miner-turned-farmer,
arranged for Mr. Maxwell to haul his produce to camps in numerous gullies and canyons. Call invested all of his money in seeds, vines, and cuttings with little to spare for transportation costs. Sharing the burden of the partnership, Maxwell contributed a team, a wagon, and yoke. This arrangement promised to make money for both, but Maxwell committed suicide when he lost all his money gambling. The $80 owed to Call worried him less than the loss of the team. Call lamented, Maxwell’s “failure has nearly ruined me.”

Other men began farming as well. G. C. Jackson farmed near the American River, and raised vegetables, potatoes, and various grasses to make hay. To make extra money, Jackson also cut wood and hauled it into Sacramento. Traveling to mining camps was difficult enough, yet even trips into major cities provided obstacles. When Sacramento flooded in 1852, he “hauled” his wood in a sailboat floating through town. Nonetheless, miners-turned-farmers had reduced the cost of food in the mines by the early 1850s. Men combined roles as farmer and hauler—or trader and hauler—when it suited their needs, creating new occupations for disgruntled miners. Regarding the availability of food, Alonzo Delano observed a marked improvement in Grass Valley (Nevada County) at the expense of the farmers: “Goods and provisions are abundant and cheap, affording but little profit. So many have rushed into trade that profits are cut down to little more than a living, and although mining is uncertain, yet at this moment it is, in my opinion, the surest business of the country.” Delano’s statement demonstrated how many men abandoned the mines. Others, however, soon followed to take their

---

55 Call and Call, The Diaries of Asa Cyrus Call, 44-45.
During the 1850s, trading and farming both became increasingly secure occupations because the number of men seeking gold grew during the decade. Between 1850 and 1852, the California population reached at least 200,000. There were, observers complained, too many miners relying on too little gold for support. In 1849, a miner might have made $16 per day or more. Miners depleted the placer deposits and more men arrived, reducing the average daily “wage.” Even without these figures, miners knew at the time that the easy days of the placers were over. In the meantime, these new arrivals needed to be fed.

Miners in California saw the end of the gold rush in the sense of the possibility of finding large deposits without significant investments. Simultaneously, men in far off lands continued to plan their trips to the golden mountains of the Far West, not understanding the realities of production. With this perspective, some miners in the state chose to start farming, instigating a “food rush” soon after the gold rush. In May 1850, the editor of the San Francisco Alta reported on the opportunities for farmers in the mining districts. He told his audience that people found “fine arable lands” close to the mines ready for “immediate profitable cultivation.” It was true, and miners-turned-farmers started producing fruits and vegetables for miners and securing incomes for

---

56 Jackson to Jackson, 27-29 November 1852, BANC MSS C-B 859; Delano to True Delta (New Orleans), 29 June 1851 in Delano, Alonzo Delano’s California Correspondence, 120-23.
57 Numerous miners observed declining fortunes and warned friends not to come, or, at least, not to expect great fortunes, see Jos. Richardson to Dudley Anderson, 17 August 1850, folder 6, box 1; Isaac Bullock to Martha Bullock, January 20 and 25 March 1851, T. L. Hereford to Solomon P. Sublette, 11 August, 1851, George E. Payne to H. S. Levinich, 30 August 1851, folder 3, box 1; [unknown] to Charles Kendall, 17 January 1854 and E. F. Munger to Mr. Kendall, 16 July 1854, folder 6, box 1; Oscar Maltman to Robert W. Allen, 31 May 1859, folder 11, box 1, California Letters, 1849-1885, Yale Collection of Western Americana, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; Rohrbough, Days of Gold, 187-90.
themselves.\textsuperscript{58}

Farmers near the mines cultivated crops to meet demand of local miners and raised crops according to the tastes of that market. Farmers planted vegetables such as potatoes, onions, beets, cabbage, and turnips, items easily boiled or thrown into a one-pot stew. In addition, they added beans, squash, peas, cucumbers, radishes, lettuce, parsnips, asparagus and carrots to many miners’ diets. Miners also appreciated most types of fruit. One farmer made a $25,000-return on his watermelons during the 1851-1852 season. Exceptional accounts of returns such as this one have found their way into local histories and reminisces, in which authors portrayed the deprivations and adventures of gold rush life. In letters and diaries, however, farmers recorded the diversity of foods grown near the mines. They planted a variety of trees, including peaches, pears, quinces, nectarines, plums, nectarines, and at least twenty varieties of apples. Most farmers were unable to sell tree fruits in the early 1850s, but farmers raised strawberries, blackberries, and grapes for immediate sale while waiting for their trees to mature. By 1860, California residents ate a diverse diet of fruits and vegetables in clear contrast to the first two years of the gold rush.\textsuperscript{59}

In order to make these foods available to miners and townspeople, farmers needed

\textsuperscript{58} Alta, 2 May 1850.
\textsuperscript{59} Without looking at the primary sources, it is difficult to see the extent of the diversity of domestic production. Agricultural historians relying on the census have been able to identify larger trends, such as the wheat boom and the later transition to fruit. But census takers in 1850 and 1860 were limited by the categories on the census forms. Additionally, by comparing the names of farmers in the mines with both the population and agricultural censuses for those years, I have found that the census takers missed a number of farms. Operators, such as Asa Call, went uncounted because they operated for a few years in between the decennial censuses. For the standard treatment of agriculture in California during these years, see Lawrence J. Jelinek, \textit{Harvest Empire: A History of California Agriculture}, 2nd ed. (San Francisco: Boyd & Fraser Publishing Co., 1982); Paul W. Gates, ed., \textit{California Ranchos and Farms, 1846-1862} (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1967); Gillis and Magliari, \textit{John Bidwell and California}; Osgood Hardy, “Agricultural Changes in California, 1860-1900,” \textit{Proceedings of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association} (1929): 216-30; Howard S. Reed, “Major Trends in California Agriculture,” \textit{Agricultural History} 20 (October 1946): 252-55.
to obtain seeds, land, and water to raise crops, which raised serious obstacles for those living in the mountain mineral districts. In the earliest years of the gold rush, farmers used creative methods to obtain seeds, tree slips, and vine cuttings. Prior to 1852, most men traveled to missions or ranches to purchase these fundamental items while a few men asked family members in eastern states to acquire common varieties of various crops on their behalves. John Callbreath wrote to his father in New York, requesting rutabaga seeds in October 1850. He informed the elder Callbreath of his plans in mineral California: “I am making a reckoning on a fine crop this winter and no seed can be had in California.” Farmers relied on networks of families at “home” to augment their efforts in the Far West.60

After 1852, however, farmers looking for seeds and cuttings purchased these items from dealers in Sacramento and San Francisco. As men gave up their dreams of golden nuggets for those of golden fields, entrepreneurs took advantage of this occupational switch. James Warren, for instance, moved his business from the tent at Mormon Island to a building in Sacramento where he sold agricultural implements and seeds to farmers. Initially, Warren believed California lacked agricultural potential. In August 1849, he described California as “barren & burnt up by the hot sun.” Warren abandoned his home in Massachusetts where August meant lush green grass, flourishing crops, and plenty of rain. Just three years later, Warren gave up provisioning miners for farmers because the latter had become a significant market.61

60 John C. Callbreath to “Parents,” 1 October 1850, John C. Callbreath Letters, 1849-1899, BANC FILM 2678, Bancroft Library.
For farmers examining the land with an eye trained in the eastern states, the land of gold gave forth wealth from the mountains, not the fields. The editor of the San Francisco Alta noted that Americans formed opinions about California’s fecundity without staying long enough to see the transformation that took place in winter. Forty-niners arrived in the mountains during hot summers and left before the rains started in November. California boosters lamented the situation because returning miners reported on California’s arid environment to prospective emigrants. How could an easterner expect winter to change a desert into a garden? Consequently, newspaper editors, the state’s first boosters, attempted to counteract these reports. A writer for the Sacramento Transcript said, “most things we meet with here are so diametrically opposite to all we have before seen and been accustomed to” that Americans like himself had to “step into the imaginative” to grasp it all. When miners stayed through the rainy season (usually November to March), they witnessed a metamorphosis as winter transformed the grasses from tan to green. More importantly, the fecundity of California soil became obvious to observers—farmers and city people alike.62

James Warren, the miner-turned-trader, joined boosters and promoted the state’s agricultural potential, often in an attempt to attract farmers to his store. Warren and other dealers contracted with implement companies and merchants on the East Coast to stock their stores with plows, reapers, and any essential equipment in addition to seeds. In conjunction with his implement business, Warren published the California Farmer, the first agricultural paper in the state, to advance agriculture. Farmers wrote to Warren asking for particular types of seeds and cuttings and then asked advice about planting,

maintaining, and harvesting these varieties in the new territory. In the end, farmers obtaining seeds from home or dealers introduced fruits and vegetables desired by American settlers and sojourners.63

California represented an unknown, curious landscape to Americans. They attempted to adapt their farming techniques to raise foods they missed from home. Women living in the mines, such as the apple-pie-baking Mrs. Phelps, made desserts and meals familiar to miners, often using imported ingredients. Mrs. Phelps made her pies with imported dried apples from the East Coast, and easterners and midwesterners moped about missing apple trees and fruit. Food represented more than just sustenance; it had become a key component of homesickness.

The number of apple trees in the state increased as farmers planted more and more acreage. David J. Staples gave up mining within months of arriving in California and established a large ranch in the southern mining district. He proceeded to plant various crops, and by 1859, he had more than 1,000 apple trees on his property.64 Other early arrivals, such as the Murphy family, planted familiar American fruit trees as well. In 1862, a visitor to Murphys, California, remembered seeing apple, peach, and pear trees, a familiar sight in an unfamiliar land.65 Apples captured the imagination of Americans in

63 Warren’s son, John Quincy Adams Warren, stayed in New England for several years to facilitate transactions between eastern merchants and his father in California. James Warren also petitioned senators and congressmen for seeds from the agricultural commissioner in the Patent Office. Gates, ed., California Ranchos and Farms, 1846-1862. Farmers sent samples of successful varieties grown in California to Warren’s office. He published information about these specimens, exhibited them for others to see in his shop, and published letters by farmers discussing obstacles to farming in California and various experiments to overcome them. Basically, Warren and his son were known as true “friends of agriculture.”

64 Hubert Howe Bancroft, “Life of Dr. John T. Strentzel,” 1890, transcript, BANC MSS C-D 778, Bancroft Library; Call and Call, The Diaries of Asa Cyrus Call; notice from the Republican (San Joaquin County) reprinted in the California Farmer 29 July 1859; Conlin, Bacon, Beans, and Galantines, 100.

65 Jane Gould, 30 September 1862, Journey from Mitchell Co., Iowa to California by Land, BANC MSS C-F 50 Pt.1:3 FILM, Bancroft Library. The wife of Pearson B. Reading also mentioned eating various types
California, and they reworked the environment to look more like the picture of the homes they remembered. As a result, by 1870, farmers planted more apple trees than any other type of tree.66

It took time for these methods to produce results because individuals and seed dealers depended on the existing transportation routes to get supplies from the East. One farmer pleaded with his children to experiment with various techniques for sending seeds, since earlier shipments arrived “dead.” He recommended they pack seeds in brown sugar, moss, or soil. Nonetheless, the difficult task of getting trees seemed to dog Smart. He told his son to “fetch trees” because they were “worth more here than a large drove of dying cattle from the plains.” Undoubtedly, the Smart boys found it difficult to imagine a wagon train crossing the plains dragging a load of trees, but their father guaranteed “hundreds of farmers will be glad to pay you for them in stock that is healthy.” Without these eastern sources, there were few other options for individuals seeking seeds and cuttings.67

In addition to these distant suppliers, early settlers sold items farmers needed, but for miner-farmers this required much expense and energy. Most of the early Spanish and Mexican settlers received land grants near the coast or in the south, far from the mines.

Asa Call determined to farm with or without his gambling partner Mr. Maxwell, and Call of fruit in Santa Clara while visiting with pre-gold rush settlers. See Diary of Mrs. P. B. Reading, 25 September 1856, Pearson B. Reading Collection, 1843-1868, CSL; Schmidt, Who Were the Murphys? California’s Irish First Family; H. S. Foote, Pen Pictures from the Garden of the World, or, Santa Clara County, California, Illustrated (Chicago: The Lewis Publishing Co., 1888), 38-56.

66 Immigration Association of California promoted the San Joaquin Valley to American farmers in a promotional tract. The author said: “The apple is one of the most common fruits among the valley farms” in an attempt to paint a picture of the Central Valley as a familiar looking location. Immigration Association of California, Resources of the Southern San Joaquin Valley, California (San Francisco: Immigration Association of California, 1885), 27. These trees were, most likely, planted in the 1850s and 1860s or from that stock.

67 Jesse Smart to “my dear son,” 31 October 1852, Correspondence of Jesse Smart, 1852-1866.
traveled from his garden on the Merced River to Sonoma, a Spanish mission settlement (1823) established prior to annexation by the U.S. To get there, he walked or rode a horse to the nearest town from which he embarked on a boat to take him up the San Joaquin River to Sacramento. From town, he then took boats and stagecoaches to get to the town of Sonoma. He purchased grape vines and peach, pear, and fig trees. As an uncommitted bachelor, he purchased a few rose bushes in order to have flowers to take with him on visits to the houses of respectable young ladies “who were half besides themselves in consequence.” In late May, the river rose from melting snow, and Call watched in anguish as his efforts of time and money washed down the mountain.68

Residents of the mining districts, such as Call, experienced especially wet winters between 1849 and 1854, which created problems for everyone. Wet winters meant heavy rain in warmer areas and heavy snow pack in the mountains, causing flooding in both winter and spring. Miners appreciated just enough water to wash their gold while farmers needed water to irrigate their fields. Too much water made roads impassable, strained dams, and washed away farms without any recourse.69 John Strentzel had also traveled long distances to get the materials for farming in the early 1850s. He bought onion seed for $20 per pound and fruit trees for his inland farm along the Merced River from a dealer at the coastal settlement of San Jose. As the rains came, his family escaped to the bedstead and the chickens to the trees, and all watched the rain fall as it deluged

68 Call and Call, The Diaries of Asa Cyrus Call, 53-55.
69 Harriet Frances Behrins described how she and the miners were cut off from provisions, especially food, by a swollen river. See Behrins, “Reminiscence of California in 1851,” in Let Them Speak for Themselves, 27-41. For a more analytical discussion of flooding in the mines, see Isenberg, Mining California, 27-28, 61-62, 68-69; and Raymond F. Dasmann, “Environmental Changes before and after the Gold Rush,” in A Golden State: Mining and Economic Development in Gold Rush California (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 105-22. Also for later confrontations between miners and farmers over water, see Robert L. Kelley, Gold vs. Grain: The Hydraulic Mining Controversy in California’s Sacramento Valley (Glendale, Calif.: A. H. Clark Co., 1959).
their crops with five to ten feet of water. Floods destroyed Strentzel’s gardens again as the winter overflow of melting snow invaded the boundaries of his garden. Soon after, the Strentzel family moved to Martinez for a “better climate.”

The Strentzels and other farmers eventually left the foothills and mountains to settle in agricultural counties, such as Contra Costa, Santa Clara, and Sonoma because farming near the mines involved too many risks. In fact, miners and farmers had varying approaches to water use and commitments to land. Vast numbers of single men searched for gold without any physical or emotional ties to the soil or its flora, while even speculative farmers committed time and money to plots of land for at least one season, usually more. Miners damned rivers, built flumes to move water, and denuded hills of plant matter at will. Water, soil, and the vegetation had value only as they helped these transients secure gold. In contrast, farmers in these areas bought land and squatted, investing money to promote growth within it. When miners relocated streams and destroyed watersheds, they affected farmers’ lands and profits. In addition, loggers also damaged the natural environment at the same time. Wood provided framing for city buildings and mining camps; merchants, saloon keepers, prostitutes, and others needed places in which to do business and live. The activities of miners and loggers contributed to floods down river during these wet years to the detriment of downstream residents.

Farmers understood the interconnected nature of the emerging agricultural economy and the boom and bust cycle of mining. Men abandoned claims in bad weather

---

70 Bancroft, “Life of Dr. John T. Strentzel.” John Strentzel became a well-known Contra Costa County resident. His daughter, Louisa Wanda, married John Muir, and the family house is now designated as a historic site in Martinez. His position as an early settler of Stanislaus County is noted in Branch, History of Stanislaus County, 206.

71 Isenberg, Mining California, 21-25, 60-69, 80.
and during “dull times” to gamble on better locations. Writing home, one farmer explained this relationship to his family: “We put up another house in winter diggings than dun well for a short time but the water dride up the miners dride up and we dride out of twenty five hundred dollars.” As farmers laid crops in mining areas, they expected to profit from a captive market, as this author noted, but also knew the risks of the unstable mining market. For that reason, Susanna Townsend described the cabbages she and her husband grew as “the objects of so many hopes and fears.” Because of dry weather, she commented, “the ground is too hard to plough and farmers are grumbling about the fine weather.” Farmers griped about the weather, miners leaving for recently discovered gold mines, and sagging profits. The agricultural population, even during the gold rush, became a somewhat permanent group and watched as their mobile markets marched away to new diggings.72

During the 1850s, fickle miners followed the news of gold deposits around the state, and they dramatically changed settlement patterns in mineral counties. In these counties, miners made up most of the population. As one observer noted, “large bodies of miners keep in perpetual motion from bar to gulch, and gulch to can[y]on, in pursuit of variety, or paying dirt.” In addition, merchants, service providers, and professionals lived in nearby towns to provide for the needs of miners. In the county seats, government clerks and officials gave locals access to government services. All of these people purchased goods from nearby traders and farmers. As the single men abandoned depleted areas for productive ones, the townspeople often followed, making it difficult.

for farmers to depend on mining markets.\(^{73}\)

During the 1850s, and well into the 1870s, officials moved the location of county seats to serve the population as it migrated. For example, Chico (1850), Hamilton (1850-1853), and Bidwell Bar (1850, 1853-1856) all served as the county seat for Butte County until the miners finally abandoned these areas after depleting gold deposits; officials then switched the county seat to the town of Oroville. This made sense to county officers and merchants, but for local farmers, such as the Brooks family, the move had devastating effects. The Brooks family farmed and raised dairy cows to provide milk to residents of Bidwell’s Bar. Unfortunately for them, there was no life in the town after the county seat moved. An observer of the transfer predicted that the coyotes “will soon play hide and seek, through the streets of this deserted village,” but in the meantime the Brooks lost their income and then their land. Thus miners created, disturbed, and recreated settlements as they sought out their personal fortunes. Residents and farmers chose to follow these miners or, instead, move to counties adjacent to cities such as San Francisco, Sacramento, and Stockton. For some, the single man’s frontier became too unpredictable.\(^{74}\)

---


\(^{74}\) Elisha Brooks, *A Pioneer Mother of California* (San Francisco: privately published, 1922), 40-42; Shaw, *Ramblings in California*, 125. In 1856, the town of Millerton became the county seat in order to provide for miners in various hotels. By 1870, the miners abandoned the Millerton area and several floods destroyed town property. By that time, Fresno’s agricultural population grew. A local said of Millerton: “People are not going to spend money in putting up substantial buildings in so unstable a place as the present county seat. …Everything is dead, on the rapid decline.” *Fresno Weekly Expositor*, 13 July 1870. The county seat moved to the agricultural area of Fresno City in 1874.
For farmers and miners alike, life remained erratic, and sometimes volatile, throughout the 1850s. Both groups of men experienced floods and droughts as well as bonanzas and “hard times.” Men who did well in the gold fields bought land in California or in the eastern states. Those who failed to make their “piles,” large or small, had few choices. Many men retreated after failing in the mines. Historian J. S. Holliday estimated 90,000 men went home on the Panama route alone between 1849 and 1852. When Jacob Stillman booked passage home in 1850, he shared the ship with 116 other “broken and disappointed miners.” Nevada County boosters said the “disgusted and the disappointed” emitted a “blue flame of oaths all the way by the Isthmus.” Stillman and his cursing cohort joined the successful miners returning to the comforts of home, which seemed especially nice after wading in icy streams, baking in 110-degree heat, and living among men and vermin. The joys of home contrasted with the mining frontier and included homes with solid walls and female relations to cook meals at the family hearth.

Many failed miners recognized, after one or more seasons in the California mountains, that the easy days of the placers were gone in most parts of the state by the early 1850s. Within days of arrival in September 1850, James and David Campbell accepted the odds were against them and left the Sierra Nevadas for the coastal farm of

---

75 California residents witnessed the exodus from the mines. Mary A. Black, resident of Charley’s Ranch near Marysville, said, “There is the greatest panic here for Iowa lands that I ever saw. Every Boy that has a few dollars to save is laying it out in Iowa lands.” During the 1850s, farmers, such as Asa Call, expanded operations in all parts of the state of Iowa. Black to “Cousin,” folder 10, box 18, SMCII, CSL; California Scrapbook 16, 1883-1891, Huntington Library.

their uncle. The forty-eighters and forty-niners reaped the greatest bounties, leaving hard to extract veins of gold below ground, while miners still scrambled above ground looking for smaller and fewer nuggets. This meant too many men searched for an elusive ideal—easy wealth. Even those men pursuing other trades failed to meet expectations.

E. Flitner, a carpenter from Maine, said “Business here is getting rather dull. You have no ideas of the number that have arrived by every steamer since I have been here and consequently labour must fall or rather wages.” He recommended his friends resist gold fever “if they can make a good living at home.” Gold rush narratives by participants and historians generally focus on the adventure and excitement of the earliest years in California. More often than not, however, miners did not reap riches as easily as they expected, and the failure to do so forced men to adjust their plans.

Disgruntled miners remaining in the state attempted to find alternatives to mining, especially positions relating to their previous training. Farming often became the most viable occupation in the limited, frontier economy. Moreover, miners-turned-farmers

77 Richard Street claimed in his book, Beasts of the Field, that “few gold seekers—no matter how bleak the prospects—would work on farms” and that “Having left the East largely to escape the drudgery of agricultural labor, they now avoided it like the plague” (118). While it was true that many American farmers envisioned the riches and glamour of gold mining, they found quickly that mining was often harder work than the “drudgery” of farming and that they could not make enough for the deprivations they faced, i.e., farm life was more comfortable in terms of food and lodging. The Campbells are excellent examples of this larger trend. They were more than willing to work on their uncle’s farm doing the hardest of the agricultural labor in exchange for the uncle’s help financially to start a farm and for the cooking of their aunt who had been “very kind this far.” Additionally, a quick survey of the birthplaces of farm laborers listed in the 1860 census demonstrates that young American men, and many northern European men, left the gold fields for boarding and wages on another farmer’s property. As the editor of Direct Your Letters to San Jose notes, the Campbell boys may not have made as much on the farm as they would have in the mines, but they earned twenty times the amount possible in Illinois. Since the family homestead in Illinois was in jeopardy, the boys worked hard to send money home (Jackson 148-51). They balanced their considerations on the health and comfort and possible wages in California and Illinois, not just mining vs. farming as Street declared. James Campbell to “Father and Mother,” 8 October 1850 reprinted in David W. Jackson, ed., Direct Your Letters to San Jose: The California Gold Rush Letters and Diary of James and David Lee Campbell, 1849-1852 (Kansas City, Mo.: The Orderly Pack Rat, 2000): 142-43; Richard Steven Street, Beasts of the Field: A Narrative History of California Farmworkers, 1769-1913 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), 118.

78 E. Flitner to “Dear Brother,” 14 September 1850, folder 6, box 16, SMCII, CSL.
expressed modest desires after they awoke from the gold-induced dreams. After gold fever broke, they determined to pay debts and avoid new ones. In the eastern states, men accumulated debts during economic downturns and viewed the gold rush as an opportunity to put their families on more secure footings. Jesse Smart, who ordered seeds from his family in Maine, started his trip to California at 54-years old. He sought wealth, and to do this, he left two sons, a daughter, his mother, and a mortgage on the farm. Smart’s removal to California had not just been a fanciful chase after great riches. Jesse Smart and his family hoped going to California would cure “hard times” in Maine, but this father found much of the same in California. After several misfortunes, he apologized to his children for staying in California so long. In a desperate moment, he told his children: “I cannot return destitute.”

Smart and other failed miners reluctantly admitted to their failures. Even though these men may have gotten swept up by the excitement of the gold rush, there were real problems at home they hoped to solve when they heard the news of gold in California. Historian Scott A. Sandage recently examined how Americans struggled with failure during the rise of the market economy and found that failure became a “national dilemma” during the years between the panics of 1819 and 1857. Failed men migrated

---

79 Jesse Smart to “Son,” 17 August 1855, Correspondence of Jesse Smart, 1852-1866, Huntington Library. The Ackley family emigrated from Missouri, hoping to return with enough money to farm independently at home. Mary E. Ackley, Crossing the Plains and Early Days in California: Memories of Girlhood Days in California’s Golden Age (San Francisco: n.p., 1928), 11.
80 The year 1819 marked the first nationwide economic crisis in the U.S., and recession returned after the panics of 1837 and 1857. Ironically, California gold fueled speculation and easy credit in the East during the 1850s, precipitating a bubble in real estate and western migration. Additionally, the loss of 30,000 pounds of gold in a ship wreck reduced investor confidence in 1857 and added to a number of complicated forces causing the panic. Kenneth M. Stampp, America in 1857: A Nation on the Brink (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 212-26; For the effect on individuals choices in the face of economic collapse, see Scott A. Sandage, Born Losers: A History of Failure in America (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005).
to various frontiers to avoid the stigma of debt and hoped to start over. The wife of one westering failure mentioned the life of a trader she met on the way to California: “If all men could make money as fast as he does they would not have to go to California.” Because of the gold rush, however, men looking west in the mid 1850s had hope, but often lost it soon after arrival.81

California became a beacon in the 1850s for failed men looking for luck and a respite from creditors. S. D. Warner joined Jesse Smart as a double failure and avoided writing home. He finally contacted his eastern creditor, admitting “I did not write because I felt disappointed and embarrassed to write since I cannot pay my debt.” This had to be particularly painful, since miners like Warner failed once in the East and again in the West.82 Even with enough funds to go home Smart and Warner chose to stay in California to make an income farming. Some men were just unwilling to go home without enough to pay their debts. Warner’s final fate is unknown, but Jesse Smart never made it back to Maine. In 1861, he died disappointed and broken in California. His family lost the homestead on the other side of the continent.83

Even men with moneyed families determined to reckon with failure instead of going home. Emory Townsend’s economic downturns forced his wife to seek work as a teacher in various towns near the mines. The Townsend couple lived among miners, making do on the income of both husband and wife. Finally, after six years of this, Susanna Townsend’s sister begged her to return and offered to pay for two tickets on the next steamer to Boston. As Emory’s doting wife, Susanna replied: “You are old enough

81 Mary C. Fish, diary, May-September 1860, BANC MSS C-F 140, Bancroft Library.
82 S. D. Warner to “Friend Thomas,” 8 June 1855, BANC MSS C-Y 228, Bancroft Library.
83 Amanda Smart Greenlaw to Williams A. Smart, 10 December 1860 and 21 July 1861, Correspondence of Jesse Smart, 1852-1866.
now to know something of practical life and need not that I should explain to you that a man cannot move from California to New England even if he has only himself and wife, without money.” Susanna reminded her family of wifely obligations, all of which were at the expense of her own comfort. The two lived as poor farmers because Emory avoided admitting his failure. Townsend, Warner, and Smart grappled with their impotence as providers and their inability to be men of good character, i.e., prosperous and debt-free.84

Latecomers to the gold rush reached California along side many other gold seekers; overall a surfeit of laborers searched for declining quantities of easily accessible placer gold. Between 1848 and 1852, the state population increased 2,500 percent. That meant a hard-working miner made $20 per day along with 5,000 others in the first year of the gold rush. By 1852, however, 100,000 men competed for mineral lands, making about $5 per day. Miners in California perceived the end of the gold rush long before the rest of the nation. After 1852, daily earnings continued to decline, and only a few in the late 1850s mined independently. Increasingly, corporations took over the work of individuals, and El Dorado disappeared before everyone’s eyes.85

Prior to 1852, men generally worked fluvial claims, a process known as placer mining. At first, a placer miner proceeded with little more than a pick or shovel to dislodge dirt and rocks in the mountain streams. He then sifted gold from sand with a pan, long tom, or rocker. Gold dust and nuggets flowed down streams as water eroded

84 Call and Call, The Diaries of Asa Cyrus Call; Susanna Townsend to “Shorty,” 23 January 1857, Susanna Roberts Townsend Correspondence. Susanna had several miscarriages and lived in town to teach while Emory farmed closer to the mines. She committed herself to helping her husband at great expense to her personal comfort.
85 Holliday, The World Rushed In, 350-92; Paul, Mining Frontiers of the Far West, 16, 35.
rock formations at higher elevations. Gold mixed with other materials as the river moved sediment down stream. As early as 1850, miners took their picks and shovels to the hills where they stripped underbrush and uprooted trees to access embedded materials within the mountains. In 1852, Anthony Chabot introduced a hose to do the same work, thus inventing “hydraulic” mining. Men joined partnerships to build dams and flumes for hydraulicking, but over time entrepreneurs with capital for equipment and wages employed miners. No longer fortune seekers, miners became wage laborers or looked for other types of work. Joseph Pownall, a placer miner, explained that it took both good luck and hard work to make an income panning for gold. As the placers dried up, miners ran out of good luck. Miners, employed by corporations, accepted the dangerous and difficult labor for a daily wage with no hope of good fortune smiling on them.86

There were good reasons, as the miners demonstrated, to give up their golden dreams. Men disliked the back breaking work, and they were discouraged by decreasing incomes. Some men also left the mines to establish farms because they wanted to start families or invite kin to make the trip. After one year in the mines, W. Stevens recorded in his journal his waning desire to sacrifice his health and happiness for a fortune. Instead, he yearned to have his “loved ones” with him. A few years, or even months, in the mines convinced men to give up “bachelor’s hall.” One miner-turned-farmer wrote to James Warren, then the editor of the California Farmer, looking for a wife. The correspondent, only known as “Christopher,” asked Warren to tell Betty Martin that he was a “young farmer not bad looking & fresh from one of the beautiful valleys of

86 R. G. Cleland, ed., “From Louisiana to Mariposa,” Pacific Historical Review 18 (February 1949): 24-32; Isenberg, Mining California, 25. Roxanna Foster describes a “tunnel” her husband bought into in the mid 1850s because the placers were worked out. He made $3,000 in 10 months, enough to buy a farm in Santa Clara. Lucy Ann Sexton, The Foster Family: California Pioneers (Santa Barbara: n.p., 1925), 196.
Pennsylvania.” He had tired of the search for gold, and now he wanted to “live for love.”

Living for love instead of the pursuit of gold meant that men needed to stop there peregrinations and bachelorhood. Few wives were as patient as Susanna Townsend or Harriet Behrins, who both lived in the mines with their husbands. Women complained about the shortage of female neighbors, poor quality and scarce food, or the volatile nature of life in the camps. While several camps had their pie making women, more than 90 percent of the California population was male in 1850. Women cooked and made do with pork, butter, and flour traveling around Cape Horn from the East Coast. Just as the passengers on these ships, food items experienced the travails of a long trip, making most of it unpalatable and sometimes inedible. As women arrived, they needed more in terms of food and supplies than the single miner roughing it in a tent or rude cabin. When Susanna Townsend joined her husband Emory, he purchased a window for the cabin, an unknown luxury in their camp. The window signified the needs of a woman and her work, since miners spent their days out of doors, and she worked inside cooking and sewing.

California men adapted readily to meet the needs of their wives. Husbands built houses, purchased dairy cows and poultry, and started gardens in order to have households based on a nuclear family. David J. Staples and his friends pooled money to

---

88 Americans also imported Chilean flour until 1852 or 1853. “Agriculture—Horticulture—Manufactures,” in History of San Joaquin County, California with Biographical Sketches (Los Angeles: Historic Record Company, 1923); Edward D. Melillo, Strangers on Familiar Soil: Chile and the Making of California, 1848-1930 (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 2006), 94-153.
89 Paden, The Wake of the Prairie Schooner, 501.
buy land on the Mokelumne River in the San Joaquin Valley. He became a farmer, the local postmaster, and a justice of the peace. His friends continued mining, but they married and used the Staples’ ranch as the center of their community. Mary Staples and the miners’ wives shared work, built schools, and socialized together as they might have in any rural setting in the nation. The “Staples’ Ranch” gave the Mokelumne River mining camps a permanent landmark for the formation of a rural community, one that local men and women appreciated as they traveled through the area or when they settled nearby.  

Almost as soon as miners created the single man’s frontier, women began recreating the places men had built. Travelling to California on ships or wagons, wives, daughters, and sisters took advantage of the transportation networks men created to get to the mines. These new camp residents inspired melancholy recollections, and reminiscing miners related stories about the “first” woman to arrive in their camps. J. D. Peters, for instance, said “I’ll never forget the time the first woman came into Columbia. The miners heard that she was coming and they all quit work and marched four miles down the road to meet her.” This poor woman stepped off the stagecoach, weary from crossing oceans, rivers, and hard packed ground to find dozens of dirty miners and a band of musicians to welcome her. Reports of a miner’s wife blessing a particular camp with her femininity make good nostalgia, but the fact is women arrived increasingly over the 1850s.

Mary Pratt Staples, “Reminisces,” ca. 1886, BANC MSS C-D 289:1; Wilson Elliott also described “society & privlegs” in California as much improved with “meetings every Sunday & preaching jeneraly twice at the schoolhouse” in the southern mining district. Wilson Elliott to “parents,” 28 June 1857, folder 6, box 958, Elliott Family Papers, 1854-1960, CSL.

Peters quoted in Branch, History of Stanislaus County, 101. For a similar report, see Carr, Pioneer Days in California, 216-17, 263. See engravings of mining life and women, including “Live Woman in the Mines” and “Miners’ Lamentations” reproduced in Rotter, “‘Matilda for Gods Sake Write,’” 135, 137.
Between 1849 and 1869, women disembarked from every steamer entering San Francisco ports. The Golden Gate, for example, docked in 1852 and brought seventy women and fifty children. In addition to sea-faring women, wives and daughters joined their husbands and fathers in the mines by coming west in wagon trains. Families reached the state, bringing their female kin with them and escorting other men’s wives and children. Illinois farmer Chester Warner crossed the plains three times, bringing cattle to establish a paying homestead during the first two, and then escorting his family to populate the homestead on his final trip. By 1857, women represented 50 percent of the emigrants in some wagon trains. Because women braved the sea and traversed the country, the male-female ratio decreased from 12.2:1 to 2.4:1 over the course of a decade. By 1860, the number of women had increased, a fact of which the average citizen approved.

Women travelers, on sea or land, experienced many of the same problems as the gold rushing men who came before them. The poor wife managed meals for herself and

---

92 Albert L. Hurtado, “Sex, Gender, Culture, and a Great Event,” 1-19; Glenda Riley, “Women on the Panama Trail to California, 1849-1869,” Pacific Historical Review 55 (November 1986): 533-43; James Parker, The San Francisco Directory for the Year 1852–53. Embracing a General Directory of Citizens; a Street Directory; a New and Complete Map of the City; and an Appendix of General Information, an Almanac, etc. (San Francisco: James M. Parker, 1852), 14. The increase of children in the mining districts can be seen in the case of Tulare County. There were very few or no Anglo children in the southern mining districts in 1849. By 1852, there were 18 and by 1863 that number had increased to 836. History of Tulare County (San Francisco: Wallace W. Elliott & Co., 1883), 198.

93 See the foreword to the collection of the Warner Family Diaries, 1864, BANC MSS C-F 50, part I:5, microfilm, Bancroft Library; Albert L. Hurtado, “His Own Will and Pleasure” in Intimate Frontiers: Sex, Gender, and Culture in Old California (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1999), 75-113; Joan M. Jensen and Gloria Ricci Lothrop, California Women: A History (San Francisco: Boyd & Fraser Publishing Co., 1987), 17. Women were so scarce in some mining towns that men expected the women to attend the dances and balls. A notice in one paper stated, ladies not attending “will please send word.” Clipping, undated [ca. 1849-1852], scrapbook, Ann Henry Papers, 1847-1882, BANC MSS C-B 636, Bancroft Library. See also Carr, Pioneer Days in California. Carr gives a list of pioneers in Trinity and Humboldt counties, from where and when they arrived and notes when their wives arrived. Most who arrived between 1848 and 1850 brought their wives out in the years 1852 and 1853. For a large wagon train bringing women and children, see George Crooks, “Account book and diary, 1848-1854,” CSL; Margaret Carleton Hussey, “The History of the Napoleon Byrne Family,” vol. 2, Byrne Family Papers, BANC MSS 71/37c, Bancroft Library.
her brood of children, all the while envisioning her family’s final destination and new lives. Without an adult partner, even simple seasickness emotionally defeated some female ship passengers. After one bout of nausea in the sultry weather of the Gulf Stream, Sarah Brooks recorded that she felt she should “make an effort to get up and dress or lie quiet and just die easy.”94 Men and families worried about women traveling to California unescorted, especially when considering women crossing the Panamanian Isthmus.

Even though the Panama route was the shortest temporally, a passenger took one ship to the isthmus, disembarked to cross the land separating the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, and then boarded a second ship to travel to San Francisco. In Panama, travelers crossed the isthmus in small boats or were literally carried by native Panamanians. Only a short railroad journey promised to ease the discomfort of the middle passage. William Hanford wrote to his sister in California and expected that family members were soon to be reunited. Hanford contemplated upon the proposed railroad; he said, when “this is completed the journey may be performed in less time & with much less fatigue than families formerly experienced.”95

Indeed, by 1855, under the title Panamanian Railway Company, Americans funded and built a railroad to make the transfer easier. Historian Glenda Riley argues that more women came to California because of this fact. Once in San Francisco, the

94 Quoted in Riley, “Women on the Panama Trail,” 540-541. See the rest of Riley’s article for the problems women faced on board ships, 531-48.
weary female traveler rested in the small town called “the city,” which included hotels and restaurants. Mary Ann Meredith even called on friends in 1859 who had moved to San Francisco earlier in the decade. She needed her rest since she faced days of difficult passage on a variety of smaller boats and stagecoaches. To get to the mining town of Downieville, Hester Ann Harland departed San Francisco on a boat steaming up the Sacramento River and then continued with a long ride on a stagecoach from the town of Marysville. Other inland towns and camps required even more fortitude to reach. No matter how motivated women were to join their husbands, their passages over land or sea enervated them. Women attempted to maintain their composure as well as their physical health under trying circumstances as they battled sea sickness, bumpy roads, and dust.96

On wagon trains, mothers, wives, and daughters spent months on the trail and worked as they trudged across the plains and over mountains. In trail camps, women worked as they did at “home” and reached California tired, dirty, and sunburned. Men and women sought out warm beds and fresh fruit and vegetables after months of crossing rough roads. A young Eliza McAuley noted in her diary: “We have been so long without fresh vegetables that we find that cold, boiled vegetables are a luxury, and Margaret and I devour all that are left between meals.”97 The McAuley family, as did so many others, relied on early California farmers to restock provisions and recover physically. As the wagon trains headed west and crawled over the Sierra Nevada Mountains, they found

96 Mary Ann Harris Meredith, Diary of Mary Ann Harris Meredith, pp. 21-24, 1925, typescript, CSL; Hester Ann Harland, Reminiscences (N.p., 1941), 19; Riley, “Women on the Panama Trail.” Americans started the railroad in 1850, and it cost $8 million. This demonstrates an early and significant commitment to ending the trials of the Panama crossing.
outposts established by residents prior to American annexation, including Fort Sutter, and gold rush farms such as Staples’ Ranch.  

Using knowledge they gained from maps, guide books, and word of mouth, travelers planned on stopping at one or more ranches. Landowners allowed families to camp on their properties and gave them produce in exchange for cash or conversation. Even as late as 1862, one rancher’s wife was so lonely that she traded vegetables for news from the Midwest. The farmer and his wife called on the camping Gould family two or three times a day to talk and read the newspapers that the Goulds brought with them. The McAuley and Gould women briefly witnessed how their California sisters lived on the predominately male frontier.

The transportation routes used by miners, traders, packers, and Expressmen gave physical expression to a more emotional and moral connection between mining camps and the world. Miners stayed morally accountable to family in eastern states through letters, and then “respectable” women poured into the camps after 1851. As historians Ray Allen Billington and Martin Ridge indicate, local, state, and federal officials facilitated the growth of the transportation links between California and the United States. At the peak of agitation for more federal funding, 75,000 Californians petitioned Congress in 1856, demanding an overland route for mail and news service because the sea route cost too much and took too long. Billington and Ridge point out that

---

98 By 1861, Bidwell had returned to agriculture and had thousands of producing fruit trees in addition to several nurseries on his property to supply farmers with cuttings as well as to provide travelers and residents with fruit. Wells and Chambers, History of Butte County, California, 206.

Americans worried about their compatriots living in isolated lands without ties to the “states.” Before too long the pressure to connect the new state resulted in the passage of the act authorizing the transcontinental railroad (1862). In the mean time, American women traveled to the mines using ships, wagons, and stagecoaches.\textsuperscript{100}

As women arrived in the mining districts, wives did more than bake apple pies for lonely miners. They needed to convert male living spaces into homes for female domestic production and reproduction. Without cook-stoves, miners’ and farmers wives’ used the fireplaces, Dutch ovens, and tools brought to these homes by their husbands. These women quickly took over the duties of male cooks. They raised poultry, helped with gardens, and milked cows in addition to mending clothes and sewing for the newly sex-integrated households. All of these activities increased the household income by saving money on groceries or cooked meals. If women had extra eggs or milk, they bartered with neighbors or sold products to local men. In California, the wives of miners and farmers lived in similar conditions, save the fact that the husbands of one group left the house to dig for gold and the other to plow for grain. Men profited from their wives’

\textsuperscript{100} Ray Allen Billington and Martin Ridge, Westward Expansion: A History of the American Frontier, 6th ed. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2001), 279-80. For the efforts of locals in California establishing early transportation routes, see Oscar Osburn Winther, “Stage-Coach Days in California: Reminiscences of H. C. Ward,” California History Society Quarterly 13 (September 1934): 255-261; L. R. Hafen, “Butterfield’s Overland Mail,” California History Society Quarterly 2 (October 1923): 211-22; An Illustrated History of San Joaquin County, 129. George R. Stewart described the overland stagecoaches shuttling passengers and mail between the Midwest, Utah, and California. Because Salt Lake City needed mail service, coaches connected the Midwest to the Far West before the completion of the transcontinental railroad. Passengers during the late 1850s-1860s traveled west on the mail route. Fares ranged from Sacramento to Omaha were $236 in 1867. Thus westering individuals might join a wagon train, book passage on a ship, or ride the stagecoach. George R. Stewart, “Travelers by ‘Overland’: Stagecoaching on the Central Route, 1859-1865,” American West 5 (July 1968): 4-12, 61.
relocations financially, physically, and emotionally as the women transformed cabins into homes.\textsuperscript{101}

In these California cabins, women made these rudimentary buildings into homes and workplaces. They brought children and created new family members soon after arrival. Years after the gold rush, miners romantically recalled the joy they felt as children populated the camps. They often missed children as much as they did women. One miner begged his mother to visit and said, “you may bring as many children as you please.” Single men cherished the sounds and sights of children as they remembered life with brothers and sisters, while fathers remonstrated themselves for leaving their babies behind. As a result, historian Elliott West found that miners pampered boys and girls, giving them trinkets, and left the diggings to greet new children in their camps.\textsuperscript{102}

Men who did bring women to California started families quickly, ending their personal shortages of female and youthful company. Women got pregnant soon after arrival and suffered to give birth without doctors or female kin to help them. Mary


Staples noted that since nurses were unavailable, she and the wife of a miner entered into a “reciprocity,” helping each other through their pregnancies. Emory Townsend paid a doctor to attend to his wife who had miscarried during previous pregnancies, and he and his wife strung calico from the ceiling to make rooms in the house. Emory and the doctor slept on the floor, while Susanna slept in her calico “room.” Clearly, women disliked giving birth and raising children far from their female family members, but they adapted the spaces men built to provide privacy and extended living areas by using any available materials. The Townsends even built a cloth lean-to and outhouse for their growing family.103

During the 1850s, the number of women increased steadily, but their dispersed settlement left some women feeling lonely and isolated. Women needed help with pregnancy and childbirth as well as companions with whom to socialize and share chores. Distant neighbors took the time to visit socially. Elizabeth Gunn entertained a rancher and his wife from a farm about ten miles away. The couple needed to escape their isolation and wandered toward the mining town in which the Gunn family lived.104

As a temporary substitute for close neighbors, women in remote areas wrote to the California Farmer in order to communicate with other rural women in the state.

“N.B.H.,” Fanny A. Canfield, and Lodissa Frizell regularly wrote letters for publication


104 Marston, Records of a California Family, 170.
in James Warren’s paper. These women, among others, directed letters to women in general and replied to specific letters published earlier. Frizell described her life in the mines—how she rued the loss of her circle of family and the destruction of nature by the gold miners. In this emotional and physical desolation, Frizell said she never had “thought of finding pleasure through the means of the pen and press, were it not that I have been so entirely cut off from almost every other source of enjoyment.” As a “friend of agriculture” and a facilitator of communication, James Warren, became a well-known figure in rural homes because the Farmer provided a connecting link between rural families. Wives of farmers and miners utilized the agricultural paper to form an imagined female network in rural California.  

It is clear that California women looked to the newspapers for more than just news. Moreover, local newspapers from “home” kept California settlers aware of far away events, including marriages and deaths, in case letters were lost or incomplete. A letter from home did not seem complete without a full report of the family’s health, local gossip, and economic news, some of which was gathered from the newspapers. Elvira Gnagi took the time to report in her diary when newspapers from Wisconsin arrived because they meant so much to the entire family. Newspapers and letters helped women far from home to maintain kin ties as they developed their own family frontier. 

---

105 Even miners and single male farmers subscribed to the California Farmer in order to connect to a wider rural community. H. Coleman in Nevada County told Warren he would be “lonesome” without the paper and begs Warren not to cut off his subscription even though Coleman fell behind in his payments. H. Coleman to James Warren, 10 March 1855, folder “C-Miscellany,” box 1, Papers of James Lloyd LaFayette Warren, 1805-1896, Bancroft Library. Readers also wrote to Warren describing the psychological effects of receiving the paper—reading about farms and farmers—and how they appreciated the companionship they found within the discussions between the men and women who wrote letters to each other.

106 Elvira Marsh Gnagi, diary, 1 January to 23 December 1884, BANC MSS C-F 55, microfilm, Bancroft Library. Lillian Schlissel, Byrd Gibbens, and Elizabeth Hampsten, Far From Home: Families of the...
The presence of women during the 1850s, irrevocably altered the single, male landscape. Women changed the demographic, fostered a family atmosphere, and assisted farming and mining men financially. During this decade, single male farmers and farm families manipulated the physical environment to perform for the needs of the incoming American immigrants. Single men and families had greater access to food because of these changes, but families also created rural communities to transform California into a family friendly region. Mary Staples reminisced about the families who joined her in San Joaquin County as did Susanna Townsend. When Townsend arrived in 1851 with her husband in Calaveras County, she was one of only a few women. Within a year, thirteen American families joined them on Jackson Creek.

In the case of this small mining camp, the settlement of families seems random, as men still sought out areas to dig for gold as independent miners. But during the 1850s, families also carved out spaces for rural communities juxtaposed with well-established towns where they farmed for the mining market. Stable populations of miners existed in towns near rich, underground veins operated by independent miners and corporate mining companies, while farming families occupied lands down river where placer mining ceased as a viable economy. These communities became in essence, the hinterlands of urban spaces in mineral California.

By using the agricultural and population censuses in conjunction with manuscript collections, directories, and newspapers, I have assembled two case studies of “butter and

---

Westward Journey (New York: Schocken Books, 1989). The authors note how westering families accepted and adapted to becoming “dis-assembled” families. Women, on many frontiers, had the charge of keeping family together. Since California was the last frontier, for many families, it makes sense that the women contributors to the California Farmer looked to each other, i.e., fellow immigrants, to construct an imagined community (231, 244).

107 Carr, Pioneer Days in California, 275-79.
barley” districts (rural communities near mining towns as described above). Between 1850 and 1860, families settled in Rough and Ready to raise goods for the mining towns of Grass Valley and Nevada City in Nevada County located in the northern mines.

Farmers in La Grange, Tuolumne County, formed a similar rural community to serve town residents near productive lodes in the southern mines. As agricultural populations emerged and farmed for the miners, this connection formed an urban/agricultural nexus similar to ones developing across the nation. Historian William Cronon demonstrated, in Nature’s Metropolis, how Chicago residents and farmers fostered reciprocal relationships based on commerce and food production. Similarly, the urban spaces of mining California attracted farmers, and the latter occupied abandoned land to farm and form communities.108

In the northern mines, residents of Grass Valley and Nevada City prospered from tapping the veins of gold in the area, and miners, provisioners, and county officials created a relatively stable population there. Historian Ralph Mann has identified the

veins located near these two towns as the most productive in the state. Originally a part of Yuba County, the population grew, persuading state legislators in April 1851 to create a new county. The new county of Nevada included both gold towns as well as Rough and Ready about seven miles southwest of Nevada City on the Yuba River. Initially, miners from Iowa, New York, and Wisconsin inhabited Rough and Ready, naming it after Zachary Taylor. They honored one of the leading generals of the Mexican War, under whom A. A. Thompson of Iowa served before settling this gold rush camp. In 1850, Thompson and his fellow placer miners panned for gold dust and nuggets eroded from the veins embedded in the hills near Grass Valley and Nevada City. They worked the placers out but were unable to access the smaller veins underneath the soil. The independent miners moved on to richer diggings, and mining companies chose to invest in the towns upriver where larger lodes waited for hydraulic operations to expose them.  

Miners-turned-farmers lived in Rough and Ready, and farm families joined them over the decade of the fifties. Ten single farmers took advantage of fecund soil while miners waded in nearby streams in 1850. By 1860, 44 single farmers maintained “bachelor’s hall” but lived among farm families. Both types of farming households produced goods for Nevada City and Grass Valley as well as smaller camps accessible by river boats or wagons. In addition, farm families boarded single men to assist with farm operations. Failed miners received the benefit of wages and homes, meaning warm beds and services of the farmwives including cooking and sewing. Locals built churches, schools, and frame houses as well as establishing an “air of permanency.” Additionally, men brought social institutions to replace the brothels and saloons, including the orders of

109 A. J. Doolittle, Township and County Map of the Central Part of California (Nevada City, Calif.: A. J. Doolittle, c. 1868); also see map of “Central California,” in Branch, History of Stanislaus County.
the Odd Fellows, Masons, and the Sons of Temperance. As a result, families headed by lawyers, blacksmiths, and miners joined the farm families and escaped the raucousness of the male frontier in town.110

Without personal histories, only the census takers give clues to pasts of the 75 farm families living in 1860 Rough and Ready. A majority of the families had lived on one or more American frontier, had three or more children, and arrived in California between 1851 and 1857. Paula Rouse, for example, gave birth to her youngest son in March 1857 on California soil, after having four children in Ohio in the 1840s and one daughter in Iowa in 1854. They, like many of their neighbors, used their experiences in the Midwest to produce market dairy for miners and subsistence crops for domestic use. William Rouse farmed 80 acres and kept 11 milch cows as well as other livestock, while his wife and children made butter and kept house. Rough and Ready farmers joined dairy producers in other counties to increase the amount of fresh milk, butter, and cheese available to Californians. They raised barley to feed their cows, and the census takers recorded their butter and barley (market productions) in contrast to the work of women (domestic use). In 1850, census takers found only a few ranch owners producing market dairy in two counties, valuing less than $1,000. In contrast, the Rough and Ready farmers produced 16,550 lbs. of butter in 1860. The Rouses and their neighbors made it

possible for miners, lawyers, and others to bring their wives and children to mining towns and live comfortably in these butter and barley districts.\textsuperscript{111}

The town of La Grange emerged out of the southern mines in a similar fashion. In 1850, legislators placed La Grange within the boundary of Tuolumne County, one of the twenty-seven original counties. Similarly to Nevada County, Tuolumne County miners-turned-farmers focused their attention on the laboring men in camps surrounding Sonora, Columbia, La Grange, Yankee Hill, and Jacksonville. On the Tuolumne River, 5,000 residents peopled Sonora by 1849, and small farm populations formed around it with an estimated 2,000 acres in cultivation by 1854. Joshua Holden had a profitable farm nearby until gold miners made claim to his fields, and a “memorable riot at Holden’s Garden” in February 1851 landed several parties in hot water. In mineral California, miners trumped farmers for land use.\textsuperscript{112}

The editor of the \textit{Union Democrat}, a local paper, reported on the activities of various farmers, including D. J. Staples, “Col. Smart” (a relative of down and out Jesse Smart), and an interesting pair of men known as Twist and Jimison. While the Holden farm exemplified the urgency of gold digging, the editor told his readers to go to Jacksonville just to walk the grounds of Smart’s garden. He said the “sight and fragrance of the beautiful flowers” killed any man’s “blues.” As single men pined for the company

\textsuperscript{111} See also local histories, such as Franklin Beard, \textit{Gold Fields to Grazing Fields} (La Grange, Calif.: Southern Mines Press, 1988). Elihu Burritt Beard mined for two years in El Dorado, Tuolumne, and Mariposa counties before farming and ranching near La Grange in 1852. He bought government land, preempted land, and land from locals selling out. By 1856, he met a Missouri girl at a local dance and married. The two supplied miners and teamsters on their way up into the mountains until 1871 when they, as many other farm families, abandoned the mining districts for the coastal, agricultural districts (134-36). For the overall shifts in California dairying, see Santos, “Dairying in California Through 1910,” 175-94.\textsuperscript{112} Shaw, \textit{Ramblings in California}, 116-17. For other “gardens” in the gold country, see Nathan Sweet, “Early Gardens,” folder “Agriculture (1),” box 1, June English Collection, Henry Madden Library, Special Collections California State University, Fresno [hereafter Henry Madden Library].
of courtship-aged girls or women they had married, they remembered the rural
landscapes in which they lived. Under the title “Avarice,” a broken miner wrote to the
California Farmer, lamenting his gold fever: “no walking out in the grape-vine bower
with two or three plump seventeen-year-old girls…one throwing grapes at your head.”
This miner wistfully reminisced about both the young women and the farms on which he
had courted them. Americans in California recognized the bucolic order of even the gold
rush farms as “marks of civilization” to demonstrate social progress and to relieve
homesickness.\(^ {113} \)

Beyond mere nostalgia, farmers in Tuolumne County prospered feeding the
miners of the area. One farmer had amassed 700 acres in La Grange by producing for
several mining districts in Tuolumne and Stanislaus Counties. His goods did not go far,
as they were sold nearby where he found “a ready market almost at his door.”\(^ {114} \) Enough
farmers took up plots in the area, that James Warren took out advertisements for his new
seed company in the Sonora Herald. Sonora had prosperous gold mines and the benefit
of being the county seat. Warren knew, therefore, farmers regularly came into town. The
mines in Sonora and Columbia continued to produce during the 1850s, while the
mineralized lands of La Grange attracted less attention. By 1860, 341 farmers lived in La
Grange. By 1860, La Grange farmers demanded the state section off the lower part of the
county because they tired of paying more taxes than the miners upstream. State

\(^{113}\) Union Democrat, 8 July, 19 August, 2 September, 9 September, 16 September, and 23 September 1854. See also reminiscence of Uriah Wood, reprinted Los Banos Enterprise, 16 July 1964; “Letter from a Miner” and “Avarice,” California Farmer, 4 July 1856; Americans recognized the chicken as a sign of civilization, i.e., settlement, see LoLo Westrich, “The Frontier Chicken,” The Californians (July/August 1985): 41.
legislators responded by carving Stanislaus out of Tuolumne County. La Grange resident and state legislator B. D. Horr petitioned for the split on that basis. A correspondent to the Mariposa Chronicle concurred, stating “a majority of the farmers are anxious to become part and parcel of the new county.” The letter writer claimed that being a part of mining county meant farmers were “burthened with taxes without any benefits.”

The relationship between La Grange and the mining towns upriver paralleled those between Rough and Ready and its urban mining markets. Some mining continued around La Grange, but generally more families moved to the area to establish rural communities. I. D. Morley, a La Grange farmer told readers of Warren’s agricultural newspaper about the mix of miners and farmers in the area. Morley saw no problem with it as long as there was “permanent settlement”: “We hope that good families will soon occupy the whole field soon. A revolution is going on, and society has improved very much in the last year.” Morley and other observers applauded the influx of families into the area during the mid-fifties. Eight farm families lived in Tuolumne County in 1850, and by 1860 that number increased to 163 in La Grange alone. Morley and his contemporaries praised families for bringing civilization and social development beyond what men had accomplished on their own. Women may not have been “gentle tamers” of

---

116 Miners & Business Men’s Directory, 3, 8, 74; California Farmer, 1 August 1856, and 25 July 1856; “Helen” to “Mary,” 20 March 1853, folder 5, box 17, SMCII, CSL; Mariposa Chronicle, 15 December 1854. Similarly to D. J. Staples, as a farmer rooted to the ground, Morley became a figure locals relied upon for stability. He became a justice of the peace. Morley also regularly reported on the status of the area to Warren for the paper. Branch, History of Stanislaus County, 115. Author Justus H. Rogers contrasted the “floating population” and the “birds of passage” with the permanent population, mostly farm families, settling Colusa County between 1854 and 1858. Rogers, Colusa County: Its History Traced from a State of Nature through the Early Period of Settlement and Development, to the Present Day (Orland, Calif.: n.p., 1891), 65-86.
the Wild West, but families brought the air of permanence and stability that residents appreciated around the mining districts.\textsuperscript{117}

California may have been one of the most urbanized places in the West, but as William Cronon pointed out, urbanization necessitated the existence of agricultural hinterlands, it did not negate them. Historians of the gold rush have painted a picture of gold rush California, in which grizzled men in tired clothing who slept in tents, ate over open fires, and battled rugged terrains. They deemed California as bawdy and rough-hewn—no place for a woman. Yet women journeyed to California and reconstructed the masculine landscape into social economic spaces they recognized with the whole-hearted support of the so-called adventurers.

Women did not “civilize” nor did they “tame” the Wild West made by men. The farmers’ and miners’ wives who brought children, tended gardens, and cooked beloved dishes did not fit any of the stereotypes assigned to western women. They were individuals, each peculiar in her own way, but their lives were determined by the necessity of unending, arduous chores of living in the mid-nineteenth century. These women, unlike the iconic prostitute or the social philanthropist, have become virtually invisible to historians because they left so few documents. They in conjunction with their husbands, brothers, and fathers worked to make California into a land of families and farmers.\textsuperscript{118}


\textsuperscript{118} For a review of the images of western women, see Joan M. Jensen and Darlis A. Miller, “The Gentle Tamers Revisited: New Approaches to the History of Women in the American West,” \textit{Pacific Historical
San Francisco and Sacramento bustled with activities because of the gold rush, yet much more transpired outside of the towns. Together women and farms represented the changes in California during the 1850s. Declining gold profits for individual men forced them to consider new occupations and permanent settlement. Asa Call took his farm proceeds to Iowa and established the town of Algona in the state’s northwestern frontier. While much of Iowa is relatively flat, Call left the California mountains for an uncharted place surrounded by rolling hills and trees. Moreover, some former miners decided to stay. Feminization of the male frontier gave lonely men hope that they might end the “wild” in their western lives without leaving the West. Royal Porter Putnam commented on newly arrived young women: “How fortunate that is for some of old Bachelors. We may yet get married if they keep arriving from Texas.” While writing of the “beautiful & very captivating creatures,” he said, “I must stop, consider & pause.” Putnam, along with other old bachelors, praised the changes made in California by families. It was families, they thought, that made a better California than the one occupied by men and their lonely vices.119

---

119 Putnam’s diary entry for 7 December 1859 in The Journal of Royal Porter Putnam (Porterville, Calif.: The Farm Tribune, 1961). Putnam mined, drove cattle, and searched endlessly for a non-mining occupation. He finally set up a store along an “emigrant road” and provisioned incoming families. The area around the store eventually became a town, called Porterville no less. Because Putnam finally settled down, he married and raised two sons before his death in 1889.
CHAPTER 2. MAKING A BETTER CALIFORNIA: BOOSTERS, SETTLERS, AND IMMIGRANTS

“I heard but Gold, Gold, and Crime,” wrote Oren Cadwell in 1857 from his windswept farm in Michigan. In this letter to James Warren, editor of the California Farmer, Cadwell explained how he was “wrongly informed (as the majority of our Northerners are)” about California’s environment, both social and physical. Cadwell married and set up his farm in 1854 in Tallmadge, Michigan, but wished he had known about California’s resources before doing so. He quickly tired of the “evil wind that blows no good” and the fever he ascribed to the farm’s location. All Cadwell wanted to do was raise fruit trees “to perfection with the labor of my hands with which I am willing to give.” From 2,000 miles away, Cadwell determined to sell his farm and move his young family to the Pacific Coast, making these decisions based on information about California’s soil and economic opportunities. The Michigan farmer and his wife started corresponding with Warren in the winter of 1856 after reading his paper and continued the relationship after they arrived in California and started their own fruit farm.120

Miners, traders, and farmers settled in California, and boosters wanted to encourage more families such as the Cadwells to join the earlier arrivals. Promoters—from newspaper editors to railroad companies—advertised the state to farm families in the eastern states and parts of Europe, crafting their propaganda materials to overcome the negative impression formed in the minds of Americans and Europeans about “El Dorado.” Successful and failed miners alike sent news home about the state, including crime, problems with land titles, and high prices. Seeing California through the eyes of

miners, the state lacked social stability as an untamed single man’s frontier, at least, to many Americans. Boosters and settlers entered into a dialogue about the obstacles to settling California and the future of its landscape. They often agreed, and, as a result, redefined the Promised Land as a “Land of Promise,” in which families, landowners, and government needed to work together to make a better California, which meant a more rural, agricultural California.\textsuperscript{121}

California boosters came in all forms, from men and women begging friends and family to immigrate to businessmen who counted settlers as possible contributors to the formers’ profits. Before the Central Pacific and Union Pacific railroad companies completed the transcontinental railroad in 1869, Californians believed the state lacked a good transportation network and suffered from its remoteness. In that year, officials drove a symbolic golden spike into the rails at Promontory Point, Utah, where the two sets of tracks met. This act physically and symbolically connected the Far West (emphasis on “far”) to the rest of the nation. Additionally, boosters continually complained about how the Mexican land grant system fostered a poor work ethic, and miners were too mobile and speculative to counteract the enervating influences of the Mexican system of ranching. Mining stimulated a number of changes, including the

\textsuperscript{121} These themes are implicit in the text of the literature, but also explicitly mentioned: California: The Land of Promise (San Francisco: California State Board of Trade, 1897-98); “Sonoma the Land of Promise,” in Sonoma County and Russian River Valley Illustrated (San Francisco: Bell & Heymans, n.d. [ca. 1888]), 45. In 1870, a traveler in California wrote: “Here...our people have found a heritage which rivals the land of promise.” George W. Pine, Beyond the West (Utica, N.Y.: T. J. Griffiths, 1870), 442; James L. Tyson, Diary of a Physician in California: Being the Results of Actual Experience Including Notes of the Journey by Land and Water, and Observations on the Climate, Soil, Resources of the Country (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1850). The words “Land of Promise” sit above the title on Tyson’s cover. Miner Benjamin Dore looked upon the Golden Gate, the entrance to the ports of San Francisco, and said “it looked pleasant and the boys were anxiously looking at the promised land which we have long bin looking for.” Five months later when he got to the mines, he said, “saw nothing to induce me to stop in mines at present” and continued to hire himself out as a carpenter. Eventually he settled down in Fresno among the fruit farms. Charles L. Camp, ed., “The Journal of Benjamin Dore,” California Historical Society Quarterly 2 (July 1923): 114, 138.
influx of a large population, but it was farmers, in the minds of boosters, who were capable of “settling” the place in terms of land use, social institutions, and permanent population.

Better transportation, especially in the form of a transcontinental railroad, promised to solve the state’s problems. In 1858, William Garrard addressed the state agricultural society at its annual fair. He reiterated a common sentiment: “California needs nothing but a population to place her among the first, if not the very first state of this Union.” A few industrious individuals exhibited goods worthy of the “highest admiration,” but California’s progress required a larger population, especially in the relatively undeveloped countryside. Thus all “must admit that the great desideratum of the age is a connection” to the United States by railroad. At least that is what Garrard and his like-minded neighbors believed.122

After 1869, the era of “great expectations” failed to materialize. Despite the hopes of Californians in the 1860s, eastern merchants flooded the west with goods, and consumers had no interest in the products of western farmers. During the 1870s, Californians struggled economically for two reasons. Connected to the nation by rail, residents felt the impact of the panic of 1873. Additionally, cheaper imported goods made it harder for local farmers to sell their goods in the state. Settlers and boosters whined about “hard times” and “dull times,” and a new breed of promoters joined the

122 William Garrard, “Opening Address,” Official Report of the California State Agricultural Society’s Fourth Annual Fair, Cattle Show and Industrial Exhibition, held at Stockton, September 29th to October 2d, 1857 (San Francisco: O’Meara & Painter, 1858), 102-05. Michigan farmer Oren N. Cadwell complained that working farmers could not afford to bring their families using the lines of transportation available in 1858: “We want competition! So let us have it. It will break down monopoly, and bring things to their proper level. Try it, and see how soon the shores of the Pacific would be peopled with the bone and sinew of the land.” Oren N. Cadwell to James Warren, 14 May 1858, folder “Cadwell, O.N.,” box 2; and see also P. C. Bradshaw to James Warren, 3 March 1858, folder “B-Miscellany,” box 1, Papers of James Lloyd LaFayette Warren, 1805-1896.
cause to advertise the state. The year 1869 marked the beginning of a concerted effort to attract new residents to the state.¹²³

Politicians, merchants, and landowners looked to farm families to solve the state’s problems. Boosters renewed their campaign focusing on making land available to “actual settlers” and providing information on soil, crops, and climate to farmers who judged the distant land based on multifarious sources, including the words of failed miners and wistful promoters. California businessmen formed immigration bureaus and employment agencies to attract “working” people. Moreover, the Southern Pacific Railroad Company executives added to the effort by hiring land agents to catalogue and advertise railroad lands for sale. Individual promoters and agents of more organized groups composed narratives about California’s virtues to convince farm families that settlement in California was possible and desirable. They addressed their materials directly to rural families, focusing on their concerns about California and the solutions to any perceived impediments to settlement.

This brief summary outlines the major trends of California promotional activities in the state prior to 1900, but the story diminishes the role of Californians as residents. Boosters were more than self-serving, profit mongers or greedy railroad executives looking to dupe farmers out of their savings for overpriced land. From the beginning Americans who settled in California as permanent residents envisioned a state where they

¹²³ In numerous county histories and reminiscences, Californians described the period after the railroad as the era of “great expectations.” See chapter 24, “Great Expectations,” in Jesse D. Mason, History of Santa Barbara County, California (Oakland, Calif.: Thompson & West, 1883), 158-70; Lloyd Tevis, California and the Pacific Coast (San Francisco: Southern Pacific Railway Co., 1881), 10; Richard J. Orsi, Selling the Golden State: A Study of Boosterism in Nineteenth-Century California (Ph.D Diss., University of Wisconsin, 1973), 381-83; William Cole, California: Its Scenery, Climate, Productions, and Inhabitants (New York: Irish-American Office, 1872). Visitors to the state even heard the ubiquitous phrase; William Cole told his New York readers that business had been “dull in San Francisco after the completion of the railroad, even though ‘great expectations’ were formed at the time it was being built” (41).
might make a living in small communities as they had in the last places they called “home.” These people personally invested their finances and families’ labor in the state and desired new immigrants as much as the promoters who devoted their financial resources. Before both of these groups started to advance the state as a proper home for families, the gold rush attracted a large number of men from around the world.

Oren Cadwell had heard about gold on his quiet Michigan farm, and so had thousands of men who eventually heeded that call. Gold certainly spurred a large influx of men. Because of that, author David Carle called Sam Brannan, the Latter-day Saint merchant of Mormon Island, the first state booster.124 By January 1848, numerous Americans had joined Californios in the former Mexican territory. Before the Mexican-American War (1846-1848) there might have been 8,000 to 10,000 non-Indians in Alta California, including Mexican born Californios and American farmers and merchants. The war brought several thousand soldiers and sailors, but the population remained low as there were few incentives for Americans to come to California in other capacities.125 Brannan cried, “Gold!” in the streets of San Francisco, and his announcements sent half of the city into the hills within days. Sailors, soldiers, clerks, and farmers headed for gold rich canyons, chasing dreams of wealth. By the end of 1848 Army and Navy commanders confirmed reports of the discovery, news which reached the ears of President James K. Polk and much of the nation. Neither Brannan nor the military

officers can be considered the state’s first true boosters. Most American gold rushers intended to extract the metal and go home, and the gold dust found in the streams benefited the eastern states more than it did California.\textsuperscript{126}

Argonauts came and went during the gold rush, but there were a number of men who viewed the mild climate as an opportunity to farm without “evil winds” or malarial fevers. As miners-turned-farmers grew crops, they began to understand the climate and its blessings in terms of their businesses and health. At first, the Mediterranean climate confounded farmers with dry summers and mild, wet winters. Americans, however, accepted the state’s peculiar climatic conditions over time. Simply, they were able to imagine California as more than wild and strange, and they made it home. Before Royal Putnam established his town of Porterville, he remarked on how the fine weather affected settlement in Tulare County. By June 1860, people established homes and farms because the California climate did “more to keep the people from their distant Home in the North than all her gold.” After almost two years in the state, he thought he might be one of those detained. He recorded in his diary the reason for staying: “During the winter my health was good.”\textsuperscript{127}

Despite the nice weather, California was just too remote for the average American farmer to consider the state as just another frontier. It was hemmed in by the Rocky and Sierra Nevada mountain ranges and the Pacific Ocean, and thus few made the trip prior to


the gold rush. Gold beckoned sojourners while the climate encouraged people to make long-term decisions about staying. Improved health and the mild climate tempted many farmers who were accustomed to waking up early to feed and water livestock on cold mornings in the eastern states. Everitt Judson, a New York native, called California “my Land of Canaan,” and told his wife he would return for a visit, but he never expected to “winter again in that Ice Burgh.” He spent years trying to convince his wife to immigrate to the land of warmth and sunshine, telling her in almost every letter that the weather felt like June in the East.

California winters probably seemed like spring or summer to most easterners and midwesterners. The California rainy season commenced sometime in October or November, bringing moisture to the soil and green to the hills over the following six months. Like eastern summers, California winters were wet and verdant. On a practical level this required farmers to adjust to new seasons for planting and harvest, a small price to pay for feeling healthy and comfortable. Some eastern and midwestern farmers enjoyed the prospect of working outdoors in a land so unlike their winter Ice Burghs, while others physically needed to escape humid summers.

Men in California found the dry summers to be a relief as compared to the humidity of many midwestern states—from Michigan to Missouri. When Oren Cadwell asked James Warren for accurate information about California, he wanted to know about the climate for reasons beyond fulfilling his dreams of raising fruit trees and flowers. He asked pointedly, “Is the Ague & Fever prevalent there or what diseases prevails [sic] mostly?” Farmers and their families in the humid states endured the chills and fevers—

128 Everitt Judson to Philuta Judson, 4 April 1854 and 17 July 1859, Judson-Fairbanks Papers, 1852-1887, Huntington Library.
sometimes known simply as the “shakes”—caused by malaria. Ague season ended with winter, only to replace the sufferer’s shakes with shivers. Historian Conevery Bolton Valenčius recently investigated settlers’ commitment to finding healthy locations in the states of Missouri and Arkansas during the early nineteenth century. She found that families planned migrations around finding salubrious landscapes as well as cheaper land. Settlers avoided low lying areas because they seemed unhealthier than other geographical locations. Despite their attempts, they still encountered the dreaded malaria-carrying anopheles mosquito and continued their search for healthful landscapes, including California. Land, physical well-being, and family combined; farmers needed all three to pursue agriculture and live happily.  

Individual comfort meant more to families than a modern reader can often imagine. In the nineteenth century, family members died from malaria, cholera, small

---

129 Observers noted in their letters and diaries numerous Missouri settlers in California, often referred to as Pikes, or Pike County residents. According to the census, 16,050 Missouri natives lived in California by 1870 (560,247 total population). This number is a bit misleading since farm families may have come from Missouri after living there for ten or more years. Take for example, the Wommack family. George, Adison, and Mary were born in Missouri, but their parents were born in Virginia. The mother, Martha, spent one-quarter of her life on their Missouri farm raising three of her five children. Californians identified the families from the last place they lived, and thus the Wommacks were considered Missouri emigrants. See Population Census, Rough and Ready Township, Nevada County, 1860. It may have been for that reason that the term “Pikes” often referred to natives of Missouri, Arkansas, Northern Texas, or southern Illinois. One author explained the pejorative nature of the term when he said that a Pike was an “Anglo Saxon relapsed into semi-barbarism.” Additionally, according to this author, the Pike spits, drinks whiskey, shakes from fevers, distrusts city people, venerates Andrew Jackson, and girdles trees because “he has an implacable dislike” of them. Quote cited in Gaye LeBaron, Santa Rosa, a Nineteenth Century Town (Santa Rosa, Calif.: Historia, Ltd., 1985), 17. Additionally, Santa Rosa became the home to so many Missourians (more than 1,300) that it was commonly called by contemporaries as the “state of Missouri” in Sonoma County. Gaye LeBaron estimates that 30 percent of the county seat’s population emigrated from the south, 10 percent of which came from Missouri (Le Baron 17). About San Joaquin County, one author said that “most of the settlers” from the early days emigrated from Missouri. History of San Joaquin County, California with Biographical Sketches (Los Angeles: Historic Record Company, 1923). For an example of a Missouri family coming to California to escape malaria and poor health, see Byrne Family Papers, BANC MSS 71/37c, Bancroft Library. See also Levi Butts’ letter about his desire to leave Missouri because the “colory has been very fatal here,” Levi Butts to Jackson Butts, September 18[50 or 52?], Biography Files, Society of California Pioneers, San Francisco. Conevery Bolton Valenčius, The Health of the Country: How American Settlers Understood Themselves and Their Land (New York: Basic Books, 2004), 1-36, 58-89.
pox, and other diseases. Furthermore, those who lived with chronic diseases, such as the “ague,” or debilitating injuries, worked less. Everyone in the household adjusted to the new patterns of work based on the current state of each household member. Boosters of middle states included information about salutary conditions in their promotional literature, and migrants based part of their decisions about relocations on such factors.

Issues of climate and health might have preoccupied emigrating farmers, but early California boosters spent little time convincing easterners of spring-like winter days and cool, dry nights. There were only a few organized boosters in the state during the 1850s and early 1860s, and newspaper editors took on much of the advertising burden. In a few cases, correspondents and editors related information about the weather in terms of health. For instance, a correspondent for the Alta toured Sonoma, and predicted in January 1850 that invalids would eventually flock to Sonoma for cures because of the “salubrity of the climate” and its natural hot springs. But before settlers considered the health of the country, it had to be clear, first and foremost, that agriculture was profitable in the land of gold and crime.130

In the 1850s, boosters often used the vehicle of newspapers to give evidence of California’s fecundity. While miners sent news home of murders and mayhem, dry soil, and brown hills, the editors of various papers, including the Bulletin, Alta, and California Farmer, promoted the profitability of agriculture in the state. News about California’s wild frontier emanated quickly into other states, but its quality soil attracted little notice.131 As Ernest Seyd demonstrated, reports of danger, immorality, and loafing even

---

130 Alta, 4 January 1850.
131 For references to California made by visitors unimpressed with California’s climate and agricultural possibilities, see Tyson, Diary of a Physician in California, 79; Theodore T. Johnson, California and
reached England by 1858. Sounding much like American boosters, this Englishman described California as a place of “peace and prosperity” based on farming, where residents restrained and punished the “profligate and idle.” California boosters had good reasons to worry about disgruntled miners relaying false impressions to rural people in the “States” and in Europe. This led one editor to ask, “what is necessary to place these resources in a proper light before the great public?” He answered his own question, of course, recommending a geological survey. Until scientists determined the quality of California soil, however, good old fashioned editorializing had to suffice.132

In an effort to counteract the reports of debauchery and villainy in gold country, Californians demonstrated their interest in and commitment to agricultural improvement as they had in Massachusetts, New York, or Ohio. Agricultural societies, fairs, and farm journals all testified to the development of serious agriculture in the state. In October 1853, James Warren memorialized Congress for its “fostering care” of California’s agriculture because with help it might be “destined of God…to be the source of supply when other portions of our beloved country may be in want.” He, as other residents, saw the imminent decline of the placers and prepared to shift the state economy to raising victuals instead of extracting minerals. To do this, Warren founded his paper, exhibited local products grown by California farmers, and helped establish the California State Agricultural Society, all prior to 1855. The Boston nurseryman wanted to encourage

---


Ernest Seyd, California and its Resources: A Work for the Merchant, the Capitalist, and the Emigrant (London: Truebner & Co., 1858), 1-12, 114-47; Alta, 16 September 1850. For examples of news of California agriculture reaching the Midwest, see “Animals [livestock] in California,” and “Oranges in California,” Prairie Farmer (Ill.), March 1851 and 29 July 1858.
miners to take up farming and imported the institutions of the eastern states to generate information about soil and crops for their use well before the end of the gold rush.133

James Warren instigated these acts, however, with the assistance of numerous farmers. He filled his papers with testimonies to local conditions, and farmers sent samples of wheat, fruit, flowers, and even local soils to put on display in his office or at the annual exhibitions.134 These samples represented more than the boasts of local farmers about their abilities. G. C. Holman forwarded native chalk from the Mokelumne River to Warren as an interesting geological sample and to help advance knowledge about local conditions, what he called the, “artz,” referring to the “arts and sciences” in general.135 As Americans journeyed into new lands, agricultural society members collected and distributed data to help farmers. James Warren carried much of this burden in the early 1850s by starting his paper.136

---

133 Memorial reprinted in first issue of the California Farmer, 5 January 1854.
134 California Farmer, 8 and 18 October 1858; Walton E. Bean, “James Warren and the Beginnings of Agricultural Institutions in California,” Pacific Historical Review 13 (December 1944): 361-75. Also see references throughout the James Warren collection and the California Farmer. The annual exhibitions started by Warren eventually evolved into the state fair.
By the mid-fifties, farmers, boosters, and agricultural society members also advertised the state’s ability to feed itself as a sign of agricultural progress. A Sacramento reporter told readers that farmers in 1854 produced a vegetable crop large enough to feed 300,000 and enough grain for the state and more. He said, “These big facts are most incontestable proof of the fertility of our soil.” He continued to warn that California farmers succeeded only when they considered appropriate tillage. Thus, agricultural societies and journals were “indispensable.” Californians liked the idea of creating an agriculturally self-sufficient state. About a month after this article, Franklin A. Buck told his sister in Maine: “You little thought in the States I suppose that in five years this mountainous, dried up Golden State would raise her Potatoes & Flour & have it to export.” Farmers participated actively in demonstrating the suitability of California for traditional agriculture, while newspaper editors put their efforts in print for locals and interested parties outside of the state to read. They did this because they knew negative reports about California reached eastern states, and they wanted to prove these stories as misrepresentations of California’s resources.137

Travel guide writers also promoted California prior to 1869 to farm families. Starting in the 1840s, authors converted early reports and diaries into rudimentary travel guides for migrating Americans interested in the Far West. Mary Jones remembered the winter of 1845-1846 when the “neighbors got hold of Fremont’s History of California and Oregon.” By spring, her husband and neighbors readied themselves to leave their

---

137 Article in Sacramento State Journal, reprinted in California Farmer, 14 September 1854; Franklin A. Buck to Mary Sewall Bradley, 10 October 1854, box 2, Papers of Franklin Augustus Buck, 1846-1966, Huntington Library.
homes in Clinton, Missouri. Historian David Wrobel estimates that millions of books, pamphlets, and maps of various western destinations circulated during the nineteenth century and that it was common to see these in peoples’ homes. Americans, such as the Jones family, weighed their choices, and then often used the promotional literature to direct them to their new homes. After news of the gold rush, travel writers followed suit and repackaged their guides for gold-seeking men looking for directions to the mines.\textsuperscript{138}

Westward bound miners captured the attention of travel guide writers for only a short period. Once again, the needs of families going west prior to the building of the transcontinental railroad, inspired the authors of guide books to consider writing for farmers and their families. Edward H. Hall published his \textit{The Great West: Travellers’, Miners’, and Emigrants’ Guide and Hand-Book} in 1865. Hall described the state and the counties of California, listing types of crops grown in California, adapted techniques, and equipment used. He determined that agriculture was “well worthy of careful study” because of the state’s climate, and he claimed his publication prepared his readers for their new western lives. Historians dispute the overall value of the guides because most of the guidebooks in the 1840s, 1850s, and 1860s proved useless to travelers. Westering people found barren fields where travel writers promised feed for livestock and got lost

taking reported “cut-offs.” Nonetheless, guidebooks inspired, if not assisted, immigration and promoted the settlement of sparsely populated areas.139

Journalists and travel guide writers constructed the public narratives of immigration, but settlers added their perspectives as well. Immigrant families stayed in contact with former neighbors through letters. California immigrants sent accounts of their new communities, in which they attested to the capabilities of the soil and the fitness of the state to become a destination for other families. Settlement, as such, amounted to its own form of boosterism. “Roving Jack” reported regularly to California Farmer readers about the changes that occurred in the Merced Valley during the 1850s. He reminded the paper’s readers that “coarse and fine gold gulches” of the southern mining district attracted a “floating population” of men in 1849, but after just five years, families replaced bachelors’ tents with houses and schools. Because of the family-oriented institutions, “improvement appeared written in legible characters upon the face of nature.”140 As Jack and others roved about the state, they read between the lines of the stories told by the physical and cultural landscapes—well-ordered crops, houses, chicken coops, and fences. These visual clues told settlers about California’s transformation, and correspondents believed they only acted as the messengers of the good news.141

140 California Farmer, 14 September 1854.
141 Miners made recommendations to family members as did farmers. For examples of both see, T. L. Hereford to Solomon P. Sublette, 11 August 1851, folder 3 and Oscar Maltman to Robert W. Allen, 31 May 1859, folder 11, box 1, California Letters, 1849-1885, Yale Collection of Western Americana, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; Joseph Aram to Daniel H. Wright, 9 March 1849, Aram Family Papers, 1835-1912, Huntington Library; Wilson Elliott told his parents that there were more schools and religious meetings in the valleys of the southern mines because “the population in the mountains is a roving population while in the valleys they jeneraly settled down to stay a while at any rate & so they go in for good schools & good meetings.” Wilson Elliott to “parents,” 28 June 1857, folder 6, box 961, Elliott Family Papers, 1854-1960, CSL.
Newspaper editors printed regular editions of their sheets, and politicians made grand speeches, both qualifying California as sufficiently “agricultural.” Moreover, Californians proved to other farmers that the soil yielded to the labors of men, and their products promoted the state as much as any literature printed for the purpose. Benjamin Landis of Yuba County raised melons with his family near the mines and related his work to the future of the state. He allied himself with the overall cause as he was “deeply interested in the agricultural interest of the state,” and he professed, “I feel that her interests are mine and mine hers.”\textsuperscript{142} Farmers became boosters for good reasons. Prospective immigrants to California increased state prosperity, and newly arrived farm families promised to be good neighbors, friends, and community members. James Burney informed \textit{California Farmer} readers of his agricultural experiments because he was gratified to “benefit my brother farmers and the country generally.” Early settlers appreciated the economic and social benefits of incoming families just as businessmen and landowners did.\textsuperscript{143}

More than the efforts of practiced boosters, families appreciated solid information from individuals they trusted. When William Garrard addressed the 1857 fair, he reminded the female attendees to cultivate a “home sentiment” because it “is you, more than any other portion of society, that have the power, by corresponding with your friends in the east, to bring to the Pacific that class of population that ties us to the soil and renders home endearing.” Garrard’s “you are the future” theme sounded more like a high school graduation speech than one for an agricultural fair, but the association’s officials

\textsuperscript{143} James Burney to James Warren, 28 March 1856, folder “Burney, James,” box 1, Papers of James Lloyd LaFayette Warren, 1805-1896.
labored to make California into an agrarian landscape in the midst of an outbreak of gold fever. Moreover, Garrard and the society members recognized that families in the 1850s wanted dependable information in order to consider moving to such a remote state.\textsuperscript{144}

California’s greatest early boosters, ironically, may have been the miners who returned home to “fetch” wives and children before settling in California. Unlike repatriated miners who retreated from the mines with empty pockets, husbands assured the safety and civility of California to wives before escorting them to their new homes. When miner-turned-farmer David J. Staples went home to Massachusetts to get his wife, the wives of several miners joined the Staples clan on the Panamanian route to California. Failed miners might have griped about their disappointments in the California mountains, but Staples’s New England neighbors saw first hand the commitment of a sober community member to the young state. Similarly, Abraham Clark crossed the plains in 1852 to the mines and finally traveled back to Michigan in 1856 to get his wife and several families. He wrote, “I have & are doing as much as any small emigrating society can do with my family.” Clark brought three families on his trip, two followed later, and he expected several more in the fall. He claimed these people trusted his word because he sold his land at a loss to get back to California.\textsuperscript{145}

\textsuperscript{144} William Garrard, “Opening Address,” Official Report of the California State Agricultural Society’s Fourth Annual Fair, 102-05; See also Official Report of the California State Agricultural Society’s Third Annual Fair, Cattle Show, and Industrial Exhibition, Held at San Jose, October 7th to 10th, 1856 (San Francisco: California Farmer Office, 1856), 23-24; David Goodman, Gold Seeking; Victoria and California in the 1850s (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), 441; Edmund Elliott to Wilson Elliott, 10 May 1857, folder 9, box 956, Elliott Family Papers, 1854-1960. Wilson had gone to California for the gold rush and wanted his father to join him. Like other prospective immigrants, Edmund sent his son a list of questions, including “Do people move into Cal with their families more frequently now than when you first went there?”

\textsuperscript{145} Staples, “Reminiscences”; Abraham Clark to James Warren, 6 August 1855 and July 1856, folder “Clark, Abraham,” box 2, Papers of James Lloyd LaFayette Warren, 1805-1896; settlers acted individually and corporately to promote California. In 1859, as a part of the visiting committee, he traveled around the state
Enthusiastic settlers presented different pictures of California to Americans east of the Rocky Mountains than those drawn by failed miners. Without prepared booster literature, Californians sent newspapers to provide prospective immigrants with needed information about various regions. California Farmer subscribers ordered copies to be sent east, and newspapers accompanied letters as well. Everitt Judson, for example, sent local papers to his wife to convince her of the settled nature of California. He begged her to leave Chenango County, New York, and continually claimed easterners misconstrued California. While mining in Placerville, he told her: “I am aware that the people of the States look upon the mining inhabitants of Cal as being a wild rough and lived set of beings.” He tried to reassure her that men, women, and children inhabited the mineral districts, and testified, “I have never yet heard of a female being insulted by a miner and it is shure that the miners would not allow it.” By 1860, he boarded with a family in Visalia in Tulare County in order to farm for miners at the newly discovered Kern River diggings. Judson described Visalia to his wife in letters but sent the newspapers to corroborate his words.  

Westering men, including Staples, Clark, and Judson, withstood long trips over sea and land as a part of the resettlement process, and some women were willing to follow husbands and fathers despite having to undertake arduous journeys to do so.

---


California remained physically isolated from the nation, and residents started agitating for a transcontinental railroad well before Congress passed the Pacific Railway Act in 1862. Just three years after statehood, and five years after the beginning of the gold rush, Californians in San Francisco met to discuss building a railroad to connect California to the east, but the railroad convention participants of 1853 disagreed about how to proceed. While the convention accomplished little in terms of plans for a transcontinental railroad, local railroad companies built railways to replace wagon and steamboat lines, facilitating intrastate transportation. Local boosters, politicians, and residents worked together to make transportation more convenient within the state and continued to rely on the Pacific ports to connect them to the rest of the nation.  

In the meantime, Theodore Judah remained undeterred about the transcontinental railroad and continued to pursue his dream of seeing the country tied together by rails. From 1856 to 1860, the engineer, called “Crazy Judah,” searched for passable routes over the Sierra Nevadas and the funds to build the railroad. In 1860, after he decided upon a particular route, Judah formed the Central Pacific Railroad Company yet still failed to find suitable financial support for his project. Eventually, he convinced four men—Collis P. Huntington, Mark Hopkins, Charles Crocker, and Leland Stanford—to invest enough money in the Central Pacific to incorporate it. Judah’s new business partners, known collectively as the “Big Four,” had the financial and political connections to position the Central Pacific to receive the contract for the western section of the transcontinental railroad. In September 1861, Leland Stanford won the election to be the state’s first

Republican governor, and the Big Four sent Judah and Huntington to lobby for the Central Pacific in Washington D.C.

With the assistance of Republican allies, Judah and his influential partners achieved their goals, and in 1862 the Pacific Railway Act empowered the Central Pacific to lay track from California into Utah. Unwilling to lose any of the lucrative government subsidies, the board of directors made arrangements to break ground in late 1862. News of the railroad trickled into hundreds of California communities, and people made plans, knowing that California would no longer be the most remote state in the Union. From 1862 to 1869, local boosters rested their hopes for the future on the new railroad. A farmer starting in New York or a vacationing Bostonian could then make the trip in seven to ten days, spending less money on passage to the Far West and traveling in more comfort. It was an era of “great expectations.”

With high hopes, land owners surveyed tracts and started laying out new towns. These men waited for the railroad to bring residents who needed places to live and shop. The gold rush had brought thousands of men, and now Californians expected families to settle farms in deserted areas. Town designers envisioned blocks of businesses, churches, and offices to service these farm families. During the gold rush, surveyors had captured similar visions on plat maps. John Callbreath wrote about growing towns in 1850:

“When I say it astonishing how they grow I mean on a large piece of beautiful drawing paper you will see a city as large as Boston marked out with her publick squares and

\[148\] As William Deverell pointed out, there was opposition to the railroad, but generally after it was built. Prior to 1869, Americans, in California or elsewhere, conflated the expansion of transportation facilities with progress, and there were few who doubted the transcontinental road should be built. William Deverell, Railroad Crossing: Californians and the Railroad, 1850-1910 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 9-19; Orsi, Sunset Limited, 7-9.
fountains but when you go to look for it you will find perhaps one tent.” Civic planners rued the peregrinations of miners, but now it seemed certain that settlers were actually on their way to California. As a result, civic leaders again planned communities on beautiful drawing paper.  

Landowners subdivided land to make money, and civic leaders banked on growth due to the railroad. The speculation in lands during the period of great expectations spurred individuals to buy and sell land, but it also encouraged significant investment by organized businessmen. For example, in Vallejo (Solano County), locals took a two pronged approach to spur immigration to the area. In 1865, the California Pacific Railroad Company incorporated and began construction on a railroad, guaranteeing incoming settlers could reach the rich farmland of Solano County located south of the transcontinental railroad’s terminus in Sacramento. Then in 1867, the officers of the Union Homestead Association purchased a sizeable acreage to subdivide and sell. Originally, the land had belonged to Juan Felipe Peña and Manuel Cabeza Vaca, granted to them by the Mexican governor in 1845, Pío Pico. Peña and Vaca sold various tracts to Americans after the gold rush, which became the basis for several towns in Solano County. By 1867, J. B. Frisbie acquired clear title to the land in Vallejo Township before selling 210 acres to the small group of investors. In much of the state, residents speculated in lands to reap the rewards of the railroad, worrying more about taking advantage of the next boom and thinking little of formal boosterism.

In contrast to speculators such as those in Solano County, promoters failed to organize effectively during the 1850s and 1860s. A few groups of men formed fleeting associations to advertise the state, but none lasted long. The members of the Pacific Immigrant Aid Association and the California Immigration Society attempted to sustain American interest in California while they existed. Joshua Butts, writing from New York, attempted to contact one of these societies in order to establish an emigration network. He proposed a relationship between the California, New York, European Steamship Company and any operating California society to funnel the “right kind of population” into California. Butts and James Warren traded more than thirty-seven long letters in an effort to create a viable plan. The Butts-Warren emigration society and other early immigration endeavors tended to peter out due to want of funds. Capitalists and speculators invested in land and town building as long term investments while boosters, without significant financial backing, focused on attracting new settlers immediately.\footnote{Orsi, \textit{Selling the Golden State}, 381-82; Joshua Butts to James Warren, 19 March 1858, folder “Butts, Joshua,” box 1, Papers of James Lloyd LaFayette Warren, 1805-1896. See Butts’s extant letters in the same folder;}

No matter how short-lived, Americans in California established immigration societies because they were useful to the state and prospective immigrants expected them. In 1855, Abraham Clark asked where he could find a California group “somewhat I suppose similar to the ‘Kansas’ & ‘Nebraska Emigration Societyes[sic].’” He and his cohort of failed miners would “gladly move there famelyes here if they whare able.” Prospective immigrants used these organizations for guidance when investigating new
lands. Booster groups may have been flawed, yet westering people had a small number of sources for this type of information.\textsuperscript{152}

The transcontinental railroad, however, promised much more and inspired a burst of boosterism. California’s promoters directed their literature towards a particular type of immigrant and invited prospective settlers willing to roll up their sleeves and work. This was a chance for Californians, or so they thought, to remake the state with the future of the economy and social structure in mind—laboring farmers to replace loafing miners. For the Big Four, immigrants translated directly into needed railroad traffic. They hoped farm families might settle, produce crops to ship east, and attract new settlers and visitors.

To encourage the “right kind of population,” Central Pacific agents sponsored Titus Fey Croniseto write \textit{The Natural Wealth of California} (1868). This large volume replaced the travel guides of the wagon era with one for the railroad era. Cronise endowed his descriptions of each county with lush vegetation and rich possibilities for those desiring the slower bucolic life of small, well-tilled farms. Instead of preparing travelers for the hardships of the trail, he introduced readers to the flora and fauna of the state. From coyotes to quails, as well as the amole plant and the sequoias, he described the unique to make it seem familiar. Ranchos, the product of the dreaded Mexican land grant system, did not escape his attention: “It will be a grand day for California when the word ‘ranch,’ like the idea and system it represents, has only a historical meaning.”

\textsuperscript{152} Abraham Clark to James Warren, 6 August 1855, folder “Clark, Abraham,” box 2, Papers of James Lloyd LaFayette Warren, 1805-1896.
Consequently, he recommended that his readers buy lands with good titles, railroad lands that is.\textsuperscript{153}

Within the next year, newcomers could expect shorter trips to California and fewer obstacles to owning land, according to Cronise. The problems of California seemed to be solved. Cronise’s reviewer in the \textit{Overland Monthly} noted a few flaws in the book, but the reviewer beamed, “On the whole, our local pride is gratified…. What a suggestive record is this of the undeveloped wealth of the State!”\textsuperscript{154} Even the skeptical Henry George expected the predictions for the era to be true. He concurred with boosters: “The new era into which our State is about entering—or, perhaps, to speak more correctly, has already entered—is without doubt an era of steady, rapid and substantial growth.” He only questioned who benefited from it all. Nonetheless, the railroad beckoned the new era; flush times were in California’s future, or so everyone thought.\textsuperscript{155}

No one saw the post railroad depression coming, not Henry George, not the Big Four, not the average booster. In San Francisco, merchants experienced reduced trade, real estate values suffered, and unemployment hurt the city’s economy after the transcontinental railroad connected the city to the nation. In the wake of “dull times,” San Francisco merchants initiated the beginning of organized boosterism in the state. Historian Richard Orsi argues that while many booster associations failed prior to 1860, the economic troubles of the early 1870s provoked more sustained efforts. Various city businessmen organized the California Immigrant Union (CIU) to publish information on

available land and disseminate literature throughout the nation and parts of Europe.

Promotional literature included a typical array of pamphlets, maps, and newspaper articles. By 1880, CIU fell prey to state sectional rivalries and to accusations of being a puppet of the Central Pacific. Concerned businessmen shifted gears to avoid criticism and established the Immigration Association of California (IAC). Both the CIU and IAC produced thousands of documents to advertise the golden state and hired agents to take these materials to eastern states and a small number of European countries.156

At the same time, rural Californians were also disappointed that the railroad had not met their expectations. Farmers had hoped that the transcontinental railroad would open eastern markets to their products, but instead farmers’ and manufacturers’ goods flooded the state from the East and Midwest. Moreover, San Francisco businessmen controlled the wheat market and transportation networks, angering both large-scale grain

---

156 The railroad also inspired a body of literature by “visitors,” such as Mary Cone who traveled to California on the railroad. Author Charles H. Shinn accused Cone of using her book to expand her wallet instead of further the interests of the state. Charles H. Shinn, “Peculiar Drawbacks of California Farming,” California Horticulturist, reprinted in Southern California Horticulturist, March 1878. In 1870s a number of visitors published their travelogues as books and newspaper articles and this continued into the 1880s and 1890s, including The Cincinnati Excursion to California: Its Origin, Progress, Incidents, and Results (Cincinnati: Indianapolis, Cincinnati & Lafayette R.R., 1870); John Todd, The Sunset Land; or, the Great Pacific Slope (Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1870); William Cole, California: Its Scenery, Climate, Productions, and Inhabitants (New York: Irish-American Office, 1872); C. M. Churchill, “Little Sheaves”: Gathered while Gleaning After Reapers (San Francisco: self published, 1874); The North and West Illustrated for Tourist, Business and Pleasure Travel (Chicago: Chicago and North-Western Railway Co., 1881); Thomas S. Chard, California Sketches (Chicago: n.p., 1888); Susie C. Clark, Souvenirs of Travel (Cambridgeport, Mass.: n.p., 1893). Not all of the publications of visitors emanated from selfish motives. Marshall P. Wilder, published California in 1871 after his trip to the state along with several other agriculturalists from Massachusetts. Wilder served on several agriculture-related boards and societies, including the Massachusetts agricultural college, the Massachusetts board of agriculture, the United State Agricultural Society, and the American Pomological Society. He returned to Massachusetts with information of interest to these groups and helped to promote the state for his friends. Jeanne Carr, John Streitzel, and other grangers entertained and instructed Wilder’s group while in California. Marshall P. Wilder, California (Boston: Wright and Potter, 1871). Louisiana Streitzel, diary, 22 March, 25 April, 4 and 5 July, 7 and 8 September 1868, Louisiana Erwin Streitzel papers, 1868-1882, BANC MSS C-F 16, Bancroft Library; Alexandra Kindell, “Preparing the Ground for Progress: Agricultural Reformers and the Intellectual Origins of the United States Department of Agriculture” (master’s thesis, California State University, Fullerton, 2001), 79-119.
growers and family farmers growing grain as a part of more diverse operations. As a result, farmers also organized after 1869, first in farmers’ unions and then in the Patrons of Husbandry, or “Grange.” In April 1873, representatives from various clubs convened in San Francisco to discuss the wheat monopoly. John Bidwell presided as president of the Farmers’ Union Convention and called for a “union of interest and union of action.” At this meeting, the attendees voted to disband and meet again in a few months as grangers. Bidwell and others at the meeting recognized farmers needed to combine for self-support when businessmen of industrial America had the power to bully them.157

The year 1873 marked a pivotal moment for the Patrons of Husbandry nationally. Like California farmers, cultivators, and their families across the country suffered because of the panic of 1873. Established in 1868, the Patrons of Husbandry floundered for membership until the national panic spurred farmers to form local meetings of the Patrons (“subordinate granges”). Between January and October 1873, rural people established 6,000 new subordinate granges in all parts of the country. This was a significant number considering there were only 1,359 granges in January. As members of their local granges, farmers also participated in the state and national offices of the Patrons.158 Grangers hoped to affect lawmakers in their favor, especially for regulation

---

of the dreaded “monopolies” of capital and transportation. Californians were no
different; W. H. Baxter of Napa Valley attended the April farmers’ convention in order to
propose the Grange as a powerful alternative to the decentralized farmers’ unions.159

After the Farmers’ Union Convention adjourned, the attendees returned to their
Communities to recruit their neighbors to become patrons. By October 1873, when
farmers, growers, and ranchers met at the first state grange meeting, Californians had
established at least 74 subordinate granges. In San Jose that fall, the 104 grangers in
attendance formed committees to pursue solutions to their various agricultural problems,
but they also turned their attentions to the state’s general welfare. The California State
Grange officers appointed three men to the Committee on Immigration and empowered
them to open an immigration bureau in San Francisco. The agents of this office
published settlement guides for farm families and corresponded with prospective settlers.
Orrin Abbott, one of the committee members, supposedly responded to thousands of
letters from correspondents seeking information about the state. Grangers cooperatively
established banks, stores, and warehouses to improve their economic futures. They
invested time and money into the immigration bureau for the same reason.160

159 Patrons maintained communication between local, state, and national offices of the Grange. Farmers’
unions across the country did not have the infrastructure to work collectively, except on rare occasions.
Proceedings of the California State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, Third Annual Session (San Francisco:
Spaulding & Barto, 1875), 35-37. Orrin L. Abbott was listed in 1870 census as a lawyer and in 1880 as a farmer.
Out of the disappointments of the 1870s, Californians in the city and the country launched a sustained movement to promote the state to farm families. Businessmen and farmers both wanted a stable economy, which meant solving problems of urban unemployment, rural labor shortages, and transportation costs without causing additional social upheavals. Thus the undeveloped countryside became the focus of boosters in the state. In pursuit of their goals, promoters used standard techniques similar to their counterparts, in the Midwest and Great Plains. As areas in these states opened up for settlement, states competed for the attention of farm families. Boosters printed tracts and sent delegations to national fairs, all in an effort to put their states’ virtues in front of prospective settlers and visitors.161

In addition to the groups already mentioned, others joined the effort to attract more people to rural areas. A variety of residents became boosters for their own social and economic motives, including local landowners, employers, civic-minded reformers, newspaper editors, and agricultural society members. Moreover, some residents participated more sporadically. For example, several Fresno residents sent products of their farms to immigration associations for display. Lewis Leach sent Sicily lemons and “Mr. Story” exhibited German and Hungarian prunes. In addition to advertising communities in this manner, civic leaders and residents sponsored the production of “county histories.”162

Locals contracted with various publishers, including Lewis Publishing Company of Chicago, Thompson & West of Oakland, and Elliott & Moore of San Francisco, to produce volumes about their counties. These texts were designed to highlight settlement

161 Orsi, Selling the Golden State, 381-402; Orsi, Sunset Limited, 136-43.
162 Fresno Weekly Republican, 14 January 1887.
and permanence for the purpose of attracting newcomers. County residents, in addition, paid company artists to render likenesses of their homes and businesses and for space in the volumes. Biographies featured residents who mined in California and then became farmers or who escaped other states for the mild climate. In the biographies, Californians testified, much as they did in newspapers and letters, to how their hard work translated into nice California homes. It is difficult now to imagine some of the homes pictured in the county histories as those of working farmers, and historians have selectively used the county histories, expecting them to be no more than products of the well-to-do. Daniel G. Heald, however, was a hard-working farmer who had a picture of his home reproduced in the 1877 Sonoma County atlas along with his neighbors. He built his home in Petaluma, his wife cooked all the meals, and his children did chores. Much of the house, he built with his own hands, bringing in a mason or a carpenter occasionally to help with specific projects. Organizations continued promoting the state to outsiders, and residents made sure their communities received attention within that promotion, whether they showed off their fine lemons or Victorian-style farm homes.\(^{163}\)

Finally, in addition to all of these people, the managers of the railroad provided...  

---

significant support to the promotional movement of the post-1869 period.\textsuperscript{164} The officials of the Southern Pacific Railroad Company founded booster organizations, supported existing groups, and sent delegations to national and international fairs. They wanted to encourage permanent settlement in the state just as other boosters did. The railroad company and its agents suffered economically from the depression, and company men believed permanent settlement would increase passenger and freight traffic. Lloyd Tevis of the Southern Pacific described the problems of depression, the state’s connection to national markets, and land speculation prior to the completion of the transcontinental railroad. He reminded readers of the period when “great expectations…arose in the popular mind as to the stream of immigration which would pour over it” because of the national “connection.” The wave of immigration did not come, disappointing railroad builders among the many others.\textsuperscript{165} As Richard Orsi points out, the railroad attracted the ire of many, businessmen and farmers alike, because it monopolized transportation in the state. Grangers and members of the CIU both loudly criticized some of the policies of the railroad yet continued to work with its agents in promotional capacities. Without substantial state-funded support for boosterism, Californians praised the Southern Pacific for taking up the advertising burden. California’s promotion bound together people with

\textsuperscript{164} Historian Richard Orsi has detailed the complicated role of the Southern Pacific Railroad Company in California in his magnum opus, \textit{Sunset Limited: The Southern Pacific Railroad and the Development of the American West, 1850-1930}. The Big Four created the Southern Pacific as a parent company for the Central Pacific and numerous smaller California rail lines that they bought. The land agents role in advertising California complicates the picture presented by the anti-railroad writers following the model set by Upton Sinclair in \textit{The Octopus} (1901).

\textsuperscript{165} Tevis published his speech to a group of bankers in New York. At the time, he was associated with both Wells, Fargo & Co. and the Southern Pacific. Lloyd Tevis, \textit{California and the Pacific Coast} (San Francisco: Southern Pacific Railway Co., 1881), 7-18.
diverging points of view.\textsuperscript{166}

Surprisingly, considering the diversity of interests of the various boosters involved prior to 1900, they crafted a cohesive narrative about the state’s past, present, and future. Several themes and topics emerged during this period including, but almost all of them centered around, the idea of introducing industrious workers into the state on a permanent basis. The idolization of work played an important thematic role in the evolution of California’s booster literature. Earlier boosters raised the same themes, but it was in era of unfulfilled expectations, that boosters perfected the storyline of California’s development. The state’s past was wild and unsettled, a place where neither Mexicans nor miners had the wherewithal to instill the land with an atmosphere of “industry” and “honest labor.” Incoming families initiated the transformation of the state but needed more hard-working families to continue the work they started. California should have been a “Promised Land” from the start because of its unique climate and natural resources, but without a body of solid, permanent residents, California stagnated as a “land of promise.” Thus Californians invited specific people to join them—white, laboring families—to reap the bounty of the state’s future. These themes can be found in the pamphlets produced by groups such as the CIU and IAC, but also in the rhetoric of locals involved in the Grange, women’s reform groups, and in the county histories.

After 1869, boosters were unable to blame the lack of transportation for low immigration numbers in the state, and they found fault with the state’s Mexican and mining pasts for its continuing problems. They contended that a lack of “industry,” or the

\textsuperscript{166} Orsi, \textit{Sunset Limited}, 143-48. Keep in mind that Frank Norris later wrote \textit{The Octopus} (1901) to vilify the Southern Pacific Railroad and its managers, but the role of the railroad and residents’ responses to it were much more complicated than Norris indicated.
labor of producers, in the state led to economic and social problems. Both “California fever” and “gold fever” enervated the state’s collective work ethic. During the 1830s, Richard Henry Dana made trips to California in the midst of its Mexican period and described the inhabitants as lazy and economically unmotivated. In terms of his own Yankee work ethic, Mexicans ignored the opportunities of Alta California and only extracted wealth instead of creating it. Mexicans tended cattle on their ranchos for hide and tallow to barter for goods brought in by ships from the eastern coast of the continent with little concern for intensive agriculture. Yankees shipped food, wine, and manufactured goods, and Mexicans purchased these goods using “California bank notes,” or cow hides taken from the ill-bred, skinny Mexican cattle.167

Dana mocked the Mexicans for having a disease caused by “California fever.” In Two Years before the Mast, the New England seaman described the symptoms of the fever: “The Californians are an idle, thriftless people, and can make nothing for themselves. The country abounds in grapes, yet they buy bad wine made in Boston and brought round by us, at an immense price, and retail it among themselves at a real (12 1/2 cents) by the small wine-glass.” Dana also found it ironic that Californios bought shoes made by Boston shoemakers out of the hides taken from the Mexican frontier by eastern ship captains. As Dana described it, the rancho system morally corrupted landowners who refused to cultivate the soil and thus wasted the region’s resources.168

168 Dana, Two Years before the Mast, 88, 91; Tony Stanley Cook, “Historical Mythmaking: Richard Henry Dana and American Emigration to California, 1840-1850,” Southern California Quarterly 68 (Summer 1986): 102.
Richard Henry Dana wrote his travelogue in 1840, but his book was widely read by Americans. Boosters borrowed from Dana’s book regularly to describe California before annexation, and, at times, quoted him almost verbatim. Dana’s descriptions had entered the collective memory of Americans to the point that they rarely mentioned his name as they recounted his tales in their later works. Mary Cone did this as she claimed to describe her trip to California in her book, *Two Years in California* (1876). Anyone who read Dana, Cronise’s agricultural manual, and at least one county history could have written the same text. In general, California visitors and residents agreed with Dana because his account of Mexican settlement made sense to them in terms of their cultural knowledge. American and European visitors to Alta California who historically cultivated farms extensively disapproved of Mexican style ranching. Long before California became an American state, Jean Françoise de Galaup de la Pérouse descended on Alta California in 1786 with his French expedition. Schooled in the socio-economic ideals of the French physiocrats, la Pérouse believed in the value of small, well-cultivated farms much like his American contemporary, Thomas Jefferson. Americans brought with them Jeffersonian agrarian conceptions of land use and pronounced the Mexican ranchos as backward vestiges of a profligate culture.169

---

Promotional writers complained that the inherited system of ranchos and Spanish cows paralyzed, impeded, and retarded state progress. The earmarks of the Mexican era were seen in the herds of roaming livestock, slow town development, and low energy level of locals. California visitor, C. M. Churchill, identified the state’s advantages and disadvantages, echoing Dana: “All the productions indigenous to the temperate zones, and almost all those of the tropics, flourish luxuriantly; so that owing to her genial climate, the fertility of her soil, and the characteristics of her earliest settlers, Santa Clara, notwithstanding her Yankee immigration, hovers between effete conservatism and living progression, stupidity and activity, dullness and energy.”

Moreover, the physical landscape reflected Mexican attitudes about work. To L. L. Paulson, the timber houses built by Americans represented progress and served as a visual gauge of the disappearing Mexican past. He said, “Little remains to be seen of the universal Mexican taste in architecture, that joint product of shiftlessness and mud, the adobe.” Mary Cone also griped: “The Spaniards who built these towns seem to have eschewed geometrical figures and held in abhorrence all straight lines.” Thus, Mexican land tenure, in terms of both surveying boundaries and land use, seemed to lack order and efficiency required to inspire a healthy economy.

When Mary Cone identified Mexican proclivities toward creative town design, she also hinted at the well-known and denigrated Mexican system of land distribution. After the Mexican American War, Americans took possession of Mexico’s northern

_Agrarianism: From Hunter-Gatherer to Agrarian Radical in Western Culture_ (Moscow: University of Idaho Press, 1989).

frontier, including Alta California, under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hildago (1848). In this document, the American government promised to protect the rights and property of former Mexican citizens. Spanish governors in Alta California made a few land grants in the 1820s. After the Mexican takeover of Spain’s new world properties, Mexican officials then granted even more tracts of land to residents for service to the country among other reasons, especially in the 1840s. Moreover, U.S. officials knew about such systems from previous experiences. Not only did Lieutenant Charles Wilkes (U.S. Navy) and John C. Frémont (commissioned to the Army Corp of Topographical Engineers) file reports of their explorations in the Far West, Americans came in contact with Spanish land grants after acquiring the Louisiana Purchase. In Alta California, grantees registered their claims by submitting rough descriptions of their tracts with sketches. These “diseños,” however, lacked the technical specificity of American surveyors’ maps and led to much confusion. As a result, incredulous Californians doubted that most Mexican land grants were valid, and settlers were unable to obtain title to disputed lands.172

To answer questions about the land grants, congressmen sitting at their desks in Washington passed legislation to adjudicate land claims. Within the Land Act of 1851, Congress authorized a three-member land commission to review any claims to land granted prior to 1846. More than 800 grantees made claims to as much as 14 million acres of land in the state. Boosters, residents, and government officials viewed the grants as an impediment to settlement for two reasons. First grantees claimed large acreages of land, from one league (4,426 acres) to eleven leagues of land. American politicians and

squatters waited for invalid grants to be released so that thousands of acres would be opened for settlement. Second, during the 1850s and 1860s, news of fraudulent titles reached the East, and boosters feared that farmers disqualified California as a destination based on that information. Theodore Johnson told his readers in 1851, “Land titles have already been the subject of the most impudent, unfounded, and fraudulent claims, by which large sums [of money] have been obtained.” For this reason among others, he told Americans to by-pass California for Oregon, the “true seat of American Empire on the Pacific.” Americans inside and outside the state waited for the land commissioners to rule.173

The Mexican system of land grants and diseños worked well-enough within the cultural and economic world of Alta California, in which more cows dotted the hills than did homes. Americans, however, had to reconcile these vague descriptions and poorly drawn maps with American jargon and conceptions of private property. During the process, the land commission contended with three types of grants—valid claims, fraudulent claims, and claims to “floating grants.” All three types of grants caused confusion and consternation among the commission members, lawyers, and American settlers awaiting determination. The land act required grant holders to present their claims to the commission within two years and hold meetings between 1852 and 1856. Claimants and their lawyers had the responsibility of proving dates of residence and property boundaries. Incoming Americans demanded precision in a place where grants overlapped and had such indefinite boundaries that they were deemed “floating.” The

173 Johnson, *California and Oregon*, 197-202, 247, 251. Note that Johnson’s book was in its fourth edition by 1851, and the previous editions appeared after his first trip to the mines in 1849. He claimed to update the book after a second trip and from information secured from friends through letters and visits.
land commission, in conjunction with district courts and the U.S. Supreme Court, eventually forced American terms onto Mexican conceptions of land.

The commission over time ruled on each grant, and upheld approximately two-thirds of the grants presented to them. Additional claimants denied by the commission succeeded in gaining title to their claims through the appeals process.\(^{174}\) During the 1850s and a good part of the 1860s, however, the outcome of these investigations remained unknown, a matter left to speculation both figuratively and literally. On these disputed properties, miners-turned-farmers planned to utilize the soil for only a few seasons, taking advantage of the markets in the mining districts and the unclear state of land titles. Asa Call, Jesse Smart, and John Callbreath planted crops as speculators, not as long-term residents. Farming miners variously bought land, squatted, or planted crops on mineral claims and ranchos in order to make quick profits and move on. Travel guide author Edward Hall blamed the land system for the unsettled state of California’s first market farmers. He called the land grants a “baneful system” and “another fruitful source of evil,” retarding permanent development.\(^{175}\)


\(^{175}\) Hall, The Great West, 119-121.
Despite the confusion over titles, impatient farmers used grant-land to get started. Men with families preferred to buy land out right but made do along side single male farmers. Historians have been hard pressed to put a face to the settlers on or near grantee lands, and have made wide-sweeping judgments about the results. Geographer Ellen Liebman ascertained that the land grant system naturally led to a land monopoly excluding family farmers in California. They refer to the system in terms of a linear process of capitalistic land domination. Yet immigrant families struggled to make communities in the state, not knowing they were fighting a battle against larger historical trends. Settlers bought or squatted on both valid and fraudulent grants, often trusting the purported land owner about land commission decrees. Moreover, families rented and sharecropped land to gain access to temporary homesteads and raise money for later purchases.176

As farm families arrived in the agricultural districts, they sought land to purchase and feared how the land grant system might affect them. Well-intended landowners sold parts of their grants without knowing their claims would one day be rejected by the land commission. Even more disturbing to settlers, grifters claimed good title to valuable land. Consequently, settlers worried about having to buy land twice or being evicted without compensation for improvements. Grants took so long to adjudicate, from five to twenty years, that settlers sought out information about grants and public land with good title. In Santa Clara County, Abraham Clarke begged James Warren for information about the Alviso tract upon which he had settled: “I am not able to bye [sic] my land

twice—as soon as I can own my land I intend to work it on a different principle from the way we who rent land can afford to work it.”

Yet despite the insecurity of land titles, farmers such as Clarke continued to break the soil and build houses in the countryside. James Burney commented about his Stanislaus County neighbors; they went “to work to make their homes comfortable, seeming to have faith that they will yet be able to get a good title to their land.” As they planted crops and raised children, California families relied on the intercession of the land commissioners and trusted the American judicial system to reconcile the two incongruent patterns of land tenure.

Some settlers may have had faith enough to start farms in California, and they certainly hoped for good outcomes. Looking at how particular farm communities dealt with land tenure during these years, it becomes clear that families were committed to protecting their interests, legally and otherwise. In Sonoma County, the Green Valley settlers meted out their own form of justice to a con-man named “Boman,” who tried to claim title to the land in their community. In 1853, Jonas Turner and his family left Missouri for California to join kin in the Green Valley area of Sonoma County. There he purchased 160 acres, as did many of his neighbors, from a man believing he had proper title. Boman entered the scene later and attempted to take advantage of the settlers and confusion regarding various grants in the 1850s, demanding payment for land he supposedly owned. Sarepta Ross, Turner’s daughter, recalled this story years later, and noted coolly that one of their neighbor’s extinguished Boman’s claim with a shot to the head. Additionally, Ione (Amador County) settlers disregarded Antonio Maria Pico’s

---

claim to a “floating grant” and forced Pico’s surveyors to find a location outside of their community. Americans in the state stayed informed about the fate of grants because the judgments affected their lives.\textsuperscript{179}

For boosters, it was a crying shame that news of insecure grants made it into eastern newspapers, visitors’ reports, and travel guides. For settlers, such as James Burney and his Stanislaus County neighbors, the title issue was the “great drawback” to settling. Promoters also rued the title issue as a great obstacle to attracting settlers. Overall, California’s Mexican past intruded on American California’s present. To Americans, Californios had neither identified their holdings properly nor had they used the land industriously. The former caused problems for settlers seeking land and the latter seemed to infuse a lackadaisical attitude onto the landscape.\textsuperscript{180}

The fate of large tracts of land lingered within court proceedings, but in the meantime civil leaders and concerned locals continued their dialogue about the roles of mining and agriculture in the state. Miners’ transience continued to frustrate Californians. This is one reason that their lifestyle became the antithesis of the vision of California boosters fostered. Many miners also drank too much as they gambled and sought the company of inappropriate women. Debauchery notwithstanding, gold seekers naturally sought out gold, and moved continuously for the next discovery. Locals called them the “floating population,” “transients,” and “vagrants,” terms to which they

\textsuperscript{179} Sarepta A. Ross, “Recollections of a Pioneer,” 1914, BANC MSS C-D 5152, Bancroft Library; California Farmer 22 February 1860; Pacific Rural Press, 4 March 1882. For a specific diatribe against fraudulent grants, see George Fox Kelly, Land Frauds of California (Santa Rosa, Calif.: n.p., 1864). California Farmer, 27 June 1856. The reporter for this Ione incident did not name the grant, but it was probably the grant for Rancho El Valle de San Jose, a grant of more than 64,000 acres in Amador County. Heirs of Antonio Maria Pico and Antonio Sunol gained final patents to their titles in 1865 and 1880. They sold some of this land in 100- and 500-acre plots to settlers. See “Livermore Amador Valley Land Grants,” http://www.lhg.org/history%20folder/1landgrants.htm, accessed 7 March 2006.

\textsuperscript{180} Hayes, “Wants and Disadvantages of California,” 338-47.
juxtaposed the permanent population of farmers with families. Without a settled population, California remained plagued by an unaccountable population of men, moving county seats, and an unrealized taxable economy. The frustrated Alta editor, in 1853, wrote that agriculture might expand if only farmers “could depend on the market created by the miners.” Even in the late fifties, new discoveries of gold along the Frazer, Klamath, and Kern rivers sent boosters into editorial paroxysms: “And now comes the gold fever again, with its luring bait, and the cry is gold! gold!! gold!!!” Concerned Californians tried to convince people not to chase after “Frazer folly,” and stay committed to cultivating “good and comfortable homes.”

California’s mining past did not help the state in terms of its work ethic and image according to both boosters and settlers. Miners might strike it rich or live lives of episodic hard work punctuated by periods of “loafing.” Franklin Buck complained about lazy miners, when he told his sister, “people here overdo everything but work. They take good care not to dig too much…the dignity of labor here that is all gone. Loafing is much more respectable.” For Buck, idle men were poor customers, but they also were lousy state builders. William B. Ide chronicled the problem when he said, “Nearly all the enterprise of the county serves to corrupt and demoralize our transient population.”

---


182 Much of this resulted from the reduced wages miners earned in the mines. Franklin A. Buck to Mary Sewall Bradley, 19 February 1854, box 2, Papers of Franklin Augustus Buck, 1846-1966, Huntington Library. Depending on miners vexed farmers, traders, and freight haulers. See also Josiah Gove’s letters to his family about his failures as both a trader and packer, Gove Family Papers, Yale Collection of Western Americana, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library; [unknown] to Charles Kendall, 17 January 1854, folder 6, box 1, and O. C. Osborne to Samuel F. Tracy, 28 July, 31 August, 29 September, and 28 December 1849, folder 6, box 1, California Letters, 1849-1885, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library; Frederick J. Teggart, ed., “The Gold Rush Extracts from the diary of Chester Smith Lyman, 1848-49,” California Historical Society Quarterly 2 (October 1923): 198.
Because miners moved from town to town, Ide concluded that it was this transience that thwarted normal institutional development, especially churches, schools, and governments. Frustrated, Ide informed his brother that he had been elected to be the judge of six different courts and the clerk of three in 1851: “I suppose I shall, just to accommodate our floating population, be compelled to serve as treasurer, deputy sheriff, deputy county surveyor, and very probably coroner and justice of the peace, and very probably as deputy notary public.” Miners and mining doomed California’s future to wasteful, inefficient modes of production, whether California fever or gold fever debilitated its workers.183

In determining the appropriate types of settlers, then, boosters remonstrated non-producers. They asked a number of classes specifically not to come to California. Newspaper editors, businessmen, and other promoters created a laundry list of unwanted characters: lawyers, doctors, “shiftless, lazy” men, teachers, “bummers,” preachers, practitioners of “mediocre journalism,” loafers, speculators, book-keepers, and “genteel young men with delicate hands and immaculate linen.” California needed workers—self-reliant, hardworking producers.184

Farm families and artisans, on the other hand, had skills which boosters believed would build the resources of the state. One Californian said, “If you can build a house, you will be needed; if you can dig a ditch, you will be needed; if you can make or mend a

183 Emphasis in original. Ide’s letters were reprinted to demonstrate the previously unsettled nature of Colusa County. Justus H. Rogers, Colusa County: Its History Traced from a State of Nature through the Early Period of Settlement and Development, to the Present Day (Orland, Calif.: n.p., 1891), 65-68. William B. Ide is better known to California historians as the president of the short-lived Bear Flag Republic (22 days) declared by him and several dozen associates in 1846. The Massachusetts native arrived in Mexican California in 1845 after living on several midwestern frontiers. He made a fortune in the mines, and his adobe near Redding, California, is now a state historic park.

184 “Over-crowded Professions on the Pacific Slope,” Overland Monthly 1 (September 1868): 248; Hall’s Land Journal, April and July 1876; Semi-Tropic California, June 1880.
machine, farm, garden—anything in fact that renders earth’s surface and products fit for abode and use—you may come empty handed.” Otherwise, you “must be with capital enough to make your presence welcome, and your sojourn not a burden.” Authors regularly cited the “great wants” of California, and they invited farmers and their families to become permanent residents and to infuse the land with “energy, industry, and prudence.”

The officers of the state’s booster organizations, specifically designed their tracts for farm families. The CIU told readers, “It is not that we undervalue our gold, silver, copper, tin, iron and quicksilver mines, that we say little concerning them; but because it is not a mining, but a farming, population, that we most desire.” When the IAC took over the work of its predecessor, IAC officers continued the search for a few good farmers. In its main bulletin, the IAC members asked readers to send names and addresses of “any Farmers East of the Rocky Mountains” who might be interested in their materials. The statewide immigration organizations carefully outlined the climate, the crops, start-up costs, and labor conditions as well as avenues for obtaining government and railroad land. Boosters anticipated the questions of farmers and generated literature to answer them, all in an attempt to attract cultivators instead of miners.

Author and resident John Hayes encouraged his fellow Californians to promote immigration of farmers. Hayes wrote, “The greater the number of farmers arriving, the

---

185 “Over-crowded Professions on the Pacific Slope,” 253. For similar statements, see Cronise, The Natural Wealth of California, 9; Transactions of the California State Agricultural Society during the Years 1866 and 1867 (Sacramento: D. W. Gelwicks, 1868), 541-42; Charles. H. Shinn, Pacific Rural Handbook (San Francisco: Dewey & Co., 1879), 100; Pacific Rural Press, 15 May 1875.

186 All About California, and the Inducements to Settle Here (San Francisco: California Immigrant Union, 1870), 4-5; Immigration Association of California, Resources of the Southern San Joaquin Valley, California (San Francisco: Immigration Association of California, 1885), inside cover; Immigration Association of California, California (San Francisco: Immigration Association of California, 1882).
better will it be for those already here.” Hayes referred to both the farmers and his fellow San Franciscans who feared a mass of unemployed men milling about the city. He argued unemployed laborers lingered in the cities, but farmers were able to “create work for themselves.” Laborers only waited for jobs. Unrest among the unemployed peaked in 1877 with the formation of the Workingmen’s Party headed by Denis Kearney. As a political party, it funneled laborers’ anger about Chinese workers imported to lay track for the Central Pacific Railroad Company. The Big Four were desperate for workers in the 1860s and early 1870s, but white workers were unwilling to do the dangerous wage work demanded by railroad foremen. As a result, railroad executives authorized the hiring of Chinese men already in the state and made arrangements with Chinese labor bosses for new workers from China. The Workingmen’s Party fomented a political movement out of random acts of violence, and the members of a constitutional convention wrote an anti-Chinese, anti-monopoly document approved by voters in May 1879. Thus, during the 1870s, businessmen and boosters had good reasons to fear unemployed workers in the city of San Francisco.

While Kearney and laborers took an exclusionary stance toward certain “foreign elements,” some California farmers and businessmen relied on the labor of the Chinese. David Jacks of Monterey supported the use of Chinese labor because he ran large operations, using a variety of labor arrangements, including renting land for cash or on shares. Denis Kearney apparently instructed Monterey residents to “hang David Jacks” for his audacious use of capital and labor, but Jacks made no apology for his actions.

---

Most Californians, however, wrestled with labor problems less outrageously than Jacks. As a leading Grange member, John Strentzel officially opposed the use of Chinese labor, yet he and his wife supervised Chinese in their house and in their fields.\textsuperscript{188} Certainly, many white farmers hypocritically hired Chinese labors out of need, denouncing them as a race and California’s labor deficiencies all the while. Boosters proposed several solutions to solve the “Chinese problem.”\textsuperscript{189}

During the late 1860s and throughout the 1870s, several employment agencies emerged in San Francisco to place the unemployed on interior farms and, hopefully, eliminate the use of Chinese laborers. In 1868, San Francisco businessmen started the California Labor Exchange, directing its efforts at farmers’ labor needs. They offered to arrange for buttermakers, cheesemakers, farm laborers, and housekeepers to find positions on California ranches and farms. The exchange members expected to solve farmers’ problems, end urban unemployment, and draw hard-working, future farmers to the state.\textsuperscript{190}

\textsuperscript{188} John Strentzel called the Chinese a “horde of locusts” who were “crowding out the employment of our own people.” (Strentzel was born in Poland but identified himself as an American). Louisiana Strentzel noted that her new “chinaman…makes good bread.” She indicated in her diaries that Chinese servants did the housework, allowing her to visit other farmwives. Her husband sent two Chinese to their Carquinez ranch to cut hay, and she fixed provisions to send with them. Hubert Howe Bancroft, “Life of Dr. John T. Strentzel,” 1890, transcript, BANC MSS C-D 778 and Louisiana’s diaries in Louisiana Erwin Strentzel Papers, 1868-1882, BANC MSS C-F 16, Bancroft Library.

\textsuperscript{189} Jacks employed white hired hands and rented land to families for cash or on shares in addition to hiring Chinese laborers. See various letters and notes, boxes 1 and 3 and letter books, Papers of David Jacks, ca. 1845-1926, Huntington Library; Arthur Eugene Bestor, Jr., David Jacks of Monterey, and Lee L. Jacks, His Daughter (N.p.: Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University, 1945), 18; Robert Louis Stevenson, Across the Plains, page 30, available at “Classic Literature Library,” http://robert-louis-stevenson.classic-literature.co.uk/across-the-plains/, accessed 9 March 2006. Author Sandy Lydon stated that no matter how Monterey residents felt about the Chinese, farmers and others needed their labor. Four Chinatowns formed in the Monterey area because of the number of Chinese in the area and the hostile sentiment towards them. Sandy Lydon, Chinese Gold: The Chinese in the Monterey Bay Region (Capitola, Calif.: Capitola Book Co., 1985), 124-27.

\textsuperscript{190} California Labor Exchange, Facts for Emigrants (San Francisco: Fred’k MacCrellish & Co., 1869). Crosett & Co. in San Francisco advertised “American, Irish, German, Scandinavian Help Furnished. Warren Ewer, editor of the Pacific Rural Press, also worked with C. R. Hansen to arrange employment of
To attract farm laborers and utilize “idle labor” were worthy goals, but in the end, they were not enough; the exchange writers told readers that getting a farm was the most “earnest hope cherished by the new-comer” and included the standard guide on California farming to convince men that a few months of labor helped them achieve independence.\(^{191}\) John Hittell, one of California’s most prolific boosters, believed gold seekers were incapable of becoming a reliable labor supply. He, therefore, involved himself with the California Labor Exchange and the CIU. To Hittell and his cohort, California’s problems emanated from the idleness of Mexicans and miners, and the state’s future required a new influx of farmers.\(^{192}\)

Boosters carefully directed most of their materials to convince American farmers to enjoy the benefits of California’s climate and soil, but they also looked to Europe for industrious farm families. Both the CIU and IAC sent agents to Europe, many of whom carried with them copies of John S. Hittell’s *All About California* translated into a number of European languages. California boosters sponsored Hittell to write the essay, which they reprinted and distributed widely. The two agencies published at least twelve English editions and editions in French, Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, Polish, and, of course, German. German farmers seemed to be the epitome of good agricultural practice, and both the CIU and IAC sent agents to Germany to talk to farmers there. As Franklin

---

\(^{191}\) The exchange published its own materials and advertised in periodicals read by farmers. The agents had two goals: to find farmers interested in hiring their laborers and to find laborers willing to trust the exchange. Farmers paid no fees, but CLE agents required personal references along with labor orders. The group claimed to place 1,380 persons between April and May 1868 and 12,000 by 1869. See California Labor Exchange, *Facts for Emigrants*; “Labor Exchange” to James Warren, 21 May and 17 June 1868, folder “California Labor Exchange, San Francisco,” box 2, Papers of James Lloyd LaFayette Warren.  

A. Buck found, Germans might drink a little, but he appreciated his German neighbors for being family oriented. Buck told his sister in Massachusetts, “those who like to sleep nights” were glad the German May fest was over, but “The Germans you see are an institution out here. They are good citizens & have settled permanently with their wives & families.” In a land of many vices, a little drinking among the settled classes was the least of anyone’s problems.193

California boosters agreed with Buck on the issue of settlers. In the promotional literature, writers continually called upon persons ready to work hard, settle permanently, and build the state to replace the “shiftless” and “lazy” men of mineral California. Farmers, or laborers for that matter, did not necessarily need extensive capital, and writers portrayed the state as a good destination for the “poor man.” Boosters argued that hard work and thrift were enough to secure a good living in California: “Many failures have arisen from attempting too much. The new settler who deserves success, begins at bed-rock, keeps out of debt, buys as little as he can, wears his old clothes, works early and late, plants trees and vines for the future, leaves whisky alone, and has a definite aim and plan in life.” In the promotional literature, cultivating small plots became a consistent theme. Boosters promised Californians were ready to subdivide lands to provide acreages of 10-, 20-, 40-, and 160-lots, just enough for a motivated family to work on its own.194

Moreover, promoters distributed plat maps with descriptions of the owners, giving details on acreage, crops, and incomes. Each month, for example, in the Santa Clara Valley, the editor highlighted a neighborhood to prove the grand ranchos of the Mexican

---

193 Franklin A. Buck to Mary Sewall Bradley, 3 June 1860, Papers of Franklin Augustus Buck, 1846-1966.  
194 Immigration Association of California, California, 14.
era had been subdivided. In the October 1885 edition, H. S. Foote placed a plat map of the Orchard School District located on the eastern edge of the city of San Jose. The map includes the landowners’ names and acreage sizes (18-274 acres). Following this information, Foote provided lengthy descriptions of each farm. J. H. Cornthwaite owned 86 acres, on which he raised a diverse array of crops for domestic use and market sales: pears, tomatoes, strawberries, asparagus, blackberries, and onions. The farmer cut asparagus in January, marketing 45 boxes every other day. Foote assured readers “These are not extraordinary crops, but what anyone may expect to average.” On following pages, the editor added tips to farmers and housewives, and in all the references to small farms, schools, and housework, indicated subtly, yet graphically, that American families should consider California as place to settle permanently.


196 Santa Clara Valley, October 1885. All of the issues for 1885 and 1886 follow the same format. For
In remaking California’s future, boosters and residents fear about race and work ethics combined. Californians worried that gold fever (the speculative nature of miners) and California fever (the agricultural “indolence” of Mexicans) infected early farmers. Charles Shinn, a noted California author, told readers that speculation continued to be one of the “peculiar drawbacks” of the state to the detriment of good cultivation. He argued speculative farming could be overcome with “small, healthy farms, worked by their owners.” Miners speculated in gold and early farmers continued to bank on making great wealth by taking advantage of miners, but those days were over, writers proclaimed. The time for speculative enterprises was over; Californians now needed to work hard to build communities and a strong state. Newspaper editors admonished

other examples of boosters discussing subdivision of lands, see Sonoma County and Russian Valley Illustrated (San Francisco: Bell & Heymans, 1888), 8; California Immigration Commission, Chicago California: The Cornucopia of the World (Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co., 1883), 6; Sonoma County Central Land Company Sonoma County Land Journal (Santa Rosa: C. M. Petersen, 1883), 5; Reproduction of Thompson and West’s History of Santa Barbara & Ventura Counties (1883, reprint; Berkeley: Howell-North, 1961), 20-21. 

Charles E. Pickett blamed the miners and the land grabbers for speculation and land monopoly, which, as it turns out ruined, his life. With the complicity of the “legal spoliators” (corrupt state legislators), the speculators and landowners made it impossible for the lands to be “parceled out and possessed.” Charles E. Pickett, Protest and Memorial against Granting Appropriation to the Immigration Aid Society (N.p., 1872), 3-5 and Land-Gambling Versus Mining-Gambling: An Open Letter to Squire P. Dewey (San Francisco: n.p., 1879), 2-3. The editor of the Petaluma Argus agreed with Pickett that paying for immigrants was a bad idea. He wondered why residents of California who were in economic trouble because of the depression needed to pay for free railroad passes: “The class of immigrants we need are those who have at least means enough to pay their passage, and whose desire to come is sufficiently strong to induce them to pay their way.” Argus, 11 April 1873.

Southern California Horticulturist, April 1878. See also Southern California Horticulturist, January 1878; Semi-Tropic California, August 1880; Santa Clara Valley, March 1885.


Burrell B. Taylor told his readers hard work paid off. William Cole, a visitor from New York, warned: “the day for making quick fortunes in California disappeared about the time the placers gave out.” Burrell B. Taylor, How to Get Rich in California (Philadelphia: McMorris and Gans, 1876), 23-48; William Cole, California: Its Scenery, Climate, Productions, and Inhabitants (New York: Irish-American Office, 1872), 88; California as It is (San Francisco: San Francisco Call Co., 1881), 3. William W. Hollister, a landowner in Santa Barbara County, supposedly said: “Labor is the sum total. Go to work and grow rich. ...If you would have a moral community, make it prosperous. You can only do that by unflagging industry....If there
farmers for cultivating too much land, not growing crops for domestic use, and being “lazy.” One editor provided a list to explain poverty: “Brooms are never hung and are soon spoiled/ Clothes are left on the line to whip to pieces in the wind/Dried fruits are not take care of in season, and become wormy…. Each item in the list pointed to a farmer’s or his wife’s laziness.²⁰⁰

Californians from many ranks of life denounced the impact of miners’ lifestyles. Mrs. C. F. Colby, grange matron and farmer’s wife, started a fictional conversation with a miner in her article on farming in California. The miner declared that Amador County residents “won’t work! The soil is too rich; the orchards too fruitful; and the chances of washing out gold from this red earth too good.” Colby chided loafers through the voice of this miner. Then she ended the conversation and the article with her opinion: “Whisky and gambling and solitary vices, born of the lonely lives your people live, will kill off the present race; they will give way to hardy, industrious tillers of the soil, and all these beautiful hills and valleys will teem with wealth and happy homes.” John Hittell agreed with Colby. He told his readers that the first wave of California immigrants were “psychologically unprepared” to accept the “natural order of the universe,” i.e., to stop chasing wealth and to settle down into the quotidian rhythms of a working man’s life. California’s promoters—whether they were editors, grangers, or professional boosters—blamed miners and Californios for the moral and economic problems of the state.²⁰¹

²⁰⁰ is an American who does not wish to work, let him don the scant apparel suited to the climate, go to the tropics, be a savage, and nature will feed him from a tree. ...Without work there is no wealth.” Hollister was also on the directing board of the California Immigrant Union. Reproduction of Thompson and West’s History of Santa Barbara & Ventura Counties, introduction by Walker A. Thompkins (1883, reprint; Berkeley: Howell-North, 1961), 20-21; Orsi, Selling the Golden State, 383.

²⁰¹ Southern California Horticulturist, April 1878. See also Southern California Horticulturist, January 1878; Semi-Tropic California, August 1880; Santa Clara Valley, March 1885.

²⁰¹ “Farming the Foot-Hills of the Sierras,” California Agriculturist, 1 March 1874. Hittell quoted in Petty,
These narratives explicitly and implicitly excluded certain groups from participating in the future of California. Lazy Californios and loafing miners received much of the attention from residents. In addition, by promoting the virtues of eastern Americans and northern Europeans, Californians often indirectly disqualified the Chinese and any other group unable to assimilate. In the wake of the disappointments about the railroad, Governor H. H. Haight spoke to the state legislature on encouraging what he considered the right kind of immigration: “We need population—not of races inferior in natural traits, pagan in religion…but we need immigrants of kindred races, who will constitute a congenial element and locate themselves and their families permanently upon the soil.” Haight issued the booster salvo: California desired white farm families.202

The Chinese came for the gold rush or to work on the railroad, and Californians—from the vitriolic Denis Kearney to the hypocritical Strentzel family—were unnerved by their presence. Residents worried that the Chinese edged laborers out of work and possibly more. The editor of the Pacific Rural Press decried Chinese labor for making large-scale operations possible, supplanting natural rural development. He complained

---

202 Message of Governor H. H. Haight to the California State Assembly, 8 December 1869, in Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly, 18th session (Sacramento: D. W. Gelwicks, 1870), 55. While most boosters encouraged immigration in order to gain a population of white farming families, Charles Pickett opposed any aid to immigrant societies because he feared it would lead to a population of “Malayans, Mongolians, and Nigritians.” See Charles E. Pickett, Protest and Memorial against Granting Appropriation to the Immigration Aid Society (N.p., 1872), 3-5.
the “Chinaman had denied it to California.” Even worse, too many women, such as Louisiana Strentzel, relied on the Chinese men for kitchen help. Far from their female relatives, women in California searched for household help, relying on Indian girls, orphans, and Chinese men. An Alta reporter suggested women should take advantage of various immigration schemes, such as the one of Mrs. M. E. Parker, an Englishwoman. Mrs. Parker proposed to bring young “gentlewomen” to the state because the absence of domestic help imposed a “burden there on the housewife, who is obliged to resort to the help of Chinamen, which is not without serious disadvantages.” As Mrs. Parker demonstrated, men were not the only Californians contending with labor shortages.

For that reason, female reformers entered the employment scene as watchdogs of young, working women. In 1884, “thoughtful” San Francisco citizens contributed to support a Girls’ Union, where girls awaiting work in private homes found all the proper amenities of a respectable home in the San Francisco Girls’ Union boarding house. The SFGU matrons supervised the process of hiring out working women. Central Pacific agents placed placards on their trains directing women to these houses if they required

203 Pacific Rural Press, 11 February 1888; “Chinese or Mongolian?” California Agriculturist, 1 September 1874.
204 On Indians as labor, see Albert Hurtado, “‘Hardly a Farm House—A Kitchen without Them’: Indians and White Households on the California Borderland Frontier in 1860,” Western History Quarterly 13 (July 1982): 245-70. For the use of Chinese labor, see “California House-Keepers and Chinese Servants,” Woman’s Journal, 2 September 1876. Few have written about California orphanages in respects to the orphans, discussing the elite women who supported them instead. Alice Mary Kennedy Lynch in 1857 went to the San Francisco orphan asylum to find a “girl” to help her with her household work. Alice Mary Kennedy Lynch, diary, 27 December 1857, typescript translation of original (French), BANC MSS C-F 13, Bancroft Library. More research needs to be done, but it is likely that more orphans were adopted for this purpose. California had a particularly high number of orphans, and county supervisors always looked for ways to reduce expenditures. In Chapter Five, I discuss how the supervisors balanced humane care of indigents and county expenses. For a treatment of San Francisco social welfare and the role of elite women: Mary Ann Irwin, “‘Going About and Doing Good’: The Politics of Benevolence, Welfare, and Gender in San Francisco, 1850-1880,” Pacific Historical Review 68 (August 1999): 365-96.
205 “Female Help for California,” Alta, 9 October 1887. See also, California Agriculturist, 1 September 1874.
work. In 1887, Mrs. C. E. Kinney of the Grange proposed to the state meeting that farm families could also benefit from an employment agency. She reminded the male grangers that the lack of hired help in the home was one of the “gravest questions which confronts the homes of this coast.” As an auxiliary to the SFGU, the Woman’s Immigration Bureau placed “intelligent, respectable girls, efficient in manual work” in farmers’ homes. Together the SFGU and the Grange had the ability to solve two problems; middle class women protected the interest of their working sisters, while helping families in the city and the country acquire domestic help.  

Female reformers demonstrated their concern for these two classes of women in a variety of organizations. During the 1880s, Grange women along with prominent women of the state established Pacific Coast branches of the Women’s Educational and Industrial Union, Woman’s Social Science Association, and a silk culture society. Jeanne Carr, Flora Kimball, Laura de Force Gordon, Elise W. Hittell, Clara Foltz, Sarah Knox-Goodrich, Mrs. A. A. Sargent, participated in one or more of these groups as well as the state suffrage society. While boosters entreated emigrants to choose California, these women attempted to ease the burdens of farmwives and thus make family based agriculture viable.

---

207 Woman’s Herald of Industry and Social Science Coöperator.
208 For the suffrage activities of these women, see Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and Matilda Joslyn Gage, eds., History of Woman Suffrage, vol. 3 (1881, reprint; New York: Arno Press, 1969), 749-66. Reform-minded women in California discussed the peculiar labor problems of their adopted state, yet, at the same time, they followed the eastern models of middle-class reformers in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia. Alice Kessler-Harris, Out to Work: A History of Wage-Earning Women in the United States (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 86-92; For the WEIU, see Report of the Women’s Educational and Industrial Union for the Year Ending May 3, 1881 (Boston: n.p., 1881). There are two dissertations on the topic of the Boston WEIU, but few, if any, scholars mention the California branch. The wives of Warren Ewer (editor of Pacific Rural Press), A. A. Sargent (state senator), and E. W. Steele (dairyman and
Benevolent women were as concerned about farm families as other boosters. Several grange women joined Warren B. Ewer to form the California Silk Culture Association, which became known as the “Ladies’ Silk Culture Association” to their contemporaries. As editor of the Pacific Rural Press, Ewer lent his agricultural knowledge and promotional power to the cause while the women did much of the organizational work. The silk society members promoted silk culture as an economic solution to faltering family economies. In theory, farmwives, with the assistance of their children, would raise silk worms from eggs until the worms reached the cocoon stage. Silk worms needed constant tending, an expensive proposition in a state with severe labor shortages. Farmwives, however, had “extra” time to use between chores, in which they might feed and care for the worms. Women’s maternal instincts prepared these women, of course, to raise silk worms: “Every element of motherly care and prudence is needed in rearing the silk-worm,” reported the secretary of the group. The silk women promoted sericulture as a home product akin to poultry or buttermaking which brought cash into many farm homes for years.

While the silk organization sounds like a farce in retrospect, the women involved were committed to its success. Jeanne Carr, for example, expended quite a bit of energy on its behalf. She wrote numerous articles for the Pacific Rural Press, raised her own
worms, and showed worms and their silk at various agricultural fairs.\textsuperscript{209} Other women in the group raised worms as well, but more than that they sent eggs and instructions to women all over the state. Members of the silk society invested their time to help farm families and the state economy. At national exhibitions, women sent their silk productions as one of the many products to be raised in California. Western states, including California, sent delegations to these national fairs to advertise their lands as destinations for emigrants, using farm products as proof of economic viability.

Because of their efforts in agricultural and labor organizations, a number of middle-class farm women became state boosters indirectly. As representatives of the Grange, Carr, Kimball, and Kinney searched for ways to help average farmwives with their work. But these women also fostered the interests of California because they too wanted a prosperous, settled state. Male grangers figured prominently in the booster activities that might be considered a part of the public sphere. Frank Kimball, for example, sold land and promoted the area of National City. He raised olives, wrote for the local papers about olive culture, and participated in agricultural fairs, all of which demonstrated the location’s fecund soil and Mediterranean-like climate. His wife, Flora Kimball, participated in the more social aspects within the silk society, temperance organizations, and civic groups to plant trees. Female grange leaders worked to guarantee a moral, social health in the state, balancing the work of male boosters.

\textsuperscript{209} Jeanne Carr served as the assistant superintendent of instruction under husband Ezra Carr and in several state Grange offices. Carr wrote articles on botany and made speeches at Grange meetings and the annual Teachers' Institute. She may have been one of the most well known, “respectable” women in the state and was respected for her horticultural knowledge. Her reputation served to bolster the silk organization as much, if not more, than Ewer’s support.
Californians wanted to attract farm families, and boosters constructed the state in words and deeds to do so.

In conclusion, California’s boosters attempted to rework the state’s image into a “haven for small farmers.” It had received bad press as miners came home “disgusted” and “discouraged” and because settlers faced obstacles regarding land tenure and the strange, new climate. Despite these problems, state residents continued to advertise the land of promise to white Americans and western Europeans willing to transform the single man’s mining frontier into a land of homes and gardens. Promoters cajoled working people and admonished loafers, all in attempt to attract the “right kind of population” and make California into an agricultural paradise. Agriculture promised economic prosperity, while rural communities would harbor the morals and good behavior guaranteed by neighbors keeping an eye on one another. These were the hopes of the boosters, mostly based on the fact that families did settle in California. They witnessed incoming men, women, and children as they sowed and reaped the harvests of California’s countryside.
CHAPTER 3. SEASONS OF WORK: MEN, WOMEN, AND CHILDREN ON THEIR FARMS

In May 1850, James Campbell left his beloved wife and newborn child in Illinois to join a wagon train headed for the gold mines of California. Along the way, he saw several graves of those who died going west for farms and for gold. One of these headstones indicated one of his relatives, Margaret A. Campbell, died in 1846 while on the trail. In addition to his mournful passing of abandoned graves, he experienced the typical strains and stresses of westering. By September, this not-so-young man of 38 years reached California. He prospected for gold on the Bear River, sold cattle that he brought with him, and pined for his wife. Within eight days, Campbell became so discouraged with mining that he walked from the mines in Nevada County to the pueblo of “San Josa” at the south end of the San Francisco Bay. Gold miners generally knew little about the coastal outposts of California where the Spanish had established missions and pueblos. Campbell traveled to San Jose in Santa Clara County because his uncle William lived and farmed there. The Illinois farmer gave up digging gold and hauling dirt for digging potatoes and hauling wood, but he expected to live among family and to get a fair wage for his work.210

By the 1880s, Santa Clara County and other coastal counties gained a reputation for fruit growing and unsurpassed agricultural fecundity, yet it was the area’s early

---

210 James Campbell, diary, 1850-1852, microfilm, BANC MSS C-F 107 FILM, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley; David W. Jackson, Direct Your Letters To San Jose: The California Gold Rush Letters and Diary of James and David Lee Campbell, 1849-1852 (Kansas City, Mo.: The Orderly Pack Rat, 2000), 1-27; Phil Norfleet, “Biographical Sketch of William Campbell (1793-1885) of Santa Clara, California,” available online at http://philnorf.tripod.com/william.htm, accessed 4 May 2006. James traveled with his brother, David Lee. The two brothers decided to go to the gold mines, like so many other American men, to pay debts at home. Their parents had a significant mortgage on the family homestead in Clayton, Adams County, Illinois.
arrivals who made this reputation possible. Families such as the Campbells started settling in the coastal counties in the 1840s, and additional family members joined them in the 1850s and 1860s because of the gold rush and to reunite kin from other farming states. They formed family based networks, which supported their economic and social activities. In the following decades, residents, visitors, and immigrants recognized Sonoma, Santa Clara, and Monterey counties as agricultural districts established and fostered by early settlers. One booster reminded people of farmers’ efforts over 25 years:

“a few men, called enthusiasts by some, crazy by others, began to farm and plant orchards in the valleys, and make homes, and grew rich; many of them are still among us,—agricultural pioneers in each county of the State.”

These enthusiastic coastal county farmers produced diverse crops and depended on the labor of family members, neighbors, and hired men while contemporaries enamored with gold read and discussed the events taking place in the mountains of the mineral districts.

---

211 “California for Homes,” Commercial Herald Annual Review (San Francisco), 13 January 1881 reprinted in Madden, The Lands of the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, 46. Historian Ian Tyrrell states that “Fruit growing prospered initially because its promoters saw horticulture as a foundation for the ideal society” (Tyrrell 9). While boosters promoted the “moral dimension” of horticulture (see chapter 2 and 4 of this project), agriculturalists raised fruit based on the market and climate and later used the social and cultural benefits as additional selling points. Tyrrell also virtually ignores the importance of early settlers’ contributions to horticulture. While he is correct in saying that agriculturalists and boosters disapproved of the wheat trade as a dominate market force in California, they rarely promoted fruit culture without urging growers to raise subsistence items as well. More than just disliking the wheat trade, boosters wanted to eliminate the speculative attitude toward farming, which meant diversification not switching from one monoculture to another. One booster called monoculture “The Wicked One-Crop Idea” (Ellis 22). Ian Tyrrell, True Garden of the Gods: Californian-Australian Environmental Reform, 1860-1930 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999); Wilson R. Ellis, ed., The Resources of San Joaquin County (Stockton, Calif.: Wilson R. Ellis, 1886). See contemporary accounts about the changes in coastal counties: Santa Clara Valley, April, May, June, and July 1885, Hall’s Land Journal, July 1876, March 1877, July 1877; Jerome Madden, The Lands of the Southern Pacific Railroad Company (San Francisco: Land Agent of the S.P.R.R. Co., 1883), 36-37.

212 Farm families hired additional labor, at times, depending on Chinese and Indian labor. Quite a bit of research has been done on the abuse of non-white laborers, see especially Richard Steven Street, Beasts of the Field: A Narrative History of California Farmworkers, 1769-1913 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004); Albert L. Hurtado, Indian Survival on the California Frontier (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988); David Igler, Industrial Cowboys: Miller & Lux and the Transformation of the West, 1850-1920.
boring farm, made titillating news in the early years of California statehood. As gold miners extracted “color” from the hills, farmers identified viable crops for the foothills and valleys of the agricultural counties, and these producers learned more about the climate and soil. Historians have identified the economic activities of large-scale operators and “capitalists,” including Miller & Lux and various citrus growers, yet few scholars have paid attention to the daily lives of small-scale, family farmers working in the same communities. Family farmers and entrepreneurial men fostered markets together, 

213 I also consider the following counties in my analysis of coastal farmers when sources are available: Napa, Lake, Mendocino, Marin, Contra Costa, Alameda, Solano, San Mateo, Santa Cruz, San Benito, and San Luis Obispo. Very few farmers settled in the more southern, drier counties, and they pursued ranching and farming differently since they were the farthest from state markets and needed irrigation. This changed in the late 1880s and early 1890s with rate competition between several railroad companies, often referred to as the “Boom of the Eighties.” See Glenn S. Dumke, The Boom of the Eighties in Southern California (San Marino: Huntington Library, 1963). Both Humboldt and Del Norte are northern, coastal counties, but I have little evidence for farm families in these areas. For information on families in the southern counties, see Philip Charles Fedewa, “Abel Stearns in Transitional California, 1848-1871” (Ph.D Diss., University of Missouri, 1970); Anne Foster Baird, “The Wolfskills of Winters,” Pacific Historian 21 (Winter 1977): 351-58; Donald E. Rowland, John Rowland and William Workman: Southern California Pioneers of 1841 (Spokane, Wash.: Arthur H. Clark Co., 1999); Alan Rosenus, General M. G. Vallejo and the Advent of the Americans (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1995); Paul R. Spitzer, “To Seduce and Confuse: The Rowland-Workman Expedition of 1841,” Southern California Quarterly 80 (Spring 1998): 31-46.

214 See for example: Igler, Industrial Cowboys; Steven Stoll, The Fruits of Natural Advantage Making the Industrial Countryside in California (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998); Douglas Cazaux Sackman, Orange Empire: California and the Fruits of Eden (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005); Anthea Marie Hartig, Citrus Growers and the Construction of the Southern California Landscape, 1880-1940 (Ph.D Diss., University of California, Riverside, 2001); H. Vincent Moses, “G. Harold Powell and the Corporate Consolidation of the Modern Citrus Enterprise, 1904-1922” Business History Review 69 (summer 1995): 119-155; Lawrence Shepard, “Cartelization of the California-Arizona Orange Industry, 1934-1981” Journal of Law and Economics 29 (April 1986): 83-123. While many historians have failed to see the impact of family farmers in the state, residents and local history buffs documented the simple lives of their ancestors and community pioneers. I have relied on their small-press publications and genealogical websites to fill in many gaps regarding chain migration, work, and social activities. In some cases, information about various families, such as the Cockrills and Fulkersons, is only available via family websites. I would like to thank Larry Wendt for his permission to use the data collected by him for his webpages, see “The Fulkerson Family of Sonoma County,” http://cotati.sjsu.edu/fulkerson/Home.html and
attracting new settlers and investors to these areas. Families, however, created rural communities in which they combined the economic functions of the farm with the social roles of home and community. Californians adapted their agricultural pursuits and divisions of labor but also retained more traditional rural lifeways such as sharing work in social settings, “visiting,” and raising subsistence foods. Many California farms represented both home and work for these people who desired comfortable lives over hardscrabble ones, and, therefore, appreciated access to markets and the concomitant cash income. In California, investors built infrastructure for the processing and transportation of commercial crops, and in some areas this worked to the advantage of even the most diverse, small-scale farmers. It was the combination of capital investment and settlers that made the agricultural districts prosper.

Californians had some distinct disadvantages when it came to creating a thriving agricultural sector, a fact not lost on the state’s boosters. California’s remote location and problems with land titles frustrated farmers, who often did not have the capital to surmount these obstacles. David Jacks exemplifies a vilified land grabber upon which many local farmers depended because had the resources to invest in the land and transportation networks of Monterey County. Jacks owned much of the acreage around the towns of Monterey and Salinas. While he only obtained about 4,000 acres under the


Investments made by Jacks attracted settlers and kept transportation routes busy with his commerce and theirs. During the 1860s and 1870s, newcomers and old miners migrated toward the coastal counties, finding superior land, news of which brought additional buyers and drove up land values. Dairyman William Bardin witnessed farmers selling improved land for $35 per acre in 1869 and numerous squatters invading David Jacks’s property in that same year. A few years later, booster L. L. Paulson reported to prospective immigrants that land in the Salinas River Valley was so rich, owners sold it at $125 per acre, yet it could be rented at $8-20 per acre. No matter what the prices, farmers moved to Monterey County and soon fretted over high freight charges controlled by the Southern Pacific Railroad. Someone proposed a locally built and operated line to move goods north. In order to build the proposed Monterey and Salinas Valley Railroad,
Jacks sent agents out to the farmers to buy stock. One of Jacks’ hands reported to his employer that “We have sent Quintel up the Valey among the dutch and Ford down among the blue bellied yankeys. We are going to send John Abbott after Barden tomorrow. The Grangers will buy scrip many of them being renters.” Clearly Jacks orchestrated the funding and building of the railroad, yet a local booster recorded it as a “road built by the people for the people, to contend with the great and powerful monopoly.” As the president of the railroad, Jacks helped the farmers but also helped himself as he would have been subject to the same rates controlled by the Southern Pacific. His relationship to Monterey County farmers was more complicated but better understood by his contemporaries. His foes disparaged him for his use of Chinese labor or greedy land deals, and yet many residents took advantage of the capital he invested in the area.\footnote{The Handbook of Monterey and Vicinity (Monterey: Walton and Curtis, 1875), 60; L. L. Paulson, Hand-Book and Directory of Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Mateo Counties (San Francisco: Francis and Valentine, 1875), 250; William Bardin to John C. Holmes, 25 May 1869 and William Bardin to Elizabeth Bardin (Mrs. J. H. McDougal) 11 November 1869, typescript copies in James Bardin, Diary of a Pioneer, transcript, BANC MSS C-F 229, Bancroft Library; various unsigned and undated letters, folder “Threatening Letters”; payments to charities, folder “Personal: Contributions to religious work, 1895-1904,” box 1, Family Papers; misc. letters, folder 1857-68, folder 1869, folder 1872, box 1 John Abbott and William Robson to Miss Jacks and Robert McKee, 16 March 1874, folder 1874, box 2, Correspondence (loose), 1857-1872, Papers of David Jacks, ca. 1845-1926, Huntington Library.}

When David Jacks disembarked at Monterey for the first time in January 1850, he found a small village with a mixed population, representing the events of the last ten years. Monterey had been the capital of Mexican Califormia and one of the focal points of the war (1846-1848). Prior to 1846, Californios lived peacefully among American merchants of the hide and tallow trade and not so peacefully with local Indians who labored on ranchos and at the missions. Even though Alta California’s population lived in these coastal outposts, the numbers of residents seemed small to Americans. L. L.
Paulson described San Jose prior to American annexation as backward and under-populated due to the Spanish and Mexican influence: “The growth of San Jose was as slow and gradual as even a Mexican could desire, unless, indeed, he would prefer a perfect stand-still.” Nonetheless, Mexican colonists traded their hides and tallow for food and goods in the towns of Los Angeles, Monterey, San Jose, and Sonoma, where Yankee merchants sold their wares to rancheros. Moreover, mission fathers raised fresh fruit and vegetables for pueblo residents. Other coastal areas, initially founded by the Spanish missionaries, also attracted American farmers, the Campbells outside of San Jose, for instance. Wagon trains brought large extended families of Americans who knew nothing of gold and accepted the Mexican government begrudgingly. During the Mexican period, most of the inhabitants of Alta California lived near the pueblos and missions on the coasts, whether they were Mexican, American, Indian, or European.218

The Campbells and their wagon train, which included three other family groups, arrived in 1846, just before several battles of the Mexican American War. William Campbell emigrated from Missouri with his neighbors to find new land but volunteered to fight against Mexico. By 1847, he retired to a 160-acre farm near the former Mexican pueblo and soon to be American town of San Jose.219 Despite Paulson’s racist interpretation of coastal development, the pueblos and missions provided an infrastructure on the otherwise deserted coast that attracted American families before and after the gold rush. In San Jose, William Campbell found good, arable land and some


work as a surveyor for the town’s alcalde (mayor) to sustain his family before the first crop was realized. When his nephew relocated to the coast, James became the newest member of a larger community transplanted from the agricultural state of Missouri.

Similarly, the Gregson family moved to the pueblo of Sonoma and their residence later inspired a chain migration of families to what later became Sonoma County. James Gregson and his wife, Eliza, initially emigrated from England, landing first in Rhode Island. After some deliberations, they went west to Illinois for several years and then to Oregon, the latter being a more popular destination in 1845 than California. As a blacksmith, James Gregson had skills John Sutter needed at his fort, and Sutter helped the transplanted English family to make one last major removal. Sutter contracted Gregson to blacksmith at his new mill being built by James Marshall on the American River. At that point, no one knew of gold, only the prospect of more American families settling the agricultural regions of the California frontier. Yet when Hubert Howe Bancroft, the state’s first notable historian, interviewed Gregson, Bancroft only wanted details to

---

220 The Campbell, Aram, Finley, and Whisman families originally started with the wagon train which included the infamous Donner Party. The original train included 63 wagons carrying 288 men, women, and children. They herded 700 cattle and 150 horses along the trail. Asa W. Finley and his family operated farms in proximity to one another as can be seen in James Campbell’s diary, and Joseph Aram also settled in San Jose to farm. For more about William Campbell and Santa Clara County in the 1840s and early 1850s, see Lorie Garcia, “The Immigrants Who Built Santa Clara” in Telling the Santa Clara Story: Sesquicentennial Voices ed. Russell K. Skowronek (Santa Clara: City of Santa Clara and Santa Clara University, 2002), 93-104; David W. Jackson, ed., Direct Your Letters to San Jose: The California Gold Rush Letters and Diary of James and David Lee Campbell, 1849-1852 (Kansas City, Mo.: The Orderly Pack Rat, 2000); Jeanette Watson, Campbell: The Orchard City (Campbell, Calif.: Campbell Historical Museum Association, 1989); Joseph Aram to Daniel H. Wright, 9 March 1849 and Peter Y. Cool to Abram Cool, 9 June 1855, Aram Family Papers, 1835-1912, Huntington Library; Mary McDougal Gordon, “‘This Italy and Garden Spot of All America’: A Forty-Niner’s Letters from the Santa Clara Valley in 1851,” Pacific Historian 29 (Spring 1985): 5-16. The Campbells emigrated from Saline County, Missouri, one of the “Little Dixie” counties edging the Missouri River. For a description of markets and life in Little Dixie, see R. Douglas Hurt, Agriculture and Slavery in Little Dixie (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1992). Edwin McReynolds downplayed the emigration of Missourians to California, focusing, rather, on areas such as Texas and Oregon and the impact of the trail trade. Edwin C. McReynolds, “New Bonds of the West,” chap. 8 in Missouri: A History of the Crossroads State (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1962), 137-62.
document the gold rush story. Bancroft collected data from interviews of California pioneers, but generally focused on documenting California’s spectacular moments and success stories, especially the gold rush and large-scale agricultural enterprises. Bancroft envisioned a land full of grand potential and hardy adventurers. Eliza Gregson, however, told another story, one that Bancroft or the county historians found too banal to print—days of hard work and little comfort that underlay these impressive tales told by men.\(^{221}\)

In her version, Eliza Gregson recorded the more personal aspects of their removals and settlement in California. On the back of old bills and scraps of paper, Eliza Gregson documented her version of events in rambling, misspelled text. She wrote about escaping the “fever & auger” in Illinois and lamented the effects of malaria: “we could make a good living if we could only keep from shaking.” By moving to these agricultural regions, the Gregsons sought out an ordinary way of life for themselves and Eliza’s mother, brother, and sister. It was only by chance that they arrived in California just prior to the discovery of gold. James Gregson took advantage of the moment by digging for gold and making picks and drills for incoming miners. Eliza and the “wemen folks” did the same, sewing up overalls to sell. Unfortunately, several family members fell ill, and the Gregsons needed to get away from the mining districts.\(^{222}\)

In a desperate situation, Eliza needed to work while her husband and daughter recovered, which, in part, sent them to the former Mexican pueblo of Sonoma. There she took in sewing and laundry from Californio and non-Mexican families.\(^{223}\) By 1850, the


\(^{223}\) Eliza Gregson mentioned several families, including the Brunners (Swiss) and the Carrigers (Americans). Gregson, “Memory,” in *The Gregson Memoirs*, 15. See Florence Murphy, “Brunner House”
Gregsons lost much of their wealth in gold, and finally decided to move onto a ranch in the nearby Analy Township for greater financial stability. Mitchell Gilliam and Lancaster Clyman joined the Gregsons within a few months, bringing children and more women to the area known as Green Valley. These neighbors helped the Gregsons through illness and poor crops, a natural response to crisis by rural community members. Moreover, Lancaster Clyman hired a young man named Thomas Butler as a ranch hand, and Butler worked diligently on Clyman’s ranch until he started his own farm to support his new bride, a Gregson girl. The Gregsons, Clymans, and Gilliams all encouraged relatives to join them and made settlement comfortable for non-family members during this period. By 1855, farm families put in rudimentary houses and planted a few crops in Green Valley and other Sonoma areas.

---

224 Both Mitchell Gilliam and Lancaster Clyman are listed in the 1850 agricultural census. Gilliam’s farm included 5 horses, 1 ass/mule, 19 dairy cows, 9 oxen, 20 other cattle, and 15 swine. Clyman owned about a quarter of the livestock.

225 James Gregson, in 1850, owned one horse and seven swine. His sister-in-law, Ann Marshall, on the next acreage cared for eight head of cattle and seven swine.

226 Gregson, “Memory,” in The Gregson Memoirs, 2-17; Jonas Turner, related to Gilliam, brought his family to the area and settled on a 160-acre farm, a typical size plot for the area. Thirty-one of Turner’s 39 neighbors owned acreages between 81 and 160 acres in 1860. Keep in mind that historians rely on census bureau tabulations to compute average farm size in California. Historian Victoria Saker Woeste demonstrates the difference between “average” farm size and median farm sizes. In 1860, census officials reported average farm size for California as 622 acres while Woeste’s own count of median farm sizes placed most farmers on 235-acre plots. Throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, California’s average farm size was high compared to national figures but was skewed by a number of very large operations. In 1900, scholar David Vaught notes that about three-quarters of the state’s farms had less than 174 acres even though the average farm size for that year was reported as 400 acres. This trend may have continued throughout the century. In 1997, the average farm size for California was 374 acres as reported by the Agricultural Issues Center at U.C. Davis, yet 75 percent of California farms in 1997 had 180 or fewer acres. Victoria Saker Woeste, “Land Monopoly, Agribusiness, and the State: Discovering the Family Farm in Twentieth-Century California,” in The Countryside in the Age of the Modern State: Political Histories of Rural America, ed. Catherine McNicol Stock and Robert D. Johnston (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), 76; David Vaught, Cultivating California: Growers, Specialty Crops, and Labor, 1875-1920 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1999), 3; Agricultural Issues Center, The Measure of California Agriculture, 2000, p. 22, Available on AIC website at http://aic.ucdavis.edu/pubs/1.3.pdf, accessed 5 July 2006. California’s various micro-climates make it difficult for agricultural scholars to generalize about farms statewide. For rural historians interested in California, the median, not average, farm sizes of specific
These families chose Sonoma County based on a variety of considerations. They needed good soil, lumber for fuel and housing, and neighbors for support during difficult times. The pueblo of Sonoma attracted families in the 1840s, but used the town as a jumping off point in their search for homesteads. They specifically chose to live in proximity to the Mexican town to take advantage of its transportation networks, stores, and markets as limited as they were. Charles Von Geldern, who arrived in 1849, described the place as a headquarters for the emigrants of 1846 and as the principal place of business north of San Francisco. A few shops encircled the plaza in the center of the town of Sonoma. Storekeepers supplied goods to locals, and they imported merchandise from San Francisco via a sailing vessel, which docked at the “Embarcadero” on the coast. These were small efforts to maintain an outpost, but ones that funneled new settlers to nearby valleys.²²⁷

Individuals and family groups eventually joined early families in the pueblo and surrounding countryside. Thus “chain migration” reunited kin from distant states such as Missouri, Kentucky, Illinois, and Oregon. Ironically, settlers created rural communities in the northern coastal counties at a time when the gold rush refocused most people’s attention on the mountainous regions of inland California. Americans, Europeans, Mexicans, Australians, and the Chinese, among others, read accounts of gold extraction communities should be considered in order to describe their actual work and lifestyle. The anonymous booster who produced the Sonoma County and Russian River Valley Illustrated stated there was a “small settlement in Green Valley” and downplayed the number of families there in order to 1) draw a picture outsider might recognize, i.e., that gold attracted Americans to California, and 2) demonstrate the progress of the area due to the “ordinary diligence and prudence” of the hard working farmer. Sonoma County and Russian River Valley Illustrated (San Francisco: Bell & Heymans, 1888), 3; Lavinia Pearl Butler Robbins, Memoirs of Lavinia Pearl Butler Robbins, 1882-1972,” 1972, BANC MSS 73/122c:102, Bancroft; Sarepta A. Ross, “Recollections of a Pioneer,” 1914, BANC MSS C-D 5152, Bancroft.²²⁷ Charles Von Geldern, “Early History of Sonoma County” in Sonoma Sketches, 8-9; Frederick G. Blume ran a store out of one of Vallejo’s buildings. Biography of Frederick Gustavus Blume in History of Sonoma County (San Francisco: Alley, Bowen & Co., 1880), 484-86.
and life in the mines. Once in the diggings, men of many lands scrambled for gold without knowing or caring much for the distant, fog-enshrouded hamlets. Not too long after, some miners learned of places like Green Valley or San Jose and abandoned the soulless mines for homes and communities.228

In addition to the families coming to farm in the 1840s and early 1850s, individuals who initially wanted to take advantage of the mining boom also settled in the coastal counties. Disgruntled miners and laborers left the mining towns and camps to buy farms and live among families. Stephen L. and James E. Fowler exemplify how “miners” ended up on coastal county farms. In 1849 the Fowler boys left New York, following the route taken by thousands of other men to California. Seven months later, the scurvy-ridden passengers and crew of the Brooklyn docked in San Francisco. The Fowler brothers entered the single man’s frontier as weary bachelors, unable to go to the mines or remain idle for too long. In order to restore their health and capital, they stayed in San Francisco to build the infrastructure needed to support the city during the boom. During 1850 and 1851, they mined and built the foundations of provisioning towns along the Yuba and Feather rivers. Stephen, the diarist of the two, documented how the two suffered from the chills and fevers of malaria while trying to learn the physical and economic landscapes of gold rush California. Stephen lamented during these trials: “If I should succeede in makeing [sic] a fortune in this country I may at some future time get a wife if I am not to old and ugly.” Finally, a construction job led them to the Bodega

---

Township located on the coast of Sonoma County. There they decided to settle, and these miners-carpenters turned to farming with renewed hope for starting families.\textsuperscript{229}

Families who came to California for gold also ended up in agricultural areas where they joined rural communities. While the Fowlers mined in 1849 and 1850, their future neighbors made decisions which eventually led them to Sonoma County. In Iowa Rebecca Nutting’s father decided to relocate the family to California. The Nuttings imagined that just two years in the mines would solve their economic troubles in Iowa. In May 1850, father Nutting loaded wagons with provisions and started the long haul with his wife and children. They crossed over seemingly endless trails through the plains, forded rivers, and traversed the Sierra Nevadas. They eventually ended up on the Bear River, boarding lumbermen in tents and gardening on ten acres. Lumber fueled the economic boom of the gold rush by providing wood for dams and flumes in the mountains and for building in towns where miners spent their money. At the camp, Rebecca fell in love with the man renting the mill, George Woodson, and in April 1852 they wedded there in the California mountains. The Nuttings had planned to stay in California for just two years, but their plans changed once they started mining and lumbering. Not able to achieve their goals, the Nuttings and families similar to them reconsidered their futures. Another Iowan directed the Nutting-Woodson clan to Blume Grant in Analy Township where they settled near the Fowlers and several other miners-turned-farmers.\textsuperscript{230}


\textsuperscript{230} By 1860, the Woodson household numbered eleven: George, Rebecca, their five children, and four siblings. Rebecca Hildreth Nutting Woodson, “A Sketch in the Life of Rebecca Hildreth Nutting Woodson,” 1909, BANC MSS C-D 5140, Bancroft. Settlers commonly referred to the land in the Analy
Soon after the Woodsons made their home in the rolling hills of Analy Township, several Missouri families moved onto nearby homesteads. Larkin D. Cockrill and his family emigrated from the area known as Pleasant Gap in Bates County, Missouri. In 1853, the “Hagans-Cockrill Wagon Train” left the swampy lands in thirty wagons, including 125 people leading 3,000 head of cattle. More than thirty members of the Cockrill extended family made the 6-month trip, and Larkin’s family alone made up thirteen with his wife, seven daughters, and four sons. Young Cockrill men and women married into several of the Fulkerson, Hagans, and McReynolds families who were a part of this migration. Moreover, the settlement of Larkin Cockrill’s family in Analy Township changed the lives of the Fowler brothers and the Woodson couple. Stephen Fowler married a Cockrill girl, and Rebecca Woodson was relieved to have several women to keep her company. She sewed and visited with her new neighbors almost every day.\textsuperscript{231}

\textsuperscript{231} Towniship as the “Blume Grant,” and eventually named one of the towns “Bloomfield.” Frederick G. Blume obtained the land as a part of the Canada de Pogolimi land grant owned by his wife Maria Antonio Caseres Dawson, widow of James Dawson. Settlers purchased land around the towns of Freestone and Bloomfield located on land from this grant. The southwestern area of Sonoma County was also covered under the Estero Americano grant owned by James McIntosh, later sold to Jasper O’Farrell. Vallejo supposedly invited Dawson, McIntosh, and James Black to settle the area as a buffer between the Mexican settlements and the Russians at Fort Ross. “Frederick Gustavus Blume,” \textit{History of Sonoma County} (San Francisco: Alley, Bowen & Co., 1880), 484-86; “Freestone,” \textit{Historical and Descriptive Sketch of Sonoma County, California} (Philadelphia: L. H. Everts & Co., 1877), 97-98. Plenty of farmers squatted on these lands as well. A county historian noted that “The title to the land was not very good, and many of them were merely squatters.” \textit{History of Sonoma County}, 172. The enumerators for the census in 1860 documented dozens of farmers in the Analy Township who claimed no land. These individuals were probably squatters waiting for the purported owners of the various grants to get their titles confirmed by the land commission. “William Canfield,” \textit{History of Sonoma County}, 470-73.

These complex, interconnected relationships are difficult enough to follow in this example of one, small community. This explains, in part, why they have been lost in the historical record. These people, however, created familiar rural communities even though they established them in such an unfamiliar landscape. Before moving to Sonoma County, the Cockrill family and their relatives lived on several frontiers. The Cockrills started in South Carolina, moved to Kentucky and then Missouri. In each place, they improved farms before selling them and used the funds to buy new farms on the next frontier. The Cockrills hoped to do better than in the last place, and in the process they created a small community through intermarriage, a community they brought with them and expanded in California. Once on the Pacific Coast, Cockrill men and women married into a dozen or more families in Sonoma and Monterey counties. For the Cockrills and other westward moving families, California presented unanticipated obstacles, but these families reacted to new conditions by relying on their kin, a time proven strategy of survival.

---

232 When discussing a social history of farmwomen in California, Joan Jensen told me that it was too much work to travel all over the state to reconstruct their lives and that I could “have them.” Conversation, Western History Association, Fort Worth, Texas, 10 October 2003.

233 For a treatment of how Kentuckians, Virginians, and Tennesseans adapted to and lived in Missouri, see Hurt, Agriculture and Slavery in Little Dixie. On arrival in Missouri, these families expected to endure a period of self-sufficiency until they had crops and markets at which point they balanced subsistence and market agriculture (7-13). In the counties of “Little Dixie,” land sold for $6-40 per acre in the late 1840s-early 1850s, giving these families the opportunity to sell out with enough cash to go to California (58). During this period, malaria and dysentery affected the health of Missouri families and soil-exhaustive agricultural techniques made for declining profits. These two factors sent so many Saline County families packing that observers expected the town of Marshall to die out (70-75). For Missourian expectations regarding climate and landscape, see also Conevery Bolton Valencíus, The Health of the Country: How American Settlers Understood Themselves and Their Land (New York: Basic Books, 2004). If Valencíus is correct about how Missourians understood the relationship between health and landscape, these settlers in California would have easily accepted Sonoma as a salubrious destination. In other words, they had similar expectations for California regarding markets and pursued those while hoping for better health in the hills of Sonoma County.
As a result of the migrations of families and young men, providers of goods and services—merchants, artisans, and peddlers—followed these settlements into the hills and valleys. Various mobile merchants scaled the hills of Sonoma to sell housewives items, including sewing needles and cloth, and accepted chickens, eggs, and butter in exchange. A young resident Sarepta Ross reminisced, “We people had to buy our dry goods from the small peddlers. They came about once a month with packs on their backs, some with horses packed, and some in wagons. They carried a full assortment of dry goods I assure you.” In the 1850s, peddlers and merchants were common sources for goods. John Morris remembered the reception he and his fellow peddlers received at various Sonoma homes. During the Civil War, “old lady Gillem” (Sarepta Ross’s aunt) chased a preacher/book seller out of her house, waving a broomstick and yelling “get out of here you abolitionist we don’t want any of your Black Republican pictures here.” Despite Henrietta Gilliam’s reaction, Morris found that most hill families had become accustomed to peddlers and were not all as hostile as the broom-yielding, Kentucky woman. Without peddlers and store keepers, families went without items they were unable to produce whether they were manufactured items or “exotic” products such as sugar and coffee.

Even for families able to get into town to stores, supplies were not always

---

234 Ross, “Recollections of a Pioneer”; Most likely, peddlers camped along the edges of farmers’ properties as did “emigrants” and later campers. Several peddlers in southwestern Sonoma County found feed for their animals and board with Stephen Fowler. See entries “For Keeping Pedlars” and purchases from peddlers in Stephen Lawrence Fowler, Journal of Stephen L. and James E. Fowler of East Hampton, Long Island, pp. 11-14, 30, 35, 42, typescript, vol. 2 (1852-1866), BANC MSS C-F 144, Bancroft. Additionally Richard Karr built his store in the Santa Cruz mountains in 1852 to meet the needs of settlers who were unable to travel to the valley regularly. Reginald R. Stuart, ed. “The Burrell Letters,” California Historical Society Quarterly 29 (March 1850): 42, 56n119.

235 John M. Morris, Book 7 (reel 2), no date, Diaries and Autobiography, 1885-1906, BANC MSS C-D 5209 FILM, Bancroft.
available in agricultural areas, and families made-do with what they had on the farm. The editor of the *California Farmer* published a recipe for “carrot coffee” in 1856, “which, if well prepared, is equal to that in common use.” Assuredly, families welcomed the day when they had greater access to dry goods. At times, frontier deprivation was more visible than others. Harriet Brush remembered growing up in the San Joaquin Valley in the 1850s, just over the hills from the coastal town of San Jose. Local merchants carried so little cloth that young sisters made dresses from the same bolts of calico. Teamsters hauled many goods from the coastal towns into the interior, but they focused on supplying miners, not farm girls. They also understood that families, not single men, predominately occupied the coastal areas, and thus took appropriate merchandise to Monterey, Sonoma, and Santa Clara counties.\(^{236}\)

Because many of these families were farm-poor with their capital invested in land, local businessmen also accepted barter for their goods and gave credit. Benjamin Joy and his family sold lumber, cord wood, and general merchandise to his neighbors. His ledgers show very little incoming cash, but many of his account holders “settled up” using eggs, butter, and chickens. Eventually coastal families produced surpluses to provide urban dwellers with fresh food and then paid merchants in cash. To transform from an exchange economy into a cash economy, farmers first had to master the climate.\(^{237}\)

\(^{236}\) *California Farmer*, July 25, 1856. Both Brush and Henry Mills remembered girls using wild grapevines to make hoops for their skirts to emulate San Francisco fashions. F. F. Latta, “Pioneers of the San Joaquin Valley,” folder 17, box 7(2) and “The Story of Henry Hammer Hills,” folder 7, Box 6(1), F. F. Latta “Sky Farming” Collection (uncataloged), Huntington Library.

\(^{237}\) Business ledger, vol. 1, T. B. Joy & Co. Records, 1854?-1934, BANC MSS 67/67c, Bancroft. Extant sources indicate that almost everyone in Sonoma pursued some type of safety-first agriculture during the 1850s and returned to raising more subsistence items during the Civil War. The Bodega blacksmith William Robinson fixed wagons and plows and raised some agricultural items on the side. Barter
California’s two seasons (wet and dry) befuddled the state’s miners-turned-farmers initially, but over time farmers learned the benefits of the climate and how to work within it. One booster tried to explain that the wet season was so called not because rain fell continuously “but because it does not fall at any other time.” More importantly for the farmer, he needed to know this was the season to start plowing and seeding. The ground became desiccated during the dry season, and the first rain made the ground friable for plowing. Boosters knew that reports of California’s peculiar weather and its agricultural implications reached the ears of prospective immigrants. Thus state promoters who desired an increased immigration of farm families gave honest information about the unpredictable rains. Author Titus Fey Cronise warned that there were several very wet months and several “somewhat fickle” ones. Yet, there were advantages to this climate, especially its low humidity, fewer thunderstorms, and a mildness, which meant that farm families did not need to prepare for cold winters. In most places, agricultural writers promised, stock could put on “good flesh” without shelter in the wet season, and animals were “wonderfully precocious and prolific.”

Whether or not California livestock exhibited more precociousness than eastern animals, the climate forced farmers to adopt new approaches to farming. Oren Cadwell who learned about California’s fruit friendly climate from the paper California Farmer

---

arrangements between neighbors—even customers and merchants—allowed families to have more diverse diets and get goods they needed even when cash poor. William Robinson, William Robinson day book no. 3, 1 June 1877-8 June 1878, BANC MSS 67/48c, Bancroft. Sarepta Ross remembered using barley and wheat to replace coffee and “did more patching and wore our clothes a good bit longer” because of the inflated cost of wool and cotton cloth during the war. Ross, “Recollections of a Pioneer”; June Morrall, Half Moon Bay Memories (El Granada, Calif.: Moonbeam Press, 1978), 99.

238 Immigration Association of California, California (San Francisco: Immigration Association of California, 1882), 8; Titus Fey Cronise, The Natural Wealth of California (San Francisco: H. H. Bancroft & Co., 1868) 15-21; “A Winter Scene in Summer Land” (engraving) and “Coming to California” (text), Pacific Rural Press, 1 April 1882.
took precautions to be prepared for starting his fruit orchard. Fruit trees and grape vines required several years of growth to fully mature. Smart growers understood that they needed more than a season to produce fruit crops, and thus families needed to provide their own food products and bring enough cash to survive until they could sell market crops. Cadwell and other immigrants arrived relatively prepared with information about the state’s climate if they intended to start farms. Conversely, miners came ill-equipped and without support to pursue agricultural operations.

While miners-turned-farmers attempted to make quick profits off of peripatetic miners, single men profited from community networks. In Sonoma County, Obadiah and Jared Hoag lived with the Woodsons who had recently relocated from the lumber camps, sharing domestic and agricultural spaces for everyone’s benefit. As families settled in the coastal counties, young men, such as the Hoag and Fowler boys married local women and set up their own homesteads. Stephen Fowler succeeded in running a subsistence- and market-oriented farm to support his family because, in part, he took the time to learn about the best types of crops for the area. For 14 years, he carefully recorded what he planted and the resulting yields. In the first few years, Fowler raised at least four types of wheat, most of which met his expectations although the Australian wheat turned out “somewhat smutty.” After Fowler married, profits from his wheat and other crops helped to buy household items, dress patterns for his wife, and “small shoes” for the children. In his journal, he intertwined the personal and domestic with the experiments he made to conquer the land. Boosters and agricultural newspaper men published agricultural advice to help farmers find solutions to new problems presented by California’s weather,

Woodson, “A Sketch in the Life.”
popular crops, and pests. Nonetheless, single and married farmers in the communities such as the Analy Township had safety nets provided by their subsistence products and their neighbors’ assistance, which allowed them to experiment.240

Fowler of Sonoma County and other California men raised a variety of products on their farms, some of which went to market or the family table. Yet historians, relying on the agricultural census, define the scope of men’s work in narrow terms. Scholars refer to farmers productions in terms of “trends” or “eras,” including cattle, grain, and fruit. The available statistics point to valid trends in California’s overall production, but they also obfuscate the diversity of crops planted by farmers in the 1850s and 1860s because enumerators had limited categories on census forms. Stephen Fowler raised wheat, barley, and dairy products and purchased trees and slips for his orchard, all during the course of the 1850s. To make matters even foggier, products for domestic use had no space on the forms and can only be documented in diaries and letters.241

240 James Warren ran the first agricultural paper, California Farmer, from 1854 to 1890. Warren Ewer, formerly an editor of a mining paper, took over the Pacific Rural Press founded in 1870-1871. Ewer acquired the California Granger in 1875. In that year, he had a total of 8,104 subscribers. Pacific Rural Press, 16 January 1875. These were the two statewide agricultural papers in the 19th century. There were, however, numerous regional and local agricultural papers, including the California Agriculturist, Rural Californian, and California Horticulturist and Floral Magazine. In addition, editors of local newspapers included agricultural information for the benefit their readers whether they were new or prospective settlers.

All of the families discussed to this point farmed diverse crops for subsistence and barter until they were able to determine types of crops were demanded in local markets. Nonetheless, many farmers continued raising subsistence items into the 1870s and 1880s. A Ventura County farmer, G. W. Faulkner, recorded a diverse production in 1882 during California’s fruit era. He cultivated corn, strawberries, alfalfa, barley, grapes, melons, garden vegetables, lima beans, potatoes, buckwheat, peaches, wheat, walnuts, and apples. In addition, he had at least one cow, some hogs, poultry, and a hive of bees. The Faulkner family ate these products, sold them in town, and shared them with friends at various church and group meetings. Well into the 1870s and 1880s, many coastal families continued this course in order to reduce risk and to decrease domestic expenses.242

**Men’s Work and the Market**

Many farm families pursued subsistence crops while experimenting with various market crops. In the coastal counties dairy became a popular production because of the climate and proximity to growing towns. Much of the coastal dairy lands of the nineteenth century are now occupied by winemakers and their grapevines, which makes it difficult for modern visitors to envision California’s winemaking regions as homes of farm families. In Sonoma County, for instance, numerous wineries are nestled in the rolling hills and small valleys of the area. Winemakers have remade the landscape, replacing its former diversity of native and planted flora with seemingly endless numbers of grapevines to the point that Sonoma is as much a tourist attraction as an agriculturally productive place. Monoculture, corporations, and contested labor systems have, almost

exclusively, displaced the diverse crops, farm homes, and family labor that once existed in these spaces.\footnote{Monterey County is also the home of thriving wineries, including J. Lohr Vineyards and Winery, Kendall-Jackson Wine Estates, and Blackstone Vineyards, among numerous others. In 2003, winemakers harvested 151,344 tons of grapes from 34,287 acres. See the Monterey Wines site for other figures at http://www.montereywines.org/wineries_acreage.html, accessed 24 Monterey 2006. Salinas and Watsonville have been better known for being the “Salad Bowl” of the country, where corporations utilized capital and labor to produce small fruits and vegetables for the nation. Miriam J. Wells, Strawberry Fields: Politics, Class, and Work in California Agriculture (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996); Burton Anderson, America’s Salad Bowl: An Agricultural History of the Salinas Valley (Monterey: Monterey County Historical Society, 2002). Other coastal counties have been urbanized, and a visitor to San Jose in 2006 is hard pressed to envision area as “the garden of the world” as described by nineteenth century residents. In 2004, Monterey County ranked third in agricultural production in the state $3.39 billion). “Summary of County Agricultural Commissioners’ Reports,” 2003-2004, page 5 available on the California Food and Agriculture Department website at http://www.nass.usda.gov/Statistics_by_State/California/Publications/AgComm/200410cavtb00.pdf, accessed 2 June 2006.}

It is difficult to imagine the diversity of plant life that flourished in the mid to late 1800s, but where tasting rooms and bistro now stand, farm homes with hen houses, dairy barns, and granaries signified the dual purpose of Sonoma farms as homes and businesses. Even Santa Rosa’s historian, Gaye Le Baron cannot see beyond the rhetoric of “factories in the field” to understand that subsistence agriculture was more than a pleasurable bucolic pursuit from the days of old. Le Baron wrote about Sonoma County’s early agriculture that “Farmers in the new state of California had little or no time to enjoy the comparative leisure of subsistence agriculture.” Subsistence agriculture, no doubt, was hard work, but it functioned as a mechanism to ensure survival on the smallest, frontier farms and on market-oriented family farms. It took decades for farmers to determine successful crops and techniques for every valley in the coastal counties, and farmers continued some domestic production even after establishing thriving market crops.\footnote{Gaye LeBaron, Santa Rosa, a Nineteenth Century Town (Santa Rosa, Calif.: Historia, Ltd., 1985), 56. Despite her description of a primarily speculative agriculture around Santa Rosa, Le Baron includes photos}
The coastal areas north of San Francisco became one of the first dominant dairy regions because of their proximity to the largest city in the state and the small but growing towns on the city’s periphery. Mexicans in pre-gold rush California had no need to pursue dairying for the market, and American census takers recorded less than $1,000 in butter and cheese produced in 1850. The gold rush, however, brought thousands of people to San Francisco for temporary and permanent residence. By 1860, San Francisco’s population grew to more than 50,000, reaching 200,000 over the next two decades. Farmers in the “butter and barley” districts of the mineral counties provided fresh milk and butter to mining camps and towns, but San Franciscans also needed access to perishable dairy items from nearby sources. Farmers in the counties of Sonoma and Marin started making butter and cheese for city dwellers in the 1850s. Eventually, dairymen established herds in other coastal counties as well. By the 1870s and 1880s, coastal farmers supplied San Francisco regularly with milk, butter, and cheese.

Dairymen in Sonoma and Marin took advantage of the best location for their businesses; good climate, proximity to the city, and transportation networks combined to benefit these producers. Before rail lines connected far flung communities to the major port cities, butter and cheesemakers expedited the delivery of their goods to San Francisco using the water routes along the Pacific and via internal rivers and bays. It was

\footnote{in her book that belie her portrayal. An 1890s dairy family is pictured on page 57 with several men and women of American or European descent milking cows on a small hillside farm.}

\footnote{James Warren reported that $1 million worth of butter and $500,000 worth cheese was still imported in 1858. \textit{California Farmer}, 12 February 1858. For a discussion of the dairy near mining camps, see chapter one of this project.}

\footnote{For descriptions and operations on Monterey dairy farms, see Bardin Family Papers at the Bancroft and The Handbook of Monterey and Vicinity (Monterey: Walton and Curtis, 1875). For Santa Clara County, see John Francis Pyle Diaries and Memorandum Books, 1874-1921, 60 v., Bancroft Library.}
easier for coastal dairymen in Sonoma to travel to San Francisco than to the county seat in Santa Rosa. Boats quickly moved goods down the coast while interior trips required horses to pull wagons over rough roads and rolling hills. Dairymen near the ocean used it for transportation, but the air coming off of the Pacific also moderated the temperature in these areas. One writer remarked that the ocean air tended to the “constant recuperation of the pasturage” which meant that cows grazed on native grasses during all months of the year instead of consuming cultivated hay. Additionally, cool summers and snowless winters obviated the need for shelters. Thus the “humid atmosphere” made this area the “favorite dairying district.”

Large-scale dairy operations received the most attention, but, in fact, California farmers ran various sized dairies, all of which should be considered together within a spectrum of size and labor relations. On one end of the spectrum, small-scale, family farmers milked ten to three hundred cows with the help of family members, neighbors,

---

247 Henry DeGroot, “Dairies and Dairying in California,” Overland Monthly 4 (April 1870): 355-60. Humboldt and Mendocino counties had similar climates but were too far from San Francisco. Smaller counties south of San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Cruz, had all of the same benefits, and a few dairymen did business there. Monterey and San Luis Obispo also became home to a number of dairymen, but this appears to have occurred in the 1870s. They may have had to supply more feed to their herds than dairymen in other locations. Overall, more dairymen lived in Sonoma and Marin than in other coastal counties in the period spanning the second half of the century. For information on San Joaquin Valley dairymen during the period, see Robert L. Santos, “Dairying in California through 1910,” Southern California Quarterly 76 (Summer 1994): 175-194. Santos divides the dairying districts into four regions. Only the area north of San Francisco avoided using irrigation to raise hay and storing hay for feed during the dry season. A Carmel Valley (Monterey County) farmer raised corn and pumpkins for extra feed during the summer. “Dairying in Monterey County,” Pacific Rural Press, 23 January 1875.

248 Small-scale operators may have rented land informally from rancho owners, and more research needs to done into these “hidden” farms. An example of this can be seen in The Handbook of Monterey and Vicinity (Monterey: Walton and Curtis, 1875). The author listed the work of various farmers he found as he traveled through the area. He mentioned a “second dairy farm” on the Haight Ranch. How many “farms” existed within this “ranch?” The agricultural and population censuses are only as useful as they were accurate, which means they often belie the true size of many farms. For the life of one boy on the Haight Ranch, see John McDougall, “Looking Back Down an Age Old Trail,” Salinas Index-Journal, 13, 19, 28 June 1930. Renting for new arrivals allowed settlers to farm immediately. L. L. Paulson reported that good farm land in the Salinas River Valley of Monterey County cost $125 per acre but rented for $8-20 per acre. Landowners also made share arrangements with family farmers. Paulson, Hand-Book and Directory of Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Mateo Counties. 250.
and a few hired men. On the other end of the spectrum, one finds the large-scale ventures
described by ebullient newspapermen and zealous boosters with thousands of cows eating
grass on large acreages. One writer described the land of the Shafter & Howard dairy as
an “extensive rancho.” To Californians, the term “rancho,” Spanish for ranch, suggested
an enterprise larger than a typical American farm. While acreage and numbers of cows
seemed to be valid indicators of regional prosperity to nineteenth-century readers, these
figures are not enough to explain the complexity of California dairying after the first
years of the gold rush. Daniel Heald, Oliver Allen, and the Steele family provide
examples of the spectrum of operations and families’ relationships to them.249

The small-scale, family farms in the coastal counties sufficiently supplied
comfortable lives for farm families as seen in Daniel Heald’s Sonoma County farm,
which relied on products sold in the town of Petaluma. In 1860, the census enumerators
indicated that he produced nothing of value, yet he supported his family while building
up the business part of the farm. He invested his mining wages into 160 acres, typical
among his Petaluma neighbors, and had improved 120 acres by that point.250 By 1870, in
addition to subsistence items, Heald worked 173 acres, making butter, raising fruit, and
harvesting wheat and barley.251 During the 1870s, George Heald, the oldest son, and

250 The 1860 agricultural census indicates that Heald owned 160 acres as did 14 of his neighbors. Of these
40 individuals, 14 owned less than 80 acres, 7 owned farms larger than 161 acres but not larger than 320
acres. Four indicated no acreage owned, squatting on private or government land. Six produced enough
butter for the market to warrant a record while all but two owned at least one cow. At this point, Heald
owned three dairy cows.
251 Heald mentioned buying plum trees in town, but may have had apples and peaches in the “old orchard.”
He also raised corn, beans, peas, pigs, and sheep. There were enough poultry on the property for domestic
use and to occasionally sell eggs in town. The family had a garden, which the wife and oldest daughter
probably tended along with the poultry since he rarely mentioned it. He fed his cattle barley and beets
raised on the farm along with “volunteer” grasses. Rodman W. Paul, “The Beginnings of Agriculture in
California: Innovation vs. Continuity,” California History Quarterly 52 (Spring 1973): 16-27. In his article,
“Frank,” the hired hand, assisted with the wheat, the cows, and other chores. During planting and harvesting, Heald’s workforce also labored on the farms of “Russel” and Parker Freeman who repaid the favor in kind. Like his labor exchanges, all of his economic transactions were characterized by personal relationships. He sold butter to a single elderly woman named Charlotte McCurdy and bought gooseberries from “Mock.” Much of Heald’s work took place in the fields, but he also went to Petaluma regularly to sell his goods to town residents. While he spent his time outdoors, the family lived and worked in the Heald house.252

In the farm house, Elizabeth Heald sewed for and fed the farm laborers, adding to the domestic economy. Additionally, she gardened and cared for the poultry, which also sustained the household with food for the table and cash for family purchases. Daniel Heald regularly took Elizabeth Heald’s eggs and chickens into town on days that he sold...
butter in Petaluma. By 1877, Daniel and Elizabeth Heald saved enough money to reorder the farm and home, building a house with a new butter cellar and several outbuildings.

The family used part of the home for these economic activities, but they also entertained the Mock and Freeman families. The Heald home, pictured in the 1877 county atlas, exemplified twenty-three years of industry and thrift; Heald built the Victorian-style house himself, hiring a carpenter and mason only to complete the finished work during the last stage of construction. The farm house’s parlor represented family leisure and social activities while the butter cellar and nearby hen house identified the pecuniary function of the place.²⁵³

In contrast to Heald’s small, family farm, Oliver Allen in Marin County ran a dairy on a larger acreage and marketed his products to a more far reaching market through San Francisco. Oliver Allen of Norwich, Connecticut, sailed around the Horn in 1849 to mine and returned to New England only briefly in 1854 to escort his wife and children to Marin County. In these early years, Allen and his two sons fenced lands, planted garden vegetables, and harvested grains, all in an attempt to provide food for the house while establishing a successful dairy. In 1862, John Quincy Adams Warren traveled through the area on assignment with the American Stock Journal and described

²⁵³ Daniel Gilman Heald, diaries, 1853-1854, 1868, 1871, 1876, 1877, BANC MSS C-F 91, Bancroft; Agricultural and Population Censuses, Petaluma, Sonoma County, California, 1850, 1860; Historical Atlas Map of Sonoma County, California (Oakland: Thos. H. Thompson & Co., 1877). Heald also kept sheep, hogs, and bees on his property. In 1870, he had 960 gallons of wine on hand. He probably did not make the wine himself but received it in exchange for grapes at a local winery. J. DeTurk’s winery in Santa Rosa (Sonoma County), for instance, credited growers for grapes, giving the producers cash or wine in exchange. The Sonoma County Farm raised grapes on its property sold to J. DeTurk, and in 1888, Poor Farm Superintendent C. W. Hawkins reported he sold more than 16 tons of brandy grapes to DeTurk and had a credit to date for more than 46 tons. The superintendent used cash sales for expenses of the indigent on the property and paid grape harvesters with wine. C. W. Hawkins, “County Farm Report,” November 1888, Bin 19, Row 10, Box 69, Sonoma County Poor Farm Records, Sonoma County Archives, Santa Rosa, Calif.
the Allen farm at Point Reyes. By the time of Warren’s visit, Allen wrangled 80 head of American stock on 900 acres. Warren reported that Allen produced 50 pounds of butter per day, churned by hand, during the milking season. This much butter required more labor than Allen could provide, and several laborers lived on his property who he referred to as the “boys” in his journals.

Allen combined his capital from mining and dairying to purchase a new farm in Nicasio, Marin County, in 1865. At this new location, he increased the size of his operation on a 2,000 acre tract and hired additional laborers. Yet despite the larger size of his operations, Allen kept the organization of labor simple. In the 1850s and 1860s, everyone in the family worked on the farm, and the laborers lived on the same property as the Allens. Even the largest dairies in the state refused to use Chinese labor, and most dairymen housed American and European milkers on their properties, if not in their homes. By 1870, Jerusha Allen supervised a domestic servant who undoubtedly helped her cook and clean for her husband, son, and seven hired hands. Without daughters or other female kin, the 66 year-old farmwife needed a little extra help. There was no functional difference between Heald’s and Allen’s operations despite the fact that Allen

255 Paul W. Gates, ed. California Ranchos and Farms, 1846-1862: Including the Letters of John Quincy Adams Warren of 1861 (Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1967), 206. Warren only described the largest operations in the area, and he acknowledged neither the work of women nor any other family members. He may have wanted to show how prosperous California dairymen were or singled out large operations of interest to the readers of the American Stock Journal, a national livestock paper published 1859-1864. In 1860, Allen had two male “laborers” living on his property.
256 Allen, his two sons, and his two hired hands probably did much of the work, but this was not enough to milk and churn for eighty cows. It is unclear from Warren’s account how many cows were producing milk at the time of his visit. If Allen needed additional milkers there were numerous laborers who lived in the area. Allen does not mention, however, any labor arrangements in his diaries other than the work of his hired hands and his sons. Oliver Allen, diaries, 1857, 1864, 1866, Allen Family Papers, 1853-1919, BANC MSS 77/203c, Bancroft Library; Population Census, Point Reyes Township, Marin County, California, 1860, 1870.
had more cows on a larger acreage. Family farmers and dairymen needed some diversity to weather fluctuations in market prices and to supply the household with inexpensive, fresh foods. Their operations also required direct supervision by family members.257

In comparison to these small- and medium-sized dairies, the largest dairies seem almost modern in their administration and scale with thousands of cows and hundreds of laborers. When John Q. A. Warren visited Allen’s farm, he also went to other Marin dairies.258 Swain’s Dairy encompassed 6,000-7,000 acres as did Shafter, Heydenfeldt & Park’s. Yet Warren was most impressed by the dairy farm of E. W. Steele. On 6,000 acres near Drake’s Bay, Steele maintained 500 dairy stock. Of the operation, Warren said, “This is the most prominent and extensive establishment in the county, and they manufacture more cheese than any dairy in the State. They made during the season 640 pounds per day of cheese, and 75 pounds of butter. The crop of cheese the present season (for 1861) will amount to 45 tons!” Overall, Warren described only the largest enterprises, exemplifying the greatest success stories of an “important branch of California industry.”259

The figures Warren quoted to his readers belied the true nature of the Steele family’s dairy. While their dairy seemed quite on par with other Marin dairies, by 1870, E. W. Steele, in partnership with several family members, owned or rented 60,000 total acres in two counties to support as many as 1,500 dairy cows in addition to various other

258 In Sonoma and Marin, DeGroot followed the same basic route as Warren, visiting only the largest operators. Allen was one of the smaller operators featured. He also noted that the Sonoma dairies were generally smaller in scale than the Marin dairies.
259 Gates, California Ranchos and Farms, 1846-1862. Emphasis original to source.
cattle, horses, and swine. The Steeles’ bookkeepers recorded in numerous ledgers the extensive transactions needed to run their company, especially laborer’s wages and dairy expenses. The Steeles hired hundreds of laborers since they needed one man to every 18-20 cows for milking two times per day. At each turn, the managers attempted to decrease costs, increase output, and gain new markets for their cheese. When Warren visited the Marin location, he saw only one part of a much larger concern.260

With that said, this seemingly modern, horizontally integrated enterprise functioned more simply than contemporary observers and historians have imagined. The company’s bookkeepers listed names of numerous laborers, merchants, teamsters, and other account holders, making the actual labor arrangements seem impersonal and bureaucratic. In fact, the entire operation evolved over time, starting with the family doing most of the work. Men of the Steele family milked and cared for the livestock, and a few of the women made cheese. They continued to add properties and cows whenever possible, yet the entire operation, even at its peak, was divided into smaller units supervised by families.

In California, share arrangements solved problems for both the cash poor and those in need of labor. Throughout the 1850s and 1860s, the Steeles rented and bought land in various coastal counties (Sonoma, Marin, Santa Cruz, and San Luis Obispo), milking their own cows and the cows of others on share arrangements. In this case, the share arrangement required them to feed and milk the cows, and then process the milk into cheese for sale in San Francisco. The owner of the cows benefited by not having to

do the work and making a profit at the same time. Without capital to invest, the Steeles used their personal labor to raise cash to expand, reducing their risk by avoiding debt.

The Steeles were not the only family in the state to make share arrangements for this reason. Farmers wanting to increase their cash flow sought out share arrangements to produce honey, milk, butter, and cheese. Susanna Townsend wrote home for an article on bee management because her husband was “about to get several swarms on shares.” She noted that honey sold for $1 per pound in San Francisco. Townsend constantly searched for ways to increase the family income, and her husband later planted some wheat on shares as well. Not all arrangements worked out for poor families. Mrs. E. A. Van Court remembered when her husband leased 150 acres for dairying in Santa Clara County. He leased the land under the condition that the owner, a San Francisco lawyer, would furnish 100 cows, but the landowner shorted the Van Courts by about 99 animals. So much bad luck befell the Van Courts, the wife was sure “a hoodoo was over” them. Despite this loss, the Van Courts continued taking cows on shares because they had few other choices.261

The Steeles, however, had no “hoodoo” over them, and they built a profitable business for the maintenance of a large extended family. The Steele Brothers company supported the families of three brothers, their parents, and one cousin, as well as paying an income to the families who ran the smaller dairy units for them. They funded the expansion of their operation by working on shares. The Steeles then became the contract makers and hired families on share arrangements to supervise dairies and the hired hands. Each unit contained about 150 cows, and it took at least 8-9 men on each dairy to milk two times per day. Because families operated the units, they were able to reduce expenses to the dairy by using farm waste for greater profits. Hogs kept on the properties ate whey, making efficient use of the watery by-product left after processing milk into cheese. Butchers lived on several of the properties to slaughter hogs, steers, and superannuated cows. Additionally, much of the meat went onto the laborers’ meal tables and into local markets. Steele dairies functioned efficiently under the watchful eyes of an experienced farmer and his wife.262

By the late 1870s and early 1880s, the Steeles had reached the peak of their success with their dairy empire. In fact, family members were ready to sell out by the

---

262 The company ledgers provide little insight into how the laborers lived and worked, but a picture of how the Steeles contracted labor can be pieced together information from a variety of sources. For example, the company bookkeeper in 1880 listed William Phoenix as one of the many laborers for the year 1880-1881. Phoenix in 1880 lived along with ten other milkers, several butchers, and two Chinese cooks on the SLO property with George Steele and his wife. In 1870, George Steele housed a large Missouri family to do the work on his dairy, and his brother Edgar lived with a smaller Danish dairyman, his wife, and a company bookkeeper. There were not enough Steele family members, however, to supervise each dairy and thus farm families substituted as supervising agents. A reporter visiting Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County, noted that he found at least eleven dairies owned by or leased from the Steele Brothers. As families acquired some capital and landowners increasingly subdivided land in the 1870s, it was harder for the Steeles to contract with enough families. Morrall, *Half Moon Bay Memories*, 93; Steele Family, Ledger, 1880-1881, volume 9, carton 2, Steele Family Papers, 1870-1902, BANC MSS C-G 239, Bancroft. California farmwives used the “offal pail” or “swill-barrel” to dispose of scraps, old and spoiled food. “The Wastes of the Household,” *Santa Clara Valley*, June 1885.
mid to late 1870s despite the “success” for which they were so readily praised. Costly land disputes tired the family’s farming lawyer, George Steele, and the business had grown too big for the family to manage. In 1878, George told his brother Isaac, “everything pertaining to our business down here seems to become more mixed, complicated, and perplexing every year.” Frustrated, George continued, “I am in favor of selling anything and everything we have in this country as fast as possible and paying out of debt even if I don’t have a solitary cent left.”

The Steeles may have owned one of the largest dairies in nineteenth-century California, but they were not able to foster it for the long term. Thus, the brothers, their children, and cousins retired to other pursuits, and Isaac’s grandson took over the business on a smaller scale. The Steeles’ pursued this large-scale partnership for the benefit of the family, using the family farm model to advance their interests. Even at the peak of their expansion, the Steele’s used the profits not to aggrandize a corporate entity and pay shareholders but to make comfortable lives for the Steele extended family.

As the state population grew, so did the dairy industry. Small- and large-scale dairymen increased the number of cows, improved herds by introducing appropriate breeds, and adopted new technology. In 1850 only 4,280 dairy cows fed on the California grasses, but by 1870 that number increased to 164,093. By 1908 farmers kept...
more than 300,000 dairy cows in California. This was a significant increase, especially considering the fact that hundreds of thousands of animals, especially cattle, died during the 1861-1862 flood and drought in 1863-1864. During these years, dairymen continued to import selected breeds to control butterfat content of their herds. By the 1870s and 1880s, farmers and ranchers replaced the skinny Mexican cattle used for the hide and tallow trade and gold rush meat market with specialty livestock. Jersey cows and Holstein-Friesian breeds dominated dairy herds during these years.²⁶⁵

Farmers saw the demand for domestic dairy products. Anyone in California during the gold rush witnessed hungry miners’ willingness to buy fresh food, which translated into dollars and cents for those willing to farm. James Warren reported that Californians imported $1 million worth of butter and $500,000 worth cheese in 1858. In addition, small town and city residents of the interior and coastal areas needed milk, butter and cheese, and people with one or 1,000 cows sold to these markets. After multiple failures, the Van Courts gave up ranching and took one cow to San Francisco where they paid their rent with the milk receipts. Professional dairymen, such as Heald, Allen, and the Steeles, contributed to the larger market during the nineteenth century. The result of all this was a dramatic increase in domestically produced dairy products.

With butter for example, production in the state increased from 705 pounds in 1850 to 16 million pounds in 1880. In addition to increasing herds and introducing better breeds, dairymen adopted new technologies and types of feed. Nationally, implement dealers sold improved cream separators and milking machines in the late 1870s, and California dairymen soon adopted these labor-saving devices. Alfalfa, easily raised in the San

---
²⁶⁵ Santos, “Dairying in California through 1910.” For a contemporary discussion of the value of various dairy breeds, see “Guernsey Cattle,” Pacific Rural Press, 1 April 1882.
Joaquin Valley, became the feed of choice for their herds replacing less nutritious grasses. Consequently, dairy farmers made 52.5 million pounds of butter per year by 1910.\textsuperscript{266}

Dairymen contributed to the growing market for milk products, which allowed both small- and large-scale operators to run businesses and meet the demand of consumers. Similarly, farmers in the wine making districts grew grapes on a small-scale for local wineries. Farmers received cash or wine for their crops, helping families with extra income and wine makers in need of additional grapes. Winemaking required some skill as well as a good amount of capital to crush and process grapes and then test, bottle, and store the final product. Even though most winemakers had some land planted to grapes, the processing and marketing of wine focused their attention on the most complex aspects of the business. Consequently, farmers sold grapes directly to individuals and companies with the proper facilities. Small-scale farmers established small vineyards on their acreages, as little as one-eighth of an acre, in order to bring in cash or wine for domestic use. For a dairyman such as Daniel Heald in Petaluma, growing grapes presented few risks since most of his income came from other crops. Winemakers, gentleman farmers, and the state distributed information about raising grapes, and thus farmers unfamiliar with viticulture successfully combined their general knowledge of agriculture with the specific skills outlined by the experts.

While most American farmers had not been in the state long enough to cultivate grapes at the beginning of the gold rush, some Californios took advantage of the

situation. In 1848, the vineyards of California mostly sat on former mission lands. Spanish priests brought vines to California in the 1770s and planted them in the northern territory as they expanded the mission system. By 1823, the missionaries built the last and most northern religious outpost, Mission San Francisco Solano de Sonoma. At this Sonoma mission, Father Jose Altimira directed his converted Indian laborers to plant grain, fruit trees, and 3,000 grape vines. Later, the Mexican government, from Mexico City, ordered secularization of the mission lands, and in 1833, Alta California’s governor, Jose Figueroa, appointed Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo as the comisionado to supervise the dispossession of the Sonoma mission. Vallejo tended the vines minimally until the gold rush made cultivation and harvest financially expedient. Grapes fetched high prices in San Francisco, about 75¢ per pound in 1850. Thus Vallejo harvested grapes from several acres and earned $6,000 for the effort. Vallejo’s success in Sonoma allowed him to maintain the vineyard, which would help future winemakers and farmers.²⁶⁷

Mission fathers and Californios provided the foundation for a wine industry in the state. The grapes of the missionaries adapted well to the soil and climate and became known simply, as the “Mission grape.” Vallejo and other Californios cultivated these old vines and made Mission grape cuttings available to early growers, Americans who came before and after the gold rush. For example, Nicholas Carriger, a Tennessean, arrived in 1846 and started several vineyards. Later Vallejo befriended Agoston Haraszthy, a Hungarian who had emigrated from Wisconsin and proceeded to transform the wine

industry in the 1850s and 1860s. The earliest wine growers depended on slips from the mission’s vineyards, especially those wanting to sell wine or grapes to miners. When miner-turned-farmer Asa Call trekked from the mines to Sonoma to buy seeds and cuttings in 1852, he returned to his farm on the Merced River to plant the Mission grape. In 1864, one booster praised the Spanish for bringing the grape and making fine wines, but ensured readers that it “remained for American enterprise, aided by European experience, to develop the wonderful capacity which had so long slumbered in the bosom of this most favored land.” California, especially Los Angeles and Sonoma counties, promised to become the American seat of the world wine industry.268

While northern California farmers entered the field of winemaking, Los Angelinos, in the southern part of the state, produced the majority of grapes and wine during the 1850s. In 1856, state growers planted a total of 2,260 acres of vines, more than half of which were located in Los Angeles County, including the German colony of Anaheim. As a result, Los Angeles residents also made a majority of the wine, about 90 percent of the total output in 1857 and continued to dominate the industry until the 1870s. Despite this, several enterprising men recognized the suitability of Sonoma to grow wine grapes and hoped to direct their product at the throngs of thirsty gold miners in the diggings and San Francisco. Sonoma’s coastal hills grew green pasture for dairy cows and sheltered the inland portions of the county from cold sea breezes, yet allowed enough

cool air in so that the valleys did not experience the dry, intense heat of summer; these conditions suited grapes as well as they did cows.  

Since southern California winemakers had dominated the field, northern upstarts entered the competitive market for good wine needing the help of local farmers, many of whom had never grown grapes. Some early winemakers employed the most primitive methods—crushing grapes with their feet—, and others invested capital to build legitimate wineries. The latter, however, rarely grew enough grapes to run their wineries at full capacity and thus needed to purchase additional grapes from local farmers. By 1860, 202 people grew grapes and made wine in California. This number comes from the census taken in that year, but as wine historian Ernest Peninou points out, the census figures are a low, and a rather rough, estimate. He identified at least 60 individuals who the census takers missed, some being well known, “active” winemakers. Nonetheless, numerous coastal county farmers grew grapes in the 1850s, and the established winemakers encouraged farmers to increase the size of their vineyards throughout the 1860s, 1870s, and 1880s.

---


270 The number of individuals who grew grapes for winemakers expanded in the 1860s-1880s. The Fulkerson, Cockrills, Mizes, and Cranes, see Table XX, did not grow grapes in the 1850s because they were establishing their homesteads to support large extended families. They were able to start their vineyards after they planted crops that had multiple uses, i.e., subsistence, barter, and sale. Compare Peninou’s reprint of the 1860, 1884, and 1891 directories in Peninou and Greenleaf, A Directory of California Wine Growers and Wine Makers in 1860 and Peninou, History of the Sonoma Viticultural District. See also, “The Great Outlet for Our Grapes,” Pacific Rural Press, 21 August 1875: “the interest of the small grower is, either to unite with other small growers in forming a joint stock association and securing the necessary facilities of manufacturing and manipulation, or to sell his grapes by the ton to those who have facilities and capital necessary to make a success of the business.” For small growers to make wine, the author of this piece argued small-scale winemaking “must bring disaster to the individual and to the general industry” because their wines were mostly inferior and the risks too high. Author Frona Eunice Wait notes that Eliza Hood’s Los Guilicos cellar had largest wine inventory made from grapes grown on one ranch by one owner, indicating that this was atypical (149). She mentions many of the farmers who raised grapes in Sonoma County as well (133-53). Frona Eunice Wait, Wines and Vines of California: A Treatise on the Ethics of Wine-Drinking (San Francisco: Bancroft Co., 1889).
Winemakers’ demands for grapes created a market for local farmers.\textsuperscript{271} Isaac DeTurk’s Santa Rosa winery demonstrates how makers and growers created mutually beneficial relationships during the late nineteenth century. Before building one of the largest wine operations in the state, DeTurk started on a smaller-scale using local resources.\textsuperscript{272} DeTurk settled in Bennett Valley, six miles southeast of the town of Santa Rosa in 1858. There he planted 20 acres of Mission grapes and started making wine that year with grapes planted by his neighbor. These humble beginnings allowed DeTurk to expand and build a new facility in 1867. He continued to buy or barter grapes with farmers to keep his 100,000 gallon-capacity winery operating at a profit. DeTurk built two additional wineries in 1878 to reduce shipping costs of grapes coming from farms in Cloverdale and Santa Rosa. By focusing on processing grapes, DeTurk’s operation grew and received much attention. The Petaluma Argus editor announced 40,000 gallons of DeTurk’s wine being shipped to San Francisco in 1874, and a Santa Rosa Times reporter noted seven train car loads of wine traveling from Sonoma to the city in 1877. Newspaper editors kept reports about winery operations in front of farmers, enabling them to contact makers about buying their grapes.\textsuperscript{273}

\textsuperscript{271} I am able to assert this about Sonoma County because I have enough documentary evidence of grape growing among Sonoma County farmers, and more research needs to be done in other coastal counties to determine if this model extends into other northern coastal counties. Santa Clara Granger and nurseryman A. C. Erkson of Santa Clara raised grapes, fruit trees, and general farm products. Wait mentions several grape growers in San Jose and Santa Clara. Reginald R. Stuart, ed. “The Burrell Letters,” California Historical Society Quarterly 29 (March 1950); Santa Clara Valley, April 1885; Wait, Wines and Vines of California, 191-94; Peninou and Greenleaf, A Directory of California Wine Growers and Wine Makers in 1860, 49. The case of the Anaheim Colony, then in Los Angeles County, proves that Sonoma was not an isolated case. Anaheim is discussed at length in chapter 4. Winemakers established a small industry in the mountain districts during the 1860s but did not survive the 1870s.

\textsuperscript{272} Isaac DeTurk was born in Pennsylvania, raised in Indiana, and settled in Sonoma County in 1859. He started a “ranch” (general farming) before planting vines in 1862.

\textsuperscript{273} Petaluma Argus, 11 September 1874; Santa Rosa Times, 20 November 1877; “The Great Outlet for Our Grapes,” Record-Union reprinted in Pacific Rural Press, 21 August 1875. In addition to large operations such as DeTurk’s, numerous other smaller wineries existed in the area, see Paulson, Hand-Book and
Skilled winemakers made good enough wine with the Mission grape but soon imported varieties that soon dominated the market. Individuals with enough capital traveled to Europe to bring back new varietals. By the 1880s, Sonoma growers switched, or were switching, from tending Mission grapes to raising Zinfandel, Burgundy, Burger, Riesling, and other European varietals. This meant that local farmers communicated with winemakers to obtain slips of desired grapes. As phylloxera, a vine pest, attacked vineyards in Europe, demand for improved California wines increased, encouraging winemakers to rely less on the Mission grape. In the case of Sonoma County, Agoston Haraszthy helped to make Sonoma the second most prolific wine area in the state by the early 1860s. He brought slips of vines and winemaking knowledge from Europe to completely transform winemaking in northern California.

Agoston Haraszthy followed a long trail of trouble as he fled political persecution in Europe, settling first in Wisconsin and then in California. He helped build the town now known as Sauk City in Wisconsin, farming there until he decided to move west to avoid ill health and cranky creditors. Nonetheless, he brought experience in grape growing and winemaking from Europe to California. Sonoma’s soil and climate recalled distant vineyards of his youth. A visit with Mariano G. Vallejo at his home in Sonoma convinced Haraszthy to buy land there. Quickly, he abandoned local practices and introduced hillside planting similar to vineyards of the Old World with his sons helping

Directory of Napa, Lake, Sonoma and Mendocino Counties, 137; Peninou, History of the Sonoma Viticultural District, 188-26. Farmers in sections of Sonoma County besides Santa Rosa also raised grapes for market. Henry Marshall and James Gregson, mentioned earlier, sent grapes to San Francisco in 1877. Because of their location it was easier to send grapes to San Francisco than it was to Santa Rosa. Also the Wetmore family raised grapes in addition to grains, sheep, tree fruit and chickens. Santa Rosa Times, 10 November 1877.

Haraszthy failed to raise grapes to his liking in Wisconsin as well as several counties in California. He started in San Diego (1851), San Francisco (1852), a ranch in San Mateo County (1853), and finally in Sonoma (1857).
him along the way. Soon he expanded his vineyard to more than 400 acres covered with
tens of thousands of vines. He built a stone winery, planted imported varieties, and
introduced numerous innovations, all of which gained him the historical title of “Father
of California Wine.” His efforts resulted in good wine and awards from the state
agricultural society within the first two years of his residence in the north. Author
Theodore Schoenman points to the Hungarian’s influence: “The little town of Sonoma
became not only the central distributing point of European vines but also the fount of
knowledge in viticultural matters.”275

As Haraszthy’s Buena Vista winery expanded, the Hungarian’s cash dwindled,
and once again he was in debt. He made arrangements to incorporate his large winery
and extensive acreages under the name Buena Vista Vinicultural Society (BVVS), funded
by investors, especially William C. Ralston and a number of shareholders. Ralston, a San
Francisco banker, and the officers of BVVS conceived of a winemaking operation
structured by a modern corporate system and an impersonal labor system. Instead of
being an independent owner, Haraszthy became the superintendent and directed Chinese
and other day laborers. Father Haraszthy and his sons were reduced to employees of the
company, and when Ralston became impatient with the Haraszthy family, Ralston forced
them out because the winemaking at the BVVS was a business not an art, at least to
Ralston. Sadly, Haraszthy failed as an independent, large-scale winemaker and as an
employee of a corporate winery. Bad luck and bad vintages took their toll, and Haraszthy
did not have a diverse operation to maintain his business during difficult periods.

275 “California as a Vineland,” 602; Theodore Schoenman, ed., Father of California Wine: Agoston
Haraszthy (Santa Barbara: Capra Press, 1979), 13-29.
Haraszthy had a surfeit of visionary ideas without the capital to sustain them, and he had no other choice than to sell out and relocate again.\footnote{Haraszthy and family moved to Central America where he supposedly fell prey to a crocodile while crossing a river, an ignominious end to a long, colorful career. Schoenman, \textit{Father of California Wine}, 32-35; Peninou, \textit{History of the Sonoma Viticultural District}, 63-67.}

Before the end of his Buena Vista winery as a family operation, Haraszthy used his success to benefit other growers and winemakers. In addition to winning state agricultural society awards, he helped to organize the California Viticultural Society, and proceeded to author a useful paper on winemaking in the state and then a book. In 1862, after traveling extensively in Europe to further the development of the California wine industry, Haraszthy published \textit{Grape Culture, Wines, and Wine-Making with Notes upon Agriculture and Horticulture}. Much of the short book reads like a travelogue, but Haraszthy interwove useful details about European winemaking in order to expose American farmers to the knowledge from abroad. In the last chapter, he gave specific advice to California farmers interested in planting vineyards, including information about plowing, laying out the vineyard, and estimating start-up costs. On the one hand, Haraszthy gave instructions for independent operators, but, on the other hand, he expected “small producers,” “capitalists,” and government to work together for the advancement of the industry. It was for this reason that he so extensively described European wineries.\footnote{A. Haraszthy, \textit{Grape Culture, Wines, and Wine-Making with Notes upon Agriculture and Horticulture} (New York, 1862) reprinted and separately paginated in Schoenman, \textit{Father of California Wine}. For Haraszthy’s expectations see pp. xiv-xx of his report. After Haraszthy, additional writers added their insight into the state’s winemaking (process, history, and industry growth). Waits connected family farmers to the prosperity of the wine industry. She stated “wherever the settler has erected a permanent home” grapes abounded and “the American idea of doing everything on a grand scale does not work well in regard to wine-making.” Wait, \textit{Wines and Vines of California}, 21. See also Emmet H. Rixford, \textit{The Wine Press and the Cellar: A Manual for the Wine-Maker and the Cellar-Man} (San Francisco : Payot, Upham & Co., 1883); Charles A. Wetmore, \textit{Ampelography of California: A Discussion of Vines Now Known in The}
In addition to publications by experts, farmers assisted each other in establishing small vineyards and raising wine grapes for cash sales to winemakers. Sonoma grape acreages expanded during the last third of the nineteenth century and much of it was among family groups (see Table 1). In 1856, Sonoma farmers committed about 90 acres to grapes. By 1876, this number increased to 6,500 acres. The Missouri settlers of the extended Cockrill, Fulkerson, and Coulter family all grew wine grapes despite the fact that they brought little knowledge of viticulture from the midwestern/upper south regions from which they migrated. Haraszthy, the CSAS, and the State Board of Viticultural Commissioners supplied information about grape growing, and they learned from local farmers also experimenting with small acreages of vines.278

While Missouri families might not have had experience with growing grapes for vintners, they had experience breaking frontier soil and entering emergent market economies. As R. Douglas Hurt demonstrates in his study of Little Dixie farmers, Kentucky, Virginia, and Tennessee settlers in Missouri started farms to support their families, raising subsistence crops, and quickly planted corn, tobacco, or hemp when markets arose. Moreover, converting crops into alcohol made more sense than not. In Missouri, farmers made corn into whiskey for easy transportation, and these farmers had no moral compunction against alcohol. Larkin Cockrill, one of the patriarchs of this Missouri line, was well known for being a whiskey drinking, southern Democrat. For the

278 Peninou, History of the Sonoma Viticultural District, 48, 112-26, 302.
Cockrill clan and other Sonoma County farmers who had established their homesteads in the 1850s, raising grapes on a few acres provided a low-risk influx of cash.279

Prior to the 1890s, farm families, such as the Cockrills, produced wine grapes for winemakers, and the industry relied on an informal network of growers and wineries supplying an increasingly formalized marketing network. The 1893 depression hurt winemakers as consumers focused on purchasing necessities not luxury items. During the economic crisis, a small number of wine merchants consolidated their control over the market. In the north, Percy Morgan and six other men formed the California Wine Association while Secondo Guasti in San Bernardino led the formidable Italian Vineyard Company. As a result, these companies stabilized the wine industry in the late 1890s and early 1900s using the Gilded Age organizational techniques of vertical and horizontal integration. Historian Victor Geraci has termed the transformation in late century as “vintibusiness” to conflate national trends of economic domination with California’s budding wine industry. The wine industry certainly changed after the depression of 1893, but in the 1870s and 1880s, farmers and winemakers had no idea of the coming economic problems nor did they know their efforts would eventually lead to a major restructuring of wine production and marketing. The farmers who added small vineyards to their diverse operations took advantage of local demands and the ability to bring cash into the domestic economy.280

279 Interestingly, some Missouri farm families packed pork for the market at home and others provided “hogs on the hoof” to packing companies. Company agents paid cash and had more experience with credit, trade, and competition (127-32). These Missouri pork-packing arrangements were quite similar to the relationships between Sonoma grape growers and winemakers. Hurt, Agriculture and Slavery in Little Dixie, 5-22, 52-64, 80-102, 103-24; Clayborn, Dirty Roads and Dusty Tales, 18. See also Victor W. Geraci, Salud!: The Rise of Santa Barbara’s Wine Industry (Reno: University of Nevada Press, 2004), 19-24.
280 Geraci, Salud!, 35-36.
Transplanted farmers in California raised new crops such as tree fruit and grapes while raising familiar crops and livestock, including wheat and barley or dairy cows and hogs. In either case, much of the work of the farmer remained rather mundane. Farmers plowed, cultivated, harvested, fixed wagons and implements, killed vermin and pests, sought out advice about blights, cursed the rain or lack thereof (depending on the year), and went to town to sell their goods. As one Californian put it, “The weather, the crops, the markets are the idol trinity of most farmers,” which were the same three things the vexed or blessed farmers throughout the country. Implement dealers and inventors sought to solve specific problems for California men. Manufacturers produced orchard cultivators and side-hill plows specifically for California farms. Similarly, prairie farmers of the Midwest needed sod busting plows to rip the deep roots of the tall grasses there, a problem solved by John Deere and other inventors. Each new landscape

presented the American farmer with obstacles, but farmers adapted and manufacturers obliged.282

Women and Children on the Farm

Similar to most American farm families, men on California farms predominately cared for market crops, which required them to leave the house for the fields and the markets. Women, on the other hand, generally stayed close to home and oversaw some domestic production and child care. These gendered divisions of work on the farm existed in California as they did in other farm regions but varied depending on the couple, type of market production, and size of family. Several patterns emerged among California families. Men’s work traditionally took place in the fields for various reasons. The most practical reason was that women in their reproductive years often had young children to nurse or watch, and the farm home seemed to be the natural domain of women who were able to cook, garden, and supervise children alternately. Rebecca Woodson enjoyed her primitive home in the Analy Township of Sonoma County but had plenty of work to do: “I sat my baby on a rug (she could not even creep) and went to hunt the spring. I found it and carried many buckets full of water from it in the day[s] and months that followed.” Without the constraints of nursing babies, men left their homes to go into the fields, relying on their physical strength and the motive power of large animals. Farm

people across several centuries generally left the strenuous and dirty work of handling oxen, horses, and mules to men. Women also worked with farm animals, mostly in the poultry yard or milking house where their interactions were more controlled and intimate.

In California, the subject of milking cows provides an excellent example of how families adapted their work to the new countryside. In 1870, William Bardin wrote to a friend, “John, have you learned to milk. You know milking is a man’s work in this country.” For the Bardin family in Monterey County, this was quite true because their primary occupation in California became dairying. The Bardin boys milked as many as fourteen cows per day to advance the family’s dairy interest, and they boarded several laborers as they expanded. John Francis Pyle had a smaller family than the Bardins yet still focused his market efforts on dairy. In Santa Clara, he churned and took his butter into the town of San Jose for cash sales while he developed his small but growing orchard. Milking and butter making, while women’s work on many farms in the East and


Midwest, constituted most of the income for the Bardin and Pyle families, and thus represented their major market “crop.”

In non-market dairy families, however, the chore of milking often fell to women as men spent more time on wheat, fruit trees, or grape vines. On the Burrell farm in the Santa Cruz Mountains, everyone milked the family cows. Clarissa Burrell reported to her family in Ohio that “The children are a very great help about milking, the little girles [sic] milk 5 cows a piece and when I am not well they milk six or seven and one time they milked ten.” Burrell felt she needed to excuse her husband for not milking “on account of his hands being so much crippled.” While the women held fast in the cow barns, the fifty-five year old farmer tended peach and fig trees and numerous other fruits, including gooseberries, currants, and grapes. For early settlers, some farmwives made extra butter to improve the house since the family re-invested the income from market crops back into the farm. One farmwife, for instance, “sold butter enough to buy her first cook stove” for the Turner household in Green Valley. She and a son regularly drove an ox team 16 miles from Blucher Valley to Petaluma to sell her butter. After months of cooking over an open fire, Mrs. Turner, like so many other farmwives, was willing to put in extra work during the early days of establishing the homestead in order to make her life more comfortable later.

---

285 William Bardin to John C. Holmes, 25 May 1869, 16 February 1870, in Diary of a Pioneer, BANC MSS C-F 229; John Francis Pyle, diary, 2, 3, 10, 16, 30, 31 January; 13, 14, 21 February; 7, 14 March; 11, 18, 22 April; 22 May; 10, 18, 21, 23, 28 July; 1, 14, 24 August; “Farming Families,” Pacific Rural Press, 6 March 1880; Sarah Barnes, diary, 26 September 1872, Widney Collection, Huntington Library; Doris Elliott to Wilson Elliott, n.d., folder 2, box 956, Elliott Family Papers.

These general patterns are helpful in understanding how farm families adapted to California, yet couples negotiated duties to suit the individuals and specific needs of running the farm. In the 1880s, Evelyn M. Hertslet decided to do the milking after her husband bought a cow for the family’s new ranch in Lake County. “I have persuaded George to let me do the milking. He thought I had enough to do already; but we have made a compromise, and I am to give up washing-up after supper.” She felt the men were away from the house too much of the day to milk the cow regularly, and throughout her letters she complained about being the only woman on the farm. “The worst part of the life what I never for a moment calculated on—its loneliness. Of course the boys, coming back after working and joking together all day, don’t understand my being depressed, and think I am discontented. I must get a nice companionable dog like dear old Vixen.” She referred to Becky as “my beloved cow,” and the men of the farm chided her for the relationship. Nonetheless, the cow, the dog, and the goat became her daily companions.287

Moreover, exigencies of survival and farm maintenance trumped gendered chores. Susanna Townsend explained to her sister in Boston that she had been milking for six weeks “rain or shine” because her husband lost the tip of his finger to a “savage pig.”288 In the Townsend’s Lake County household, Emory milked and Susanna made the butter and cheese.289 As poor as any farm family could be, Townsend relied on her dairy

288 Susanna Townsend to “Mary,” 5 April 1864, Susanna Roberts Townsend Correspondence.
289 Women who were too old to remember life on a frontier farm had to learn cheese making from family. She had never seen cheese made but Emory had seen his mother make cheese and they found “full directions” in agricultural books and papers. Clarissa Burrell wrote home asking for a “receipt” to make cheese. She reminded her sister, “it has been so long since I made cheese that I have forgotten many things.” Burrell to “Brother & Sister,” 6 September 1854, in Stuart, ed. “The Burrell Letters,” 52. The editor of the Pacific Rural Press reprinted cheese making instructions from the Country Gentleman (New
products for family sustenance and often could do little more than dream about selling them. During one season, she “put down butter enough to last us all winter when the cows were dry.” Warm weather as late as January that year made killing the hogs impossible, and the family used the butter because they had no meat for a good part of the rainy season. In contrast to the Townsends, the Beerman family sold all their butter, sending their children to school with only rye bread and lard in their “lunch pails” which were really pails. On family farms, the farmers and their wives weighed decisions about sales based both on feeding the family and building the business.290

Few California farm women left as complete records of their daily chores as did Evelyn Hertslet and Susanna Townsend. Both were saddled by an overabundance of “women’s work.” Hertslet, an urban raised English woman, was astonished by how much work women did on the farm. Of women she said, they “work much harder than the men, who are continually sitting down in the shade for a gossip, while the poor women go on at if from the moment they get up till they go to bed.” Even though most

--

290 Susanna Townsend to “Fanny,” 17 February 1867, Susanna Roberts Townsend Correspondence; Robbins, “Memoirs of Lavinia Pearl Butler Robbins, 1882-1972.”
farmwives did not record their lives in as much detail as these two women, there is plenty of evidence to demonstrate that their lives were not unusual and were comparable to the typical eastern and midwestern farm woman.\footnote{Hertslet, \emph{Ranch Life in California}, 45. About women’s daily chores, Ritter remembered little worth recounting in detail. She wrote, “the endless round of daily duties pertaining to family life on a farm went on for seven or eight years.” Ritter, \emph{More Than Gold in California, 1849-1933}, 63; “Why Women Rule the Household,” \emph{Santa Clara Valley}, July 1885.}

California women, as Hertslet indicated, started their days early and ended late as they prepared three to five meals per day, waking before the men to stoke fires and finishing dishes after the last meals. When John Morris peddled books throughout the hills of Sonoma County, he had a hard time finding the man of the house awake. Sonoma dairymen, according to Morris, woke up at 4 a.m., milked the cows, ate breakfast, and returned to bed. This meant that farmwives woke-up at least as early to make the breakfast. Clearly they did not return to bed with their husbands since several farmwives turned Morris away while farmers were sleeping. Everyday meals, dishes, and children required women’s attention as men did their work in the fields, orchards, and dairy barns. Farmwives contributed to the economy of the farm by feeding the laborers, whether they were members of her family or hired hands.\footnote{John M. Morris, Book 7 (reel 2), no date, Diaries and Autobiography; Ritter, \emph{More Than Gold in California, 1849-1933}, 61.}

Additionally, women helped to transport their families’ heritage to the Far West. Gloria Ricci Lothrop states that while men experimented with new, California-appropriate crops, women brought seeds of familiar plants with them to initiate their “own quiet ecological revolution.” This “revolution,” however, served the purpose of maintaining family traditions and lifeways in a foreign land. As Americans moved west,
they transported with them regional styles of cooking and partiality for certain flavors and foods.293

In California, women continued to cook the recipes they learned from their mothers and grandmothers, adapting them to seasonal varieties of fruits and vegetables available in California. Lucy Sexton Foster remembered that her community gathered for dinners regularly, using any event—a holiday or raising money to build a school or for the local church—as an excuse to assemble and eat together. Many of the dishes were typical entries in American cookbooks: baked beans, roasted pig, pickled cucumbers, jelly rolls, and cream cakes. California women added a few items local to the area, but incorporated them into the standard American fare. Sage picked locally, for example, added flavor to the stuffing, and cooks made wild quail pies in the same manner as typical chicken pies. California cookbooks and family menus perpetuated the American diet in California. Even the fruits and vegetables in California were extraordinary only for their availability and quantity during the year.294

Numerous settlers from Kentucky, Missouri, and other southern states also brought with their tastes and recipes, allowing these southern families to maintain their

294 Before the citrus boom later in the century, Californians planted apple, plum, quince, peach, apricot, and pear trees, all of which were featured in American dishes. Sexton, The Foster Family, 212-14; Harland; Strentzel, Louisiana Erwin. “Louisiana Erwin Strentzel papers,” 1868-1882, BANC MSS C-F 16. Bancroft Library; Carrie Williams, a miner’s wife, cooked much like a farmer’s wife, dressing her own poultry. She mentioned in her diary numerous meals she made, and they were simple, hearty meals like most Americans ate on eastern and midwestern farms. Carrie Williams diary reprinted in Moynihan, Armitage, and Dichamp, So Much to Be Done. Joan Jensen and Gloria Ricci Lothrop said the following about California women, “At home they were pivotal influences in the retention and change of the social customs and values that shaped California cultures.” Jensen and Lothrop, California Women, 162. For typical American dishes, see A Practical Housekeeper, The American Practical Cookery-Book (Philadelphia: G. G. Evans, 1860); H. J. Clayton, Clayton’s Quaker Cook-Book (San Francisco: Women’s Co-Operative Printing Office, 1883; Ladies of California, California Recipe Book (San Fran: Bruce’s Printing House, 1872); Mrs. M. G. Coffin, Our Girls in the Kitchen, Oakland: Pacific Press, 1883; The California Practical Cook Book (Oakland: Pacific Press Publishing Co., 1882).
regional identities at home even when surrounded by Yankees. Jackson Graves, a Kentuckian, remembered the foods prepared by his mother. The men slaughtered the stock for beef or pork products, but it was his mother who prepared the meat as the family had been accustomed to in Kentucky. Mrs. Graves prepared and stored hams, bacon, spareribs, and sausage for family use. In addition, she had lye on hand for making hominy. The men raised corn, as many northerners in California did, and she used it for the hominy and to make cornbread. Before plowing, Mrs. Graves prepared the family’s breakfast, consisting of fried hominy, sausage, spareribs, and cornbread. California became a land neither southern nor northern in terms of antebellum America but a combination of the two, and families quietly lived as they liked.

Over time California cooking blended American culinary tastes with those of a multitude of foreign flavors. Gold attracted men from around the world, and local cuisines incorporated French and Spanish dishes. Menus from San Francisco and

295 Jackson A. Graves, My Seventy Years in California, 1857-1927 (Los Angeles: The Times-Mirror Press, 1927). Historian Sam Bowers Hilliard said of southern foodways, “Nowhere in the nation has a culture trait become so outstanding nor certain foods so identified with a single area as in the South. While it is true that recent trends indicate a mass homogenization of American food habits, the notable food preferences of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century southerners and the persistence of these choices into the twentieth century have consistently distinguished the region from other parts of the country” (37). Few of the distinctly southern foods were enumerated on the agricultural census, except for sweet potatoes. Joseph C. G. Kennedy, compiler of the 1860 agricultural statistics, noted that the “great bulk of the crop” was grown in the southern states. In comparison, Kentuckians, Missourians, and Tennesseans raised far more sweet potatoes than farmers in the northeast (Kentucky, 1,057,557 bushels; Missouri, 335,102; Tennessee, 2,604,672; Connecticut, 2,710; New Hampshire 161). California farmers, however, raised 214,307 bushels of sweet potatoes for the year ending in 1860. Joseph C. G. Kennedy, comp., Agriculture of the United States in 1860: Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1864), lxxxi; Hilliard, Hog Meat and Hoecake.

296 Rural people from northern states complained about the “Secesh” element in California during the Civil War, but, otherwise, farmers seemed to have been content to work and socialize with like-minded neighbors without much discussion about the “other.” At one point, sectional rivalries flared during the Civil War, and then the assassination of Abraham Lincoln spurred northern sympathizers from Petaluma, organized as the Hueston Rifles, to march on Santa Rosa, a.k.a. “the State of Missouri.” The Hueston Rifles stopped at the Washoe House, a tavern about halfway to Santa Rosa, and drank too much during dinner to continue. A few hangovers were the only casualties for this California-based militia of Northerners. Lee Torliatt, “Good Times at the Washoe House,” Sonoma Historian, no. 3 (2004): 9.
Sacramento demonstrate the cosmopolitan nature of California urban cuisine. Yet these menus say little about the food prepared on small farms and in the homes of mining families. Despite the international flavors found in the cities, menus of a working household in California consisted of traditional American meals augmented by fresh fruits and vegetables available during different seasons. Newspaper editors printed recipes for California women to make dishes using these abundant fruits. In the 1880s recipes featuring oranges, prunes, and lemons highlighted the new citrus industry in the state, but generally these suggestions only adapted older recipes. Orange fritters and raisin jam were familiar ways to use available articles. Thus farmwomen may have introduced new flora to California, but they did so for conservative purposes and integrated new foods into the standard fare of their households.297

Women transformed family farm products into meals. In addition to fruit or dairy raised by men, farmwives tended chickens for meat and eggs to be used in the house. Poultry provided an important, inexpensive, and portable source of protein for California families. When the Van Courts lost their ability to produce for the market in their dairy operations, Mrs. Van Court’s poultry kept them fed. They had moved dozens of times, trying to avoid the “hoodoo,” and in each removal they packed up at least a few hens to take with them. From the destitute Van Court to the wives of more successful farmers, California farmwives raised poultry (chickens, turkeys, and ducks) and killed and dressed the birds for dinner. In this way, women contributed to the domestic economy.298

297 Pacific Rural Press, 28 January 1882; Pacific Rural Press, 1 April 1882. All of the agricultural papers, and most of the local newspapers included a section for women: “Domestic Economy” and “The Home Circle” in the Pacific Rural Press; Matron’s Department in the Grange Patron; H. S. Foote provided room for the “The Housekeeper” in his Santa Clara Valley paper.
Poultry also translated into cash income for the farm home. Therefore, poultry-keeping women partnered with their husbands who went to town and handled economic transactions in the public sphere. In most farm families, women and children fed the chickens and kept track of hens sitting on eggs. Farmers also helped their wives by building hen houses and exterminating pests. San Jose dairyman John Francis Pyle took his wife’s chickens along with his butter into town. While Maggie Pyle’s recollections of life in California failed to survive, her husband notated where their efforts overlapped: “save Maggie [S]$800 for what I owe her for chickens and eggs.” For his wife, Pyle also brought gleanings from the threshing floor for her chickens and sprayed the hen house with kerosene to kill lice and mites. Other women took a more prominent role in the family poultry business. Mrs. J. Hilton accounted for her entire operation in an 1884 issue of the Pacific Rural Press. She concluded it turned out to be “pretty good pay for my season’s work, besides my housework for a family of five.” Another female reader wrote to tell the editor she would be sure to sell enough eggs to keep the Rural coming to the house. Even though farmers helped with the poultry, California women controlled the chicken and egg money.

Within their diurnal patterns of work, women added weekly and seasonal chores. On Mondays, most farm women washed, and then spent their Tuesdays ironing clothing to make the hand-washed, air-dried items more comfortable for family members. Washday exhausted even the healthiest of women who stoked fires to boil water, hauled wood

299 Ogden, “The Frontier Housewife—Stereotype vs. Reality,” 11; Pyle, diary, 24 March 75, 7 June 1875, 30 August 1875, 30 April 1884; Susannah Braly, diary, 24 March, 7 June, 30 August 1875, MS 210, California Historical Society, San Francisco; Alice Mary Kennedy Lynch, dairy, 1863, 1864; LoLo Westrich, “The Frontier Chicken,” The Californians (July/August 1985): 38-43.
300 Pacific Rural Press, 12 January 1884 and 14 January 1882; “Profits of Poultry on the Farm,” California Agriculturist, 1 February 1874.
and water, and used caustic lye soap to remove the dust and sweat accumulated on the family’s clothing. On hot days, the fires to boil water made things worse. Sarah Barnes said about one October wash day, “it has been hot and smoky today.” Evelyn Hertslet described her trials with washing in more detail. Her husband, sons, and hired men dirtied clothes beyond what seemed reasonable. “I have been working hard for the last two days washing and ironing; but the boys helped me a good deal, or I could never have got through such an accumulation…. Yesterday I got up at 6 o’clock, made the bread, which [had] been put to rise over-night, made the breakfast and helped eat it, washed up, and all the morning was washing, or cooking the dinner, shelling peas and peeling potatoes.” Her work continued into the afternoon and the next day: “We had to go on washing after dinner till 3.30, when I tidied up and had a rest till after tea, when I swept out the sitting-room. To-day I have been ironing till my back aches horribly.”

Many California women strained their backs over the weekly wash, but when possible they gave up doing the wash, letting a domestic servant or a Chinese laundryman do the work instead. Hertslet expressed feelings about clothes washing that represented those of other farmwives: “The washing is the bane of my life: it is no joke in hot weather.”

Children also worked on the farm, helping their mothers and fathers depending on their sex and age. Rural children worked and played but were essential to the farm. As historian Pamela Riney-Kehrberg points out “a child’s willingness and ability to work

---

302 Some older women and women without daughters sent the laundry out or hired domestic servants. Having a domestic servant, however, did not mean the farmwife had no work. While visiting with her daughter, Sarah Barnes said, “This has been wash day with Sarah’s girl. So Sarah and I have done more of the work than usual.” And like so many other Americans, washing was done on Mondays and ironing on Tuesdays. Sarah Barnes, diary, 2, 3, 23, 24, 30 September 1872, 7 and 8 October 1872. Pyle’s wife did laundry for some of the hired hands, and they paid her. Pyle, diary, 19 June 1875, 11 May 1884; Hertslet, *Ranch Life in California*, 71; “The Duties of Farmers’ Wives,” and Ada E. Taylor, “The Trials of House-Cleaning, Pacific Rural Press, 6 January 1883;
often meant survival for his or her family” which was no less true in rural California as the author’s field of study. Desperate for help, Susanna Townsend attempted to adopt several children. Finally, her husband brought home “another boy” to the Townsend’s Clear Lake farm in 1863, and Susanna was hopeful she might be able to keep him because he had been recently orphaned. At first, she referred to him rather coldly, but in 1865 she admitted that Eddy had become their “main stay.” The Townsends had two young daughters, but Eddy did much of the labor, and for that reason he sat in one of the three chairs during dinner. The Townsend’s girls stood at the table to eat while the workers of the family sat. Farm families in California needed children to help adults with the multifarious chores needed to sustain life.303

California boys and girls fed chickens, gathered wood and native plants, and churned butter. Lavinia Pearl Butler Robbins remembered scavenging for lettuce, grass, manzanita fruit, and wild berries. Her mother made pies with wild strawberries collected by the children. The children enjoyed hunting the hills for plants, but they did so for more than fun. It occurred to Robbins only in retrospect how poor the family actually was; “My father didn’t have any means of making a living except by hauling wood 12 miles to Santa Rosa by wagon and team whereby he could buy a few necessities we needed outside of what we could raise. As I look back I think of how we didn’t have any luxuries

303 Pamela Riney-Kehrberg, Childhood on the Farm: Work, Play, and Coming of Age in the Midwest (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005), 37. See her chapter, “But What Kind of Work Do the Rest of You Do?: Farm Children as Laborers,” (36-60). Susanna Townsend to “Mary,” 10 December 1865 and Townsend to “Fanny,” 17 February 1867, Susanna Roberts Townsend Correspondence. The Brooks family discussed in chapter one relied on their son’s strength and stamina to escort the family’s milk into town everyday. Elisha Brooks, A Pioneer Mother of California (San Francisco: privately published, 1922), 40-41. When his mother died and his father fell ill, neighbors adopted the younger Brooks siblings (45-46). Families in need of help adopted children informally as Townsend did or the Brooks’s neighbors or from orphanages. See Alice Mary Kennedy Lynch, dairy, 27 December 1857 and 3 January 1858, transcript translation from French, BANC MSS C-F 13, Bancroft Library.
but had enough to eat and were rich in experience by living close to nature and depending so much on a living out of what could be wrested from the soil in that rocky country.”

In poor and middling farm families, children labored along side adults for the survival and the comfort of the family.

Generally, young boys stayed with their mothers until fathers decided boys were strong enough to do men’s work instead of boys’ work, while girls stayed under their mothers’ supervision. Young boys also helped their mothers with distinctly female chores such as laundry and poultry, especially if there were no girls in the family. As a twelve-year-old boy Charles Allen spent much of his time around the house. He set hens and worked on the hen house, planted garden vegetables, and helped his mother on laundry days. On several Mondays, he noted in his diary how he “washed” and “helped mother.” Only on a few occasions did Oliver Allen take Charles into the fields. By the time Charles reached the age of 17, he had stopped working with the chickens and worked along side his father and older brother. Doing men’s work on his father’s extensive dairy in Marin County meant milking, churning, building fences, and cutting hay. The transition from boys’ work to men’s work was no trifle. The young boys of the Wetmore family, Charley (12) and George (10), also took care of the chickens and Mrs. Wetmore crowed to an older son that the young Charley was big enough to drive a carriage with two horses into town. Considering that these were dirt roads dissecting the winding hills of Sonoma County, Charley’s mother had much about which to be proud.

The work of young boys helped their overtaxed mothers, but sons quickly transitioned

---

304 Robbins, “Memoirs of Lavinia Pearl Butler Robbins, 1882-1972.” Robbins was Eliza Gregson’s granddaughter. Her father, Thomas Butler, was the young labor who came to work on the neighbor’s farm and married a Gregson girl. William H. Robinson, reminiscence, in Hodge Podge of Miscellany, April 2004.
into the world of men, leaving many women without help around the house.305

Families needed the labor of their children, but parents also sent their children off farm for an education, when possible. The Allens, Wetmores, and other farm families in California appreciated the benefits of education for their children.306 When the young George Wetmore wrote to his older brother about his life on the farm, he described the big orchard, the chickens he fed daily, and his schooling. George assured his brother that he attended school, but “we have our holidays now.” Most of the children in Sonoma, like George, as well as those in other counties, attended small, one-room schools houses built by the early settlers.307 Rebecca Woodson who moved into the Analy Township with her new husband witnessed how the pioneers made sure children had access to school even before they established secure incomes. In her area, the children attended the Big Valley School built by locals on the property line of the Coffer and McReynolds

305 Allen, diaries, 1857, 1864, 1866, Allen Family Papers; John Griffeth Wetmore Correspondence, 1880-1885, BANC MSS C-B 708 FILM, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley; “Interview with Henry Bohna,” no date, folder 15, box 7(2), Sky Farming Collection, Huntington; “Sister” to Wilson Elliott, 7 June 1859, folder 11, box 956, Elliott Family Papers.

306 Parents, at times, sacrificed their children’s education due to labor needs on the farm. William H. Robinson, reminiscence, in Hodge Podge of Miscellany, April 2004; Elvira Marsh Gnagi, diary, 15 March 1884, BANC MSS C-F 55, microfilm, Bancroft.

307 In the 1850s and 1860s, legislators tackled economic issues, paying less attention to the matters of education. Yet locals such as these established local common schools. By 1854, Californians supported forty-seven schools, educating more than 4,000 students. State officials, however, provided for state normal schools and eventually made school attendance mandatory by 1874. Most rural families only could afford to send their children to school for three months although administrators, teachers, and politicians encouraged six-month terms. Wealthier Californians also sent their children to tuition based schools such as the Young Ladies’ Seminary in Benicia overseen by Mary Atkins in the 1850s. Atkins boarded young women with parents who could afford the board and tuition. In 1857, Atkins charged $20-50 for each course, $132 for boarding, and $25 for washing per 5-month session. Mary Atkins to James Warren, 1 May 1855, folder L-Miscellany, box 3, Papers of James Lloyd LaFayette Warren, 1805-1896, Bancroft; flyer, 1857, folder: Benicia Young Ladies Seminary Papers, box 5, Atkins Family Papers, 1796-1909, Banc MSS C-B 449, Bancroft Library; Hubert Howe Bancroft, “Life of Dr. John T. Strentzel,” 1890, transcript, BANC MSS C-D 778, Bancroft; James Warren Matthews, diary, 25 August 1869, folder 2, box 2, Joseph Warren Matthews Papers, 1865-1900; History of Solano County (San Francisco: Wood, Alley & Co., 1879), 171-74; Irving G. Hendrick, “From Indifference to Imperative Duty: Educating Children in Early California,” in Rooted in Barbarous Soil: People, Culture, and Community in Gold Rush California, eds. Kevin Starr and Richard J. Orsi (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 226-49; Kathleen Weiler, Country Schoolwomen: Teaching in Rural California, 1850-1950 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 35-37.
families in 1854. Larkin D. Cockrill served as the first teacher because he, of all the neighbors, had the most education and experience teaching. Local residents hired teachers after they secured their homesteads and livelihoods. Hundreds of California school children attended one-room schools, which dotted the countryside.308

Making Time for Leisure

After settling in California, farm families reconstructed various social institutions in addition to schools. Homes doubled as economic centers for the farm and as leisure spaces in which men and women visited with neighbors, read, sang songs, and held prayer meetings. Because of the bifurcated nature of farm homes, families often sought leisure by combining social time and work. The time worn institution of “visiting” gave men and women and opportunity to spend time with neighbors and friends, sharing daily chores such as cooking and sewing as well as making economic arrangements for the future.

For women, visiting broke the isolation they felt as they spent most of their time indoors, often working alone or with small children. Elvira Gnagi baked bread, sewed,
and cared for the poultry in her “Mountain Home” above San Jose while her husband worked with other men in the fields and went into town often. Gnagi’s nearest neighbors, Mrs. Bollman and Brundage, came by nearly everyday because they too were stranded on remote hill farms. On one rainy day, Gnagi jotted her feelings down in her diary. “These are indeed dismal & lonely days.” She claimed to have nothing to record except: “We eat, sleep & watch the rain coming down.” After several days of rain, finally Mr. and Mrs. Brundage came down to the Gnagi ranch despite the flooded roads and deep mud. Typically, however, they cooked meals and made tea for one another. When Mrs. Brundage got a hold of some “pie plant,” she shared stalks of the rhubarb with her neighbors. In other words, the women of this small community of fruit growers looked out for one another to increase their collective comfort. They made their visits social but purposeful, sharing food and companionship.\footnote{Elvira Marsh Gnagi, diary, 22 February, 26 March, 18 April, 2 May 1884, BANC MSS C-F 55; Thomas Pyle mentioned taking his wife to the homes of their closest neighbors, the Overfelts and the Tanners. Pyle, diary, 18 January; 1, 17, 22 February; 15 March; 20 April; 3, 7 May; 4, 21 July 1875.}

Food preparation and other chores required much of a nineteenth-century American’s day. Community members participated in a rural mutuality to reduce the amount of labor while maintaining a sense of obligation. Thomas Pyle and Daniel Heald regularly butchered animals and took pieces of fresh meat to nearby family members and neighbors, and these visits usually facilitated negotiations over labor and barter arrangements. For California men, economic transactions reinforced personal relationships within rural communities. Daniel Heald recorded many of the visitors to his dairy farm with whom he also did business. In Petaluma, the Mock family sold fruit to locals, including the Healds, and traveled up to the ranch regularly to spend time in the
countryside. Heald went to church and other group meetings with his friend Parker Freemen. Freemen and Heald regularly traded laborers and worked on each other’s farms. On February 2, 1871, Heald sent his laborer Frank to help Parker finish his plowing, and he noted later that he and Elizabeth went to the Freeman’s place to “spend the evening.” Californians relied on their neighbors for leisurely social gatherings and help on the farm; visiting maintained community and family ties facilitating economic transactions and social obligations.

Americans transplanted forms of social gatherings to California as they found them useful. Farmwomen participated in various “bees” to complete projects within a social atmosphere. Rebecca Woodson delighted in the fact when Larkin Cockrill brought his large Missouri family to the Analy Township of Sonoma County. She wrote, “There was not a scarcely ever a day we was not together. We did not think we could start to make a new dress or start piecing a new quilt without consulting each other.” While the Woodson/Cockrill sewing sessions did not constitute a sewing “bee,” women formed sewing circles whenever possible to tackle large tasks. Hester Harland mentioned forming a sewing circle for a woman soon to be married. Harland and the other Downieville ladies made a trousseau for “Miss Hungerford.” The trousseau represented the beginning of Hungerford’s new life, and the women of Downieville wanted to make sure the bride-to-be had all of the necessary items to start housekeeping, even if sewn by newly made acquaintances instead of kin.310

310 Woodson, “A Sketch in the Life”; Hester Ann Harland, Reminiscences (N.p., 1941); “/49,” "A Warning to all Young Gents who patronize the Napa Ladies Sewing Circle,” folder “/49,” box 11, Papers of James Lloyd LaFayette Warren, 1805-1896, Bancroft. When the Woodson left Sonoma County, they moved to Monterey County, following other Analy settlers. Several of the Cockrill girls married Bardin men who pursued dairy just outside of Salinas.
Families arranged these informal social gatherings to bring neighbors together in rural areas, but as communities grew they were also able to take advantage of other types of leisure activities. In most agricultural communities during the 1870s and 1880s, farm people joined churches, lodges, and granges. At grange meetings, families socialized and discussed economic matters pertinent to farmers of the state. Couples attended together, singing, praying, and visiting with neighbors. In addition, several granges, such as the Santa Rosa and the Bennett Valley meetings, met together during the year, bringing together family or friends from nearby towns. In the case of these two towns, winemakers in Bennett Valley had an opportunity to meet with Santa Rosa grape growers at combined meetings, allowing them to discuss future goals for both. Gatherings at Grange Halls mirrored informal visits at farm homes; members discussed farm topics and the economy within a relaxed atmosphere of friends, punctuating the serious issues with songs and prayers. A visitor at Petaluma’s weekly meeting mocked Mrs. Heald and others for a lengthy discussion of bread-making. Despite this newspaperman’s ridicule of the Petaluma grangers, the patrons of husbandry meetings and other gatherings brought farm families together, giving them another venue to assemble as a community, even if they only wanted to talk about bread.³¹ⁱ

³¹¹ See reports of separate grange meetings together in the Pacific Rural Press. S. J. Coulter, master of the Santa Rosa Grange, invited I. C. Steele, of Steele Dairies and the Pescadero Grange No. 32, to speak at a joint meeting of the Santa Rosa and Bennett Valley granges. Coulter to Steele, undated postcard, folder “Correspondence and other printed material re: State Grange,” Steele Family Papers, Bancroft. Warren Ewer, the editor, reported on activities of specific granges when he thought they might interest patrons in other parts of the state, such as a grange cannery (fruit) in San Diego County. Petaluma Argus, 16 October 1874; Pacific Rural Press, 6 January 1883. At another meeting Heald discussed the Oran wheat samples he received from the Patent Office (probably USDA by this point), he described its planting and yields. Agriculturalists had been experimenting with this spring variety of wheat in the west. In Oregon, the university agricultural professors first planted Oran wheat in the 1872-1873 season. George Edmonston Jr., “Ben Arnold's Legacy,” Beaver Eclips (Oregon State University alumni page), available at http://alumni.oregonstate.edu/eclips/carry/aug17_2001.html, accessed 30 May 2006.
California grangers used picnics and “feasts” to gather monthly and to celebrate holidays or other special events during the 1870s and 1880s. In addition to weekly meetings, many patrons sponsored at least one “harvest feast” per month. One granger commented that the “‘social feature’ of the Grange, as manifested principally through the harvest feast, is evidently the true social feature of American life.” Throughout the country, farm work had been transformed by migration, mechanization, and new crops. Families worked year in and year out to get ahead, and this grange member wanted to remind readers to socialize because there “is no danger whatever of farmers giving themselves to riotous living; the danger lies in the opposite direction.” The women, as he noted, had much to do with social activities in the granges, especially during harvest feasts and picnics. Farmwives brought baskets full of food for everyone to eat as a group. Callie Elliott wrote to her brother about a picnic on 6 May 1874. “Can not you come down and attend? I think you would enjoy it ever so much. We have invited the Stockton Grange and the Woodbridge and Liberty Granges are going to unite with us in getting it up. We all anticipate a good time.” Elliott’s meeting had more than 100 members, and they enjoyed numerous activities as a congregation. These grangers threw a surprise party for one couple, and Callie considered having her wedding “in the Grange.”

Californians, like so many other Americans, celebrated the Fourth of July each year, parading down main thoroughfares, picnicking, and listening to speeches. Communities put on grand displays of patriotism couched in an atmosphere of leisure and recreation. In Petaluma, for the 1871 celebration, the town committee planned a parade
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312 “Harvest Feasts and Grange Picnics,” Pacific Rural Press, 17 April 1875; “Harvest Feast at Vallejo,” Pacific Rural Press, 6 June 1874; Callie Elliott to Wilson Elliott, 2 April 1874 and Callie Elliott to Eddie Elliott, 3 April 1874, Elliott Family Papers; Grange Patron, 6 February 1878; “A Bennett Valley Granger Surprised,” Sonoma Democrat, 17 November 1883. Granges made “centers of pleasant social life.”
with a “Federal salute” and “National salute” fired at sunrise and sunset, a reading of the Declaration of Independence, and fireworks. At the same time, lodges, such as the Odd Fellows of Sebastopol, held their own precessions often accompanied by simple but bountiful barbeques and suppers.313

Whether or not they were grangers, farm families combined leisure, nature, and education. Camping emerged by the 1880s as a means for urban dwellers to escape the city and for rural people to rest and take advantage of the extraordinary landscape of the state’s oceans, mountains, and sequoia forests. Eastern farm families worked most of the year to prepare for winter and were then free from the seasonal busy-ness of sowing, harvesting, threshing, butter and cheese making, and the like. During the winter, they tackled neglected tasks, fixing tools or sewing, and worked on small projects indoors. Families took sleigh rides, and found other ways of passing their days during the cold, snowy months of winter. In California, however, farmers worked much of the year. During the “winter,” or rainy season, the growing season commenced, and farmers harvested in the warm months of June and July. During the dry season, except for some of the most northern counties, temperatures rose and the pace of work slowed. When

313 Petaluma Argus, 1 and 8 July 1871. For a discussion of approaches taken by different class groups, see W. Caleb McDaniel, “The Fourth and the First: Abolitionist Holidays, Respectability, and Radical Interracial Reform,” American Quarterly 57, no. 1 (2005): 129-151. McDaniel states, “On the one hand, elites gave public addresses, attended private dinners, organized parades to display their power, and made grandiloquent toasts to themselves. Their representations of the Fourth, as Waldstreicher puts it, “portrayed the order and decorum worthy of virtuous republicans,” laying constant “stress on behavior and appearance.” Working-class laborers were less likely to spend the day so loftily. Most preferred to drink copious amounts of alcohol, which fueled drunken processions and risky experiments with primitive fireworks (132). For several descriptions, including both coastal areas and mining towns, see contemporary reports reprinted in “An Old Time Fourth of July,” American West 5 (July 1968): 37-48. Santa Cruz celebrations in the 1880s included respectable events such as parades and “peaceful-looking encampments” of cavalry companies and the “auricular torture” perpetrated by “hoodlums and small boys” using “every Chinese-invented devices for the rupture of the ear” (40). And in Bodie, a mining town, one writer said no July 4th celebration was complete without a “secondary parade and oration served up by a collection of local clowns, generally known as ‘The Horribles’” (42).
Evelyn Hertslet complained about laundry on hot days, it was because the temperature reached 102 in the kitchen of her Lake County home at 9 a.m. Families had good reasons to escape the farm in the dry, hot summer months.

For this reason, agricultural societies held county fairs and agricultural exhibitions starting in September. At the fairs, farmers learned about new techniques, crops, and livestock. Despite five months on the trail in 1859, Napoléon Byrne immediately went to the Alameda County fair being held in nearby Oakland. His wife wrote home about their safe arrival and that “Nap is in a great way about the grapes, he calculates on making a great deal of wine.” At the fair, Byrne discussed California’s conditions, and she told her Missouri relatives, “Nap is assured by the gardeners around here that they do not need irrigation.” Working farmers found exhibits of interest at various fairs. The Wetmore family attended the “Mechanics Exhibition” held in San Francisco 1880. Robert H. Wetmore, the patriarch, enthusiastically investigated the “first rate exhibition of livestock” and the great variety of fruit on display. More than that, he enjoyed hearing President Hayes and General Sherman speak. The Wetmores and the Byrnes took short trips to visit exhibitions to increase their knowledge of regional opportunities and new
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314 Mary Byrne to Mary Eliza Bryan, 9 October 1859, reprinted in Margaret Carleton Hussey, “The History of the Napoleon Byrne Family,” vol. 2, Byrne Family Papers, BANC MSS 71/37c, Bancroft Library.
315 Dairy cows had to be milked twice a day every day, and all of the livestock and chickens needed to be fed and watered. When the Tibbits left their farm, they left the farmer’s brother in charge as the “chore boy.” N. H. Tibbits, an unmarried former miner, worked for his brother or other odd jobs and complained to his former mining partner about having to care for the animals, including the “Dorg.” He also accepted the fact that “old batches” (a California equivalent to Old Maids) should not try to marry, even though it “would doo [sic] us fine if we had each a good Wife such would draw all the bad humors out of our frail body.” In eastern rural communities, unmarried aunts often helped with their sisters’ families while California had a plethora of single men. See chapter five for the fate of other miners who failed to establish their own families. N. H. Tibbits to Wilson Elliott, 8 August 1871, folder 43, and 11 December 1871, folder 44, box 962, Elliott Family Papers.
agricultural information.316

People also traveled relatively long distances to go to fairs in other communities, allowing them to visit the “sights” along the way and see new farming regions. Sarah Barnes went to the Sonoma County fair in 1872, just a wagon ride away in Petaluma but expected several friends to travel farther distances to stay with her and go to the fair. 317 Because Californians regularly attended agricultural shows outside of their communities, newspaper editors listed exhibitions in numerous localities.318 In the circular announcing a fair in Los Angeles, the committee members provided information for L.A. area residents and visitors. Fair premiums encouraged locals to contribute their best examples of crops, livestock, or domestic productions, and “camping accommodations” made room for visitors’ wagons and horses.319 Editors throughout the state shared announcements to advertise both aspects of exhibitions. Many of the farm families taking these camping trips had come to the state in the 1850s and 1860s, trekking across the plains, and now revisited the open spaces as experienced through travel and camping after ten or twenty

316 The Wetmores probably attended the Mechanics’ Institute annual industrial exhibition, held in San Francisco (10 August 1880 to 11 September 1880). Californians established the Mechanics’ Institute in 1854 to provide technical education for residents interested in agriculture and mechanical arts because it had become clear that the placers no longer had enough gold to sustain a large number of independent miners. The fairs ran for more than a month and attracted as many as half a million visitors. The officers of the institute used the proceeds of the fairs to fund training and stock its library. The institute’s history is available on its website at http://www.milibrary.org/hist.html, accessed 16 May 2006. Sarah Barnes, 12 September 1872; Mary Byrne to Mary Eliza Bryan, 9 October 1859, reprinted in Margaret Carleton Hussey, “The History of the Napoleon Byrne Family,” Byrne Family Papers.

317 Women also contributed items to the fairs, including essays, canned fruit, sewing samples, and flower arrangements. For several months before the Sonoma County Fair, Sarah Barnes, her daughter, and neighbors were sewing constantly in their free time. Louisa E. Strentzel, to “My Dear Aunt,” 19 October 1859, Strentzel Family Papers, BANC MSS 75/86c, Bancroft Library; Southern California Horticulturist, September and November 1877, November 1880.

318 Petaluma Argus, 11 September 1874.

319 Circular from Sixth District Board of Agriculture (Los Angeles), 15 August 1880, folder “C-Miscellany,” box 1, Papers of James Lloyd LaFayette Warren, 1805-1896, Bancroft.
years of building homesteads.\textsuperscript{320}

On camping trips, farm families gathered resources from the places they visited. The Matthews family of San Benito took regular trips into wooded areas near home to find honey and picnicked near the trees containing honey combs, and they picked berries on a longer trip to Monterey. During the hot days of August, Joseph W. Matthews took his family over the Santa Lucia Mountains to enjoy the sea breezes along the coast. They joined about six other families at the lighthouse, and together they all ate and visited on the sands below. After a few days of investigating the tidal pools and Monterey’s Chinatown, several families departed for their own excursions. The Emmons family turned their wagons for Pacific Grove where the Methodist camp meeting met each summer, and the Matthews clan headed for the huckleberry patches in the hills, hoping to take baskets of the wild growing fruit home.\textsuperscript{321} Both the Emmons and Matthews’s family camped for leisure and made their trips more meaningful, spiritually or economically. The berries turned out to be “small in a pecuniary point of view,” and “this expedition did not pay but the enjoyment it afforded did.” Nonetheless, the Matthews looked for foods to take home to supplement domestic production.\textsuperscript{322}

\textsuperscript{320} Mrs. Jacob Barzilla Rideout, \textit{Camping Out in California} (San Francisco: R. R. Patterson, 1889), 5-207. Rideout described the venture cloaked in obvious nostalgia: she received an invitation to go camping with friends, “pitching their tents where night found them, and cooking their provisions the old-fashioned way over a camp-fire in a dutch oven and a long-handled frying pan” (5). Emphasis in original. See also Charles S. Greene, “Camping in Mendocino,” \textit{Overland Monthly} 22 (Oct 1893): 337-348; John R. G. Hassard, “Camping Out in California,” \textit{Century} 33 (March 1887): 736-50.

\textsuperscript{321} For additional references to religious camp meetings, see Susannah Braly, diary, 8 and 14 October 1875, MS 210; “Farm Life in 1882,” 16.

\textsuperscript{322} Pacific Grove became the official site of the Methodists and served as the center of the Pacific Coast Chautauqua. David Jacks invested thousands of dollars to build the camp grounds. Visitors stayed in tents or cabins, swam in the bath houses, and walked in the forest dells edging Pacific Grove and Monterey. Anna Seward stayed in a Pacific Grove tent in July 1884 and, she wrote that she “kept house with only a coffee pot and a frying pan for kitchen equipment. It was fun. We had leisure for excursions. At nearby Chinatown we bough shells and sea urchins.” Most of the campers were from small towns and urban areas. Matthews commented “a great deal of expense has been incurred in fixing it up.” His family camped on
Berry hunts, religious camp meetings, and camping trips were all ways that rural people escaped the farm for a week at a time without extravagant expenditures. Families put together food from the pantry and loaded the farm wagon with supplies, blankets, and each other. They often gathered food, fished, and hunted along the way to add to the camp’s provisions. Twelve-year-old Birney Burrell remembered a “strawberry hunt” in June 1853 when his family and several neighbors headed down the Santa Cruz Mountains from their home. After two days of picking, Birney noted in his diary, “We have got as many strawberrys as we want and have decided on going home tomorrow.” The men killed some sea lions for their blubber and gathered mussels for their last dinner by the shore.³²³ Lavinia Robbins remembered that her Aunt Alma in Green Valley cooked good food for camping trips, especially the ham and apple sauce. The younger boys went into Tomales Bay to catch crabs, fish, and sharks.³²⁴ Farm families camping enjoyed the same locations as “excursionists,” urban visitors, who paid for access to nature. For rural people, nature was a part of their lives on a daily basis and needed no mitigation. City people who did not have the supplies and tools to make camping comfortable needed the
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³²³ Birney Burrell, diary, 5-8 June 1853, in Burrell Letters. The Burrells were not the only ones to visit this patch. See Eliza Woodson Burhans Farnham, California, In-Doors and Out; or, How We Farm, Mine, and Live Generally in the Golden State (New York: Dix, Edwards, 1856), 213-47.
organization found at Pacific Grove or various excursion companies.  

Farmers made even the simplest camping trip into an economic prospect because agriculture was fundamentally a business. Family members contributed their labor to the farm enterprise and conserved hard-earned income by recycling waste or relying on home production. Whenever farm families faced difficult economic times, fathers, mothers, and children helped by “doing without” or “making do” with old clothes or simpler meals. Often this was enough to overcome a bad business deal, a batch of sour butter, or a blight. During periods of national economic depression, however, farmers reached out to other men in the similar conditions. In the 1870s, 1880s, and 1890s, farmers struck out against the icons of the American economy—middlemen, monopolists, and railroad companies. As a result, Californians established protective unions, farmers’ clubs, granges, grower associations, and cooperatives during these years to defend their interests. They wanted consistent incomes from their crops and reasonable transportation

---

325 Librarian Gary Kurutz points out that immigrants started taking nature excursions and camping trips as early as the early 1850s. The ocean and Spanish landmarks such as the Mission Delores near San Francisco were destinations that cost people little, and mining families had the chance to escape the heat of the interior while urban dwellers found respite in greener pastures, literally. Families visited nurseries and gardens and natural wonders. Stagecoach operators shuttled visitors from towns to the ocean or to places such as Calaveras where people marveled at the Big Trees, a grove of Sequoia gigantea. Gary F. Kurutz, “Popular Culture on the Golden Shore,” in Rooted in Barbarous Soil: People, Culture, and Community in Gold Rush California, eds. Kevin Starr and Richard J. Orsi (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 280-315. Kurutz mentions other types of leisure activities in this chapter, from the typical pursuits of male miners (gaming houses and drinking saloons) to imported forms of recreation which were considered as “civilizing influences” (e.g., theater and libraries). See also George W. Pine, Beyond the West (Utica, N.Y.: T. J. Griffiths, 1870), 442; William Cole, California: Its Scenery, Climate, Productions, and Inhabitants (New York: Irish-American Office, 1872), 52-68; “Health and Pleasure Resorts of Monterey Bay,” Pacific Rural Press, 3 June 1882, Wait, Wines and Vines of California, 137-38 Silas Darius Ingram, Statement from Silas Darius Ingram, 27 August 1886, BANC MSS C-D 566, Bancroft. Alphonine Sanders had a house in the foothills of the Santa Cruz mountains that became a resort for townspeople “who wish to go to the country for a change during vacation.” Alphonine, her husband, and her children housed as many as 24 boarders during the summer. Some visitors returned year after year, mainly to stay in the mountains, see the “sites,” and eat the fresh foods of the Sanders’s family farm. Josephine J. Crawford to “Aunt,” 1 March 1888 and 3 September 1890, folder 14, box 10, Correspondence, 1857-1898, SMCII Collection, CSL.
rates. They had mortgages to pay and mouths to feed; low prices for crops threatened farmers’ businesses and their homes.

Historians have focused on the rise of agribusiness in the state, especially pointing to early organizational efforts. Winemakers, raisin producers, and orange growers all founded associations that led eventually to the growth of these industries. Steven Stoll argued that citrus cooperatives “interjected the California countryside into the churning center of the American economy” and thus the industrialization of the landscape. Yet the nation’s farmers, not just California’s, in this period had been “interjected” into the economy and formed organizations to diminish the worst aspects of being connected so intimately with the markets and economics of the cities. During the late nineteenth century, California’s rural people still viewed their labors in terms of families and homes. In the early 1880s, dairy merchants in San Francisco put oleomargarine on the market, and farmers’ response exemplifies how they framed their organizational efforts.326

Prior to the 1880s, butter and cheesemakers joined the Patrons of Husbandry to gain the benefits of the Dairy Produce Department and later the Grangers’ Business Association. Enough dairymen joined the Grange in 1873 that the officers authorized the Dairy Produce Department to sell butter and cheese on behalf of the membership, eliminating the middleman from the process. John H. Hegler, the head of the department, claimed that by September 1874 he handled about one-quarter of the dairy products entering the city of San Francisco. He also figured an increase in butter prices (25 1/8¢ to 33 1/6¢) related directly to the grange’s intercession. Soon after this report, the state grange officers abolished the department and replaced it with the Grangers’ Business

Association. The business agent continued to sell butter and cheese, and patrons built cheese factories near their farms to process milk. The panic of 1873 spurred farmers to work collectively, and they joined the grange with much hope for the future.  

The Grange’s power as an economic and political force waned during the 1880s, and farmers left the group to join crop specific associations. Once again, farmers founded these groups in response to perceived threats to their businesses. In the case of dairymen, distributors successfully introduced oleomargarine made in the East and Midwest from the tallow processed at urban slaughterhouses. The industrialized meat moguls, such as Philip D. Armour, Gustavus Swift, and Nelson Morris, slaughtered and shipped cut beef to the cities at a rate unknown until the post Civil War era. Between 1866 and 1885, more than 5 million cattle went north Abilene to Chicago. Slaughterhouse workers dismembered hundreds of thousands of animals per year and created volumes of waste, including blood, bones, and tallow. In Chicago, workers washed so much of the offal into the Chicago River, locals called it “Bubbly Creek.” By 1873, manufacturers made butter by mixing tallow or lard with small quantities of butter and marketed it as “oleomargine, “Lardine,” or “Butterine,” and by 1877 legislators started passing laws against butter substitute.  

Californians, especially dairymen, read newspaper reports about oleomargarine and its effect on the dairy market. A Boston Herald writer investigated the source of the
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328 Many grangers kept their meetings active for social and educational purposes. Secretary’s Report, Patrons of Husbandry California State Grange San Jose Grange, No. 10 Records, 1873-1907, BANC MSS 67/149 c FILM; Carr, The Patrons of Husbandry on the Pacific Coast, 134, 140.

“spurious butter,” tracing it back to the Armour packing plants in New York, Milwaukee, and Kansas City. The author claimed that a “private letter” from Armour officials to a butter dealer stated that the former had the “desire to keep it moving.” As oleo made its way to the Far West, the California legislature also passed protective legislation.

Newspaper editors made sure that residents understood that Butterine was not the same as pure, California dairy butter. Editors and angry correspondents wrote vituperative articles calling oleo by a variety of names: “bogus butter,” “spurious butter,” and “bull butter,” for example. Dairymen drew their line in the sand against this “evil,” flung their epithets, and persuaded state legislators to pass protective laws.330 Lawmakers required oleo sellers to clearly mark their product as non-dairy butter, but this did not quell the ire of butter makers. Oleomargarine distributors wrapped Butterine and Lardine in paper upon which the law had been printed. In December 1882, dairymen, agricultural professors, and boosters met in San Francisco to organize the Dairymen’s Association and demand stronger legislation. Representatives from all of the coastal dairy states met and discussed how to protect their real butter from being usurped by “bull butter.”331

More than just protecting profits, butter makers and their supporters fashioned oleomargarine into a menace, a home-wrecking force that snuck onto consumers’ tables and destroyed family farms. Granger Clara Deming of Vallejo wrote to the Pacific Rural

331 E. J. Wickson, elected secretary, started at the University of California in 1875 with a primary interest in dairying and started instruction on that subject in 1879. Bernhard Marks and Samuel Miller also attended, representing the two emerging inland diary counties Fresno and Stanislaus. Much of Fresno’s settlement occurred because of the efforts of colony agents such as Marks and is discussed in chapter four. “The Proposed Law and What it is Hoped to Gain by it,” and “The Dairymen’s Convention,” Pacific Rural Press, 16 December 1882; Dairy Research and Information Center, University of California, Davis, http://drinc.ucdavis.edu/depthistory/intro.htm, accessed 5 June 2006.
Press to praise the male members of the dairymen’s convention for helping farmwives. She wrote, “If oleomargarine is to take the place of butter, the scanty supply of pocket money of many a farmer’s wife will become scantier still, and dairymen will have to sell their fine stock to the manufacturers and find new employment.” Deming was not the only one to see oleo as a harbinger of the failure of family operations. The editor of the Pacific Rural Press published a special “Dairymen’s Edition” to print the results of the convention. Warren Ewer of the Press juxtaposed the image of prosperous family operated dairies with the image of a decrepit dirt farm. The orderly dairy barn promised “prosperity” while men chasing bulls in a ramshackle corral recalled the state’s recklessness during the gold mining years. Ewer proclaimed that oleomargarine replaced the virtues of the family operations with “the poverty, the squalor and the listless indolence.”

In the 1880s, dairymen had no idea that California, one day, would become the leading state in dairy products, and many of them feared the immediate prospects of losing their land, complete with houses and dairy barns, because of oleomargarine.

In their rally against oleomargarine, butter makers reminded consumers from where fresh butter came. Manufacturers made Butterine in factories, but farmers milked cows and churned it to produce the real thing. Their claims might seem disingenuous if farm families did not actually exist in the state. California families—such as the Healds of Petaluma, the Woodsons of Bloomfield, or the Matthews of San Benito—lived, worked, and played on their homesteads, even if they were called “ranches.” California’s soil provided them with incomes, and the state’s mountains and oceans became

---

backdrops for other leisure pursuits. The state’s promoters promised these opportunities for reward and repose, and residents took advantage of them. More than 100 years later, western writer Wallace Stegner reflected on the landscape’s power to inspire hyperbole: “And the boosters have been there from the beginning to oversell the West as the Garden of the World, the flowing well of opportunity, the stamping ground of the self-reliant.”

Like the West, California had its promoters, but they eschewed self-reliance as a relic of the speculative, individualistic mining days and laid their hopes in communities and colonies of men, women, and children who would spend their seasons of work to build a prosperous state and morally-sound communities.

---

CHAPTER 4. COMMUNITIES MADE TO ORDER: THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND MORAL LANDSCAPE OF CALIFORNIA COLONIES

When Professor Ezra Carr wrote his text on behalf of the Patrons of Husbandry, he recorded the trials and tribulations of California farmers in order to explain why they united under the banner of the Grange in the mid-1870s.\(^{334}\) In the process, Carr described the depredations of monopolists and middlemen against the agriculturalists of the state. Grangers rallied against urban businessmen and bankers who seemed to control transportation, credit, and land, key resources for farmers producing for markets. As a result, he proposed that farmers rely on the “social economy” of rural communities and cooperative associations to replace middlemen and monopolists. More than just promoting the Grange, however, Carr worried that too many people were leaving American farms to the point that the “country is depleted of its most energetic and intelligent members” while “overfull” cities faced throngs of the unemployed. Like any good California booster, he praised the “thrifty, home-building” immigrants who settled the eastern and midwestern states, and pointed to various precedents for “community and village systems of farming.” Carr recommended Californians carve out “colonies” from the landscape to attract “colonies” of industrious farm families.\(^{335}\)

By referring to colonies in different contexts, Carr promoted two strategies for settlement, both used by Americans and the foreign-born searching for new communities during the late nineteenth century. Prospective settlers formed “colonies” to facilitate their moves to the Midwest and Far West. The families involved pooled money, set


terms for who could join them, and enjoyed having hand picked neighbors in their new communities, often using the legal-financial structure of the corporation. These colonists intended to farm and recreate their communities in California even though they made arrangements as an incorporated body. Emigrants from various states used this type of colony in place of the slower process of chain migration. In addition, Owenites, transcendentalists, and other social radicals, moved west from the upper reaches of New York into the Midwest, and a few groups went as far west as California to plant their utopian colonies. In either case, individuals joining colonies chose their neighbors based on how they wanted to work and live. But, as Carr pointed out, not all rural people had a specific group with whom to form such communities. Thus the professor paid tribute to Charles K. Landis for his planned farm community just outside of Philadelphia. In 1861, Landis located a piece of land, surveyed it, and advertised his colony. By 1865, more than 5,000 individuals settled in Vineland, New Jersey, to farm and live among other abstemious families. Carr lauded Landis for finding a way to “preserve intact the

---

336 The motives and movements of groups in California are similar to those that settled in other states. Members of utopian societies and certain religious sects sought out good land and freedom from persecution. The Icarians moved from Texas, to the former Mormon town of Nauvoo, Illinois, and then to Iowa before a small group traveled to California, naming the Pacific Coast settlement, the Icaria-Speranza Colony. The Community of True Inspiration formed the Amana Colonies, settling in Iowa about the same time as the Icarians but stayed. Like most colonies, they desired a location with economic opportunity to keep the colony viable but isolated enough to preserve their cultural identity. See Peter Hoehnle, “Machine in the Garden: The Woolen Textile Industry of the Amana Society, 1785-1942,” *Annals of Iowa* 61, no. 1 (2002): 24-67. In the 1930s, the residents of Amana abandoned communal agriculture and manufacturing for production based on a capitalistic model. Compare the Amanas to the short-lived Icaria-Speranza in Cloverdale, California, where they produced wine communally for a short period. Also consider groups that stayed east of the Rockies, including colonies such as Brook Farm in Massachusetts, New Harmony in Indiana, and Fairhope in Alabama. Robert V. Hine, *California’s Utopian Colonies* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1973), 3-11; Charles Gide, *Communist and Co-Operative Colonies*, trans. Ernest F. Row (London: George G. Harrap & Co., 1930), 147, 203; Ernest P. Peninou, comp., *History of the Sonoma Viticultural District: The Grape Growers, the Wine Makers and the Vineyards* (Santa Rosa: Nomis Press, 1998), 184-86.
sanctity of the individual home, while securing the fullest advantages of social union.”

In other words, one did not have to be a socialist or a member of a communal society to benefit from the protection of the colony system.

The Landis-style colony system worked especially well in California because Mexican grantees owned large parcels of land. Well before Carr wrote about the idea of colonies, Californians had proceeded in the manner of Landis. Starting in the 1850s, California landowners and their agents subdivided and developed land for settlement purposes. The directors of the Los Angeles Vineyard Society established Anaheim in 1857 that became known as the “Mother Colony.” Landowners continued subdividing property for sale during the 1860s and 1870s, but it was not until the 1880s and 1890s that the real boom of colony building occurred. As more settlers arrived via the transcontinental railroad, colony lands provided homes and farms to rural and urban families fleeing the cities. The colony system solved several problems facing new settlers, and the promoters of these new communities promised good land titles, water rights, and assistance with new crops.

Most colony planners focused their land development around creating agricultural communities, yet many of these California colonies have now been enveloped in larger metropolitan areas, especially the colonies of Southern California. In his article

---


regarding Southern California colonies, Oscar Osburn Winther vaguely alluded to the different types of colonies while discussing their histories without assigning much significance to the varying approaches. He made even less distinction between utopian colonies and incorporated ventures, assuming that the cooperative efforts of the latter were weaker versions of the former. Nonetheless, cooperative settlement and community building worked as planned, which allowed a modicum of social and economic support and a feeling of independence. By the 1890s, boosters refined their rhetoric to reflect the balance of assistance and independence. San Joaquin Valley promoter John Wood Northrup proclaimed “In so far as ownership is concerned, every man will be independent; but settlers can co-operate in purchasing supplies, piping water, canning, drying and otherwise preserving fruits, making olive oil and marketing their products. Besides all this, they would have the advantages of social life from the start, with schools, churches, library, stores, post office, etc., which might otherwise be long in coming.” This formula worked to attract settlers to new developments because it gave them the best of both worlds. Colony planners added roads and lobbied for railroad stops that connected the communities to distant markets. Because of these transportation networks, these communities grew quickly and lost their rural characters as they were swallowed by metropolitan Los Angeles. Neither the colonists nor the community promoters intended for these places to become cities but instead planned the colonies to become rural centers of agricultural production and social control.339

In California, especially after 1869, landowners and boosters wanted to attract more rural people to the state and dissuade immigrants from choosing agricultural states

such as Iowa, Wisconsin, or Minnesota. American and European groups moved into these areas in search of large enough tracts of land to have family homesteads in one central location. A San Francisco resident told the newly arrived Henry Wetmore “not to buy or settle in California but wait a year & then take up a lot of land together & form a colony to help each other.” From Boston, Wetmore’s brother began the process of writing land commissioners in several states to find the right location for the colony. The extended Wetmore family migrated west over several years for the “general good” of the clan. As soon as the various men had earned enough money, they wanted to reunite the fragmented extended family in one place—in California, Minnesota, or Dakota Territory. Initially, Henry Wetmore and numerous other men chose California for a temporary stay not permanent relocation.

Land developer Northrup and farmer Wetmore provide examples of the two types of colonies as described by nineteenth-century Americans. Hopeful colonists perceived their agreements for settlement in terms of social communities, while developers and promoters created colonies as destinations for individuals interested in joining

---

340 John Wesley North established a mill and town in Northfield, Minnesota. He intended to recreate a New England village in the territory and attract families interested in forming “an intelligent, temperate, religious society.” North later created an agricultural colony in Riverside, California, for “good industrious people” with “high principles and ideals,” including a number of Minnesota residents. North competed for settlers with Horace Greeley’s Union Colony of Colorado, organized by Nathan Meeker. The Union Colony was also a joint stock colony with land moistened by irrigation and the residents dry without liquor. After Riverside, North continued being involved in colonization projects in Fresno County. North quoted in Tom Patterson, A Colony for California: Riverside’s First Hundred Years (Riverside: Press-Enterprise, 1971), 13-61; Merlin Stonehouse, John Wesley North and the Reform Frontier (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1965), 217-19. For a description of the difficulties North and his wife faced on the Minnesota frontier before organizing the town, see their letters in the Papers of John Wesley North, 1849-1947, Huntington Library. Hard work, isolation, and a lack of conveniences plagued John and Ann North. Settlers hoped colonies would allow them to avoid these difficulties as much as possible.

341 Several subsets of the Wetmore family settled in various parts of Sonoma County while a few brothers continued working elsewhere. By 1885, it seems they still had not reunited the entire family. Henry Wetmore to John Wetmore, 16 February 1880, Paul L. Wetmore to John Wetmore, 21 February 1880, and Henry Wetmore to John Wetmore, 30 March 1885, John Griffeth Wetmore Correspondence, 1880-1885, BANC MSS C-B 708 FILM, Bancroft Library.
communities for economic and social purposes. Landowners, their agents, and immigrants used the colony system in California to negotiate a new political, economic, and social landscape in terms each party understood, and at times these two types of colonies overlapped. For the owners, subdivision translated directly into land sales, and for new settlers these California colonies represented economically, socially, and morally sound communities in a land best known for its wildness and instability.

In most cases, a small group of investors formed a capital stock corporation to administer a proposed colony. The company bought land, subdivided it into farm lots with roads, water ditches or pipes, and town lots. Investors in these projects came from a variety of backgrounds, including rancho owners and grantees, San Francisco businessmen, and settlers. Company agents sold shares granting the holders the right to buy land and participate in administration. Shareholders elected officers and voted at meetings, giving the land owners a voice throughout the building process. The corporate directors acted much like a city council, authorizing expenditures on road and ditch building and upholding the colony by-laws, which might include bans on alcohol sales or manufacture. Both capitalists (colonies as destinations) and emigrants (colonies as social communities) incorporated in order to pool funds for expensive projects and reduce individual risk.

---

342 In several instances, both types of colonies overlapped. For instance, San Bernardino Colony, subdivided by Pacific Coast Land Bureau, an office of the Southern Pacific Railroad Company. California Immigrant Union agents subdivided and advertised the railroad lands, culminating in the town of Colton near Riverside. At the same time, a “placeless colony” contacted the CIU. A booster reported that a “first-class colony now forming in the Eastern States, will occupy at least fifty of the farms” in San Bernardino County. To boosters California remained the “land of promise” and for colonists the golden state promised land to fulfill their hopes and dreams. Hall’s Land Journal, March 1877; Richard J. Orsi, Sunset Limited: The Southern Pacific Railroad and the Development of the American West, 1850-1930 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 106-07.
It was this combination of incorporation and settlement that has obfuscated the role of colonies in rural California, yet the joint stock corporation offered advantages to individuals investing their life savings in a move to the Far West. As shareholders, the settlers had rights protected under contract law. Historian James Willard Hurst points to the importance of the contract in utilizing resources and bringing order to the market in extractive industries such as Wisconsin lumbering. Colonists/shareholders expected the directors to fulfill the contract which reduced the risk of the colonists and their investments. Additionally, investors did not depend on only a few men to carry out the designs of the colony. Directors were voted into office (president, vice-president, treasurer), which guaranteed the existence of the colony. If one man died, moved on, or failed to uphold the by-laws, another man took his place to fulfill the terms of the legal agreement.343 All farmers took risks when they started in a new land, but California’s climate and history complicated the matter. Boosters complained about obstacles to settling California because prospective settlers chose other places over California. Contracts made under the guise of joint stock corporations assuaged colonists’ fears and fostered new farming communities in the state. The corporate structure did not fully eliminate a farmer’s risk in California but gave settlers more control over land, water, and transportation.344

343 In order to have more control over their neighborhoods in California, colony designers worked clauses into their by-laws requiring lot owners to offer their shares to the colony directors and shareholders before trying to sell them to outsiders. Dorothea Jean Paule, “The German Settlement at Anaheim,” (master’s thesis, University of Southern California, 1952, available online at http://www.anaheimcolony.com/anaheimthesis.htm, accessed 7 March 2006.
State and federal legislators passed laws authorizing contractual arrangements because Americans expected lawmakers to facilitate the growth of the market. Considering the fact that a majority of Americans prior to 1860 farmed for a living, the demand for arable land also led the federal government to focus on land policy through a good part of the 1800s. Farmers persisted in their pleas for cheaper land which eventually resulted in Congress passing the Preemption Act of 1841 and the Homestead Act of 1862. The combination of contract law and public land policies combined reflected two social realities of nineteenth-century attitudes. First, hard work should be rewarded with tangible results, and contracts benefited individuals willing to direct their energy toward risky ventures. Second, resources were meant to be used, especially land and what grows on it. Legislators provided small-scale investors with the means to bring land into use for profit, especially when capital investment was scarce.\textsuperscript{345}

Cash was scarce and so was water in much of California. Most of the state’s colonies, existed in the interior and southern sections of the state where lack of water and knowledge about farming in these arid regions made settlement more difficult, if not more expensive. Irrigation ditch construction cost too much for individual farmers to undertake while starting new farms. For example, before selling lots for the Anaheim Colony in Los Angeles County, surveyor George Hansen chose the land carefully to include a ditch from the Santa Ana River.\textsuperscript{346} Hansen, on behalf of the Los Angeles

\textsuperscript{345} Hurst, \textit{Law and Economic Growth}, 301. Hurst discussed how small-scale, cash-poor lumbermen used the corporation to exploit lumber lands in Wisconsin. As we will see, colonists invested in corporations to pool their smaller investments to bring enough capital to California to buy land and get started. Landowners who used incorporation to create colonies were often land-rich but without the funds to subdivide, develop, and advertise their sites.

\textsuperscript{346} In 1889, the southern portion of Los Angeles County became Orange County, which included the Anaheim, Westminster, Tustin, Santa Ana, and Richland/Orange colonies. By the late 1880s, colonization of lands attracted more people who eventually agitated for separation. T economic identities were based on
Vineyard Society, bought 1,000 acres of the Rancho Cajon de Santa Ana and water rights. Pacifico Ontiveras already had a garden and ditch, near the LAVC land, and Hansen had to tap into the river below his property. It took Hansen’s crew several months to carefully survey the land so that water ran smoothly to the site in ditches cutting through unimproved land occupied mainly by cactus and jackrabbits. Therefore, in Fresno, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino counties, landowners used the colony system to guarantee water along with solid titles to purchasers. Promoters compensated for disadvantages by reinventing the landscape, adding water or proving the soil’s adaptability to profitable crops in places that seemed formidable to small-scale operators.

Land promoters portrayed arid lands and foothill plots as ideal places for farm families in an attempt to sell property in areas that seemed too wild, too unpredictable, or too barren. Despite Southern California’s long dry seasons and sparse rainfall, certain crops, such as wine grapes and citrus fruits thrived with the use of irrigation. The directors of the Anaheim Colony chose Southern California specifically because winemakers and grape growers in the 1850s succeeded in the Los Angeles area. Two winemakers in San Francisco, John Fröhling and Charles Kohler, were the instigators of this colony, probably the first joint-stock agricultural community in the state. They

---

347 Near Los Angeles, Mexican and Spanish residents maintained ditches, or zanjas, before Americans annexed the territory. Americans, including the Vineyard Society members, used the zanjas and adopted the Spanish terminology. George Hansen, field book “1857-Anaheim,” field book 14, box 1, Solano-Reeves papers, 1849-c. 1910, Huntington Library; Leo J. Friis, John Fröhling: Vintner and City Founder (Anaheim: Mother Colony Household, Inc., 1976), 7-12; Paule, “The German Settlement at Anaheim.”

348 Miners used the joint-stock corporation to organize mining companies headed for California in the late 1840s and early 1850s and then started new corporations to fund mining operations. In both cases, the
wanted to attract German families to grow grapes for the John Frohling & Co. winery in Los Angeles.\textsuperscript{349}

Anaheim exemplified the colony as destination model. The directors took seemingly uninhabitable land, carved out plots, and brought water to the area. They set the terms for settlement based on crops and advertised the land to San Francisco Germans who wanted to get out of the city. Emigrants from Germany and other parts of California soon joined the Anaheim colonists, and the new settlers raised subsistence crops to feed themselves while tending the grapevines. The earliest settlers expected to sell grapes to the wineries owned by John Fröhling and Charles Kohler, instigators of the colony, but soon settlers built their own stores and processing plants. Timm Boege, from Holstein, Germany, established his own winery to transform locals’ grapes into wine for sale. Had shareholders entered into these contracts to pool funds and promote equal participation. Also for the traveling argonauts, participants wanted to guarantee moral behavior in the “company.” Maureen A. Jung, “Capitalism Comes to the Diggings: From Gold-Rush Adventure to Corporate Enterprise,” in James J. Rawls and Richard J. Orsi, eds. \textit{A Golden State: Mining and Economic Development in Gold Rush California} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 52-77.

Boege settled in the Midwest or Great Plains, he might have built a grist mill to process his neighbors’ products. But in Anaheim locals grew grapes instead of corn or wheat.\textsuperscript{350}

In contrast to the Anaheim settlers, one set of Connecticut emigrants illustrates how families far from California put together a colony. In 1877, a group of eight men sent letters out to various New Haven residents, inviting specific families to form a “model colony in Southern California.” This group conceived of the colony as a group of non-drinking New Englanders finding a place in Southern California where “deserving people of moderate means” might escape Connecticut winters and raise citrus fruits. By forming a colony, the families then had the collective financial power to relocate to a place where each individual could experience a “choice society” and “old friends can be neighbors.”\textsuperscript{351} The New Haven emigrants were a placeless colony, a congregation of families without a specific destination.

The New Haven “model” colonists imagined a community in California where one had not existed. Shareholders in colonies such as this directed an agent to find suitable land for the group. The agent might buy undeveloped land, but more likely, he arranged the purchase of numerous lots on subdivided properties. Immigration bureaus, including the California Immigrant Union, directed interested buyers to landowners willing to sell. Journalists regularly announced incoming “colonies,” alerting residents to the formation of new communities and possibly the arrival of old neighbors. Newcomers from the eastern states settled into their homes to actually build the California communities they started elsewhere. Scholar Benedict Anderson, coined the term


\textsuperscript{351} Colony for Southern California, \textit{Circular}. 
“imagined communities” to suggest the means by which national identities develop. The nation, he stated, “is an imagined political community—and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.” National identity, an artificial construction, required the efforts of both the rulers and the ruled, using newspapers, administrative infrastructure, and cultural ties to unite anonymous individuals to one another. The colonies paled in comparison to the nation-states of England, France, or Germany, which expanded their empires beyond their borders. Nonetheless, colonists also bound individuals to one another and the community, creating an identity based on their residence in the colony and common values of religion of behavior appropriate to a rural place. A community had the power to force its members to be “good” and obey the rules as expressed in the by-laws and in their churches. Colonies were no less “imagined communities” within the distant, sparsely inhabited states of California, Minnesota, or Colorado than were the outposts of imperialists in the Philippines or India.352

Historians have struggled to categorize or contextualize colonies in California. Few scholars have attempted to explain colonies within the larger context of the state’s history. Oscar Osburn Winther focused on how the colony system significantly facilitated the growth of Los Angeles, but he eschewed tackling the more difficult task of explaining the “wide range of social philosophies” embodied in this “colonizing process.” Historian Robert Hine dutifully recounted the tales of utopian colonies in the state during

the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. More often than not, scholars have used particular colonies to narrowly examine regional development.³⁵³

By looking at both types of colonies—destinations and social communities—, it is clear that organizers designed these places to reconstruct the desirable economic and social aspects of eastern and midwestern rural communities. Settlers needed to be bound together by something; for some, temperance or national identity guided their efforts, while for others the opportunity to raise exotic crops drew individuals to bucolic settings replete with farm houses surrounded by orchards and vineyards. These moral, cultural, and agrarian colonies attracted immigrants and California residents, which spurred other promoters to continue using these formats.

Moral Settlements

Settlers interested in living among other teetotalers or members of their respective churches bought land in locations such as Lompoc, Riverside, and Fresno. The Lompoc Colony provides an interesting example of a temperance group because the moral issue imbued every aspect of the process, from organization to actual settlement. In 1870, W. W. Broughton, president of the Santa Cruz Temperance Society, visited Santa Barbara County in search of a large piece of land which had the fecundity to support market and subsistence crops in addition to being secluded enough to protect settlers from the vices

of other communities. Broughton considered the Lompoc Valley as an ideal location. Just northeast of Santa Barbara and Goleta, Lompoc residents had access to coastal transportation but lived far enough off the beaten path for the society’s purposes. Agents promised perfect title to the land, water for irrigation, and use of a planned wharf called “Lompoc Landing.” Society members and investors then formed the Lompoc Valley Land Colony (LVLC), approaching William W. Hollister and Thomas W. Dibblee for land rights. Hollister and Dibblee sold the colonists 46,000 acres for $500,000.354

Social control played an important role throughout the development period and afterwards. The LVLC subdivided the land so that settlers had both 5-acre lots on which to live in town and 160-acre agricultural tracts on the valley floor. While this might seem like a suburban environment, the settlers, in fact, desired this layout to keep neighbors under the scrutiny of others. Emphasizing the colony’s mission to serve as a temperance refuge, various Lompoc boosters proceeded to advertise the lands, including Broughton, the California Immigrant Union, the editor of the Santa Barbara Weekly Press, and residents through locally funded publications such as the History of Santa Barbara County.355

---

354 The name Lompoc is a slightly shortened version of the Spanish name for the area, “Lompoco.” It is pronounced Lam-poke because of its derivation. Hollister and Dibblee bought the land from the More brothers who purchased it from the original grantees, Jose and Joaquin Carrillo. The Carrillos received more than 40,000 acres from Spanish and Mexican governors in 1837 and 1845. While $500,000 might seem like quite a bit of money, in retrospect, LVLC made $700,000 in sales on the first day. LVLC directors funneled profits back into the colony in the form of improvements. Myra Manfrina, “Lompoc, Although Actually Founded in 1874, Likes To Look Back Over Colorful History to Cabrillo,” clipping, n.d., Lompoc Valley Historical Society, Lompoc, Calif.; Nancy Lee Wilkerson, “Perpetual Frontiers of the Central Coast: The Lompoc and Santa Maria Valleys, Santa Barbara County, California,” (Ph.D. Diss., University of Oregon, 1983), 53-55; History of Santa Barbara County (Oakland: Thompson & West, 1883), 282-88; “Old Records of Land Colony Sales Show first Families to Arrive Here,” Lompoc Record, 7 September 1950; Myra Manfrina, “Old Lompoc Landing Was Popular ‘Play’ Location, Lompoc Record, 31 August 1961.

355 Some historians might question the ability of the CIU to attract immigrants to the state, but its agents certainly helped placed interested farmers on colony lands. Manfrina, “Lompoc, Although Actually
1883 and featured the Lompoc Colony as a place where settlers had hoped to “eliminate forever from its prospective history that greatest of social evils—intemperance.” Santa Barbara County farmers and businessmen supported the publication of their local history as one more way to advertise the colony specifically and the county generally. Californians and immigrants from Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, and Missouri responded to the Lompoc promoters’ calls for settlers.³⁵⁶

Morality-minded farm families bought Lompoc land accepting both the credit and behavioral conditions offered by the LVLC, but soon various store owners found ways to sneak alcohol into the community. On purchase, buyers agreed within their deeds to neither sell nor manufacture “vinous, malt, spirituous, or other intoxicating liquors.” By 1880, more than 1,600 people lived in town and the valley, and by 1900 this number increased to more than 3,000. Despite the terms agreed to by purchasers, locals caught several men selling liquor, including a druggist named Green, the hotel-keeper G. Butchart, and a “Mr. Swift.” As a result of these violations, community members resorted to what one author called “gunpowder temperance.” Women chopped up Green’s whiskey filled barrels marked “Epsom Salts,” anonymous individuals threw

³⁵⁶ W. W. Broughton apparently published a promotional pamphlet entitled The Lompoc Colony in 1893 but it may no longer be extant. Santa Barbara Weekly Press, 28 May 1881; A. W. Jackson, Barbariana: or Scenery, Climate, Soils and Conditions of Santa Barbara City and County (San Francisco: C. A. Murdock & Co., 1888), 18, 32-33; Cliff Boswell, “Lompoc—Colorful in Setting, In History and Industry,” 24 June 1956, clipping 34-28, Gledhill Library; History of Santa Barbara County, 283. Broughton, the former editor of the Santa Cruz Enterprise, also started a local paper for Lompoc. The Lompoc Record served the dual purpose of newspaper and booster rag. Hollister and Dibblee paid for 150 subscriptions for distribution, hoping to sell more of their land in Santa Barbara County.
It is clear from various records that community members were serious about maintaining the moral ideal in Lompoc, but their agricultural activities brought outsiders to the area. Families planted crops based on their geographic origins. “Yankee newcomers” sowed corn and potatoes, while farmers from Santa Clara and Santa Cruz counties brought cuttings of fruit and nut trees. Almost all of the families had gardens for their own use in addition to various other subsistence and minor market crops. Sheep-shearers seemed to be the greatest threat to the dry state of the colony. Colonists and other farmers in near by valleys raised sheep for wool. As a result, Lompoc residents feared the annual in-migration of shearers as long as the covert saloon keepers continued to supply whisky. A local addressed his neighbors via the Lompoc Record, stating “Harvest will be at hand shortly, and every one knows what a terror a rum-hole is at that season of the year.” And thus the barrel choppers, rope brandishers, and bomb throwers emerged to stop the threats to their community. The LVLC and residents attempted to keep alcohol out of people’s homes as a means of social protection.

Landowners in Fresno, Los Angeles, and Riverside also organized morality-based colonies. In Fresno, Moses Church started the Temperance Sanitary Colony, clearly indicating the type of settlers he wanted to attract. As a devout Seventh-day Adventist,

---


358 Lompoc Record (May 1881) article reprinted in History of Santa Barbara County, 287.
Church wanted abstinent neighbors who would also preserve the “purity of the air” by not smoking. In less than a year (1877-1878), Church sold every lot of his land. Numerous groups also chose to affiliate with specific religious bodies to indicate the guiding principles of their colonies. A settler could choose from, or avoid, colonies based on the Episcopal, Methodist, Presbyterian, Quaker, and Catholic churches. During the Gilded Age, urbanites and farmers alike found refuge in landscapes purified of enervating influences.

Numerous religious and utopian colonies formed, failed, and moved during the nineteenth-century. Historian Robert Hine completed the most comprehensive and most cited work on utopian colonies in California, yet he says little about the national context or how they compared to other types colonies in the state. As Hine points out, the progenitors of the utopian societies were “attempting to establish a new social pattern based upon a vision of the ideal society.” Yet these colonies did not exist in a vacuum, and other groups used the colony system of settlement to enact their visions of reform. California’s moral, cultural, and agrarian colonists did not wish to withdraw from society like the social radicals living in the utopian compounds. The average colonist of Lompoc or the Temperance Sanitary Colony merely wanted to influence social mores by setting up communities to serve as models. More conservative than the socialists and radical religious groups, the settlers of these farm communities, nonetheless, wanted to

359 Charles W. Clough and William B. Secrest Jr., Fresno County—The Pioneer Years: From the Beginning to 1900 (Fresno: Panorama West Books, 1984), 143-44; Map of Santa Margarita Colony Colusa County, California (Colusa, Calif.: n.p., 1882); John Brown Colony Co., Colonization in California, the John Brown System of Colonies (Madera, Calif.: n.p., 1891).
Ethnic Settlements

While moral issues and church membership inspired settlers to seek out specific sites, ethnic groups also founded colonies in which they reconstructed their former occupations and maintained cultural ties. Swedes dominated the Scandinavian, Kingsburg, and Washington colonies in Fresno, for example. In addition, Italians and the Italian-speaking Swiss settled together in northern counties, finding similar landscapes to their native countries. These immigrants found familiar surroundings in which they remade their communities and continued rural pursuits transported from their homelands, especially dairying, viticulture, and general farming. Some of the Italian-Swiss moved into Plumas County (a mineral county) but quickly gave up mining for more traditional Swiss occupations in agriculture. Small colonies of Italian Swiss also moved into the San Joaquin Valley, where they set up dairy ranches. The Central Valley may not have looked like the Canton Ticino (in the Swiss Alps) from which many of the Italian-Swiss emigrated but alfalfa thrived in its soil and climate with some irrigation. Alfalfa replaced many types of grasses as the most nutritious, easy-to-raise feed for dairy

---

360 Hine, California’s Utopian Colonies, 4-5. Several of the utopian groups used the joint stock corporate structure to for their colonies. See his discussion of Joyful in Kern County and the Co-operative Brotherhood of Winters Island near Suisun Bay (140-44).

361 Gary Brain indicates that the Swedes immigrating to California were often members of temperance groups, lodges, farm cooperatives, or revivalist churches. Moreover, after 1900 Swedes settled among their compatriots in the rural areas of California, which meant colonies-turned-towns such as Kingsburg. Chain migration figured prominently into the increased Swedish population in California after 1900. Gary Brain, “The Ship Sailed On: Swedish-American Migration to Rural California” Swedish-American Historical Quarterly 4, no. 4 (1990): 220-33; Memorial and Biographical History of the Counties of Fresno, Tulare, and Kern, California (Chicago: Lewis Publishing Co, n.d.), 121; Richard Seto, “Washington Irrigated Colony,” 1958, typescript, folder “Agricultural Colonies—California—Fresno Co.,” Misc. Folders Collection, Henry Madden Library, Special Collections, California State University, Fresno.
cows which allowed farmers to switch to dairying over mixed farming or wheat. By 1910, half of the milk cows in the state grazed in the Central Valley, a fact which helped attract Swiss dairymen to unfamiliar looking places such as the plains of the San Joaquin Valley.\textsuperscript{362}

Parts of the Midwest also became popular dairy regions, and Swiss-made colonies in these areas as well. Like the emigrants of Canton Ticino, the Swiss from other cantons settled together and isolated themselves from the larger population generally. Rising land prices and political disturbances made life difficult for Swiss peasants in the 1840s and 1850s, spurring the first mass migrations to the United States. In 1844, the agents of the Tennessee Colonization Company encouraged several Swiss families to leave Switzerland for the U.S., and at about the same time two men from Canton Glarus traveled to the Midwest to find a location to recreate their community of dairymen.\textsuperscript{363} As a result, by 1845, a number of German-speaking Swiss founded “New Glarus” in Green County, Wisconsin. There the immigrants established schools and churches, “rendering this settlement quite independent of the surrounding villages.” Not only did these residents speak German but they “almost exclusively” spoke a German-Swiss dialect.


\textsuperscript{363} Jacqueline Hall and JoEllen Hall, “Italian-Swiss Settlement in Plumas County, 1860-1920,” Research Paper No. 1 (Chico, Calif.: Association for Northern California Records and Research, 1973), 7. Other Swiss colonies in America establishing during the nineteenth century, included Berne, Minnesota; Tell City, Indiana; Grutli, Tennessee; Helvetia, West Virginia; New Switzerland, Georgia; Ruttli, Nebraska; and Bernstadt, Kentucky. For a study of one of these colonies, see David E. Clayton, Forgotten Colony (Grutli, Tenn.: Swiss-American Historical Society, 1971). Apparently, the Swiss government gave financial assistance to groups colonizing in areas outside of Switzerland. The colony usually sent two men to the preferred destination to scout for land, just like many of the American colonies (Clayton 2).
Over time, the Swiss moved into other parts of the county and introduced Swiss-style cheese making to Americans.364

The Swiss settlements of both California and Wisconsin mirrored each other in several ways. The California Swiss maintained as tightly-knit relations as the Wisconsin farmers even though the Pacific Coast colonies were much smaller. By 1870, only 2,927 Swiss lived in California, increasing to 9,743 in 1890 and then 16,097 in 1920. The small Swiss communities in California stayed endogamous despite the fact that the sex-ratio was so skewed. Single men came first, following news of the gold rush, but Swiss families arrived in preceding waves of immigration. Many of the former miners never married, preferring not to disturb the homogeneity of the colony and live among their Swiss compatriots.365

In terms of rural migrations, the colony system represented a more orderly, formalized version of “chain migration,” which guaranteed colonists certain social and

364 John Luchsinger, “The Swiss Colony of New Glarus,” History of Green County Wisconsin (Springfield, Ill.: Union Publishing Co., 1884), 623-43. In 1926, Monroe cheesemakers introduced the Swiss Colony product line and catalog, known best for holiday gift packages, including nuts, summer sausage, and fruit cakes. Similar to the Amana Colonies, Monroe residents continue to attract tourists with ethnically inspired celebrations. In California, a number of Danish emigrants settled in Santa Barbara County, naming their community “Solvaang.” Architecture and celebrations, in Solvang, California, flavors the town with a Disney-like version of Scandinavia. Like the German-Americans in Amana, Iowa, Solvang residents held onto some aspects of their culture while making the town a destination for tourists. In the 1950s, one scholar found that more than three-quarters of the population were Danish by birth or descent, yet the area became most famous recently as a backdrop for several scenes in the movie, Sideways (2004). Also see, Kosberg, “The Polish Colony of California, 1876-1914,” 9.

365 Hall and Hall, “Italian-Swiss Settlement in Plumas County, 1860-1920.” 1-4, 14; H. F. Raup, “The Italian-Swiss in California,” in Fulfilling the Promise of California: An Anthology of Essays on the Italian American Experience in California, ed. Gloria Ricci Lothrop (Spokane: Arthur H. Clark Co., 2000), 129-40. The settler-originated Italian Swiss colonies described above need to be distinguished from the “Italian-Swiss Colony” in Sonoma. The founder, Andrea Sbarboro, of the Sonoma “colony” intended it to be a community similar to Anaheim, using Italians and Italian-speaking Swiss to raise wine grapes for his winery, for the colonists’ moral benefit, and his pecuniary gain. Italians joined the enterprise but refused to buy the shares, preferring to keep all of their wages. From that point forward, the colony was no more than a wine making company. Deanna Paoli Gumina, “Andrea Sbarboro, Founder of the Italian-Swiss Colony Wine Company: Reminiscences of an Italian American Pioneer,” in Struggle and Success: An Anthology of the Italian Immigrant Experience in California, ed. Paola A. Sensi-Isolani and Phylis Cancilla Martinelli (New York: Center for Migration Studies, 1993), 95-106.
economic benefits. Colonists migrated en masse and in smaller groups at the behest of the earliest settlers. The agents for the Washington Irrigated Colony attracted a number of settlers, including a small group of Swedes. Charles Erickson, a Swedish colonist, wrote to Swedish newspapers to advertise the colony to his countrymen. His letters helped the colony grow, which was a boon to the agents, but they also brought more Swedish farmers to help make the area seem more familiar to Erickson and his fellow colonists. For Lompoc and Riverside residents, colony life offered them the moral protection of sober neighbors, and all colonists—from the Episcopalian to the Scandinavian—hoped that social cooperation would also have fiscal advantages.366

**Agrarian Colonies**

In contrast to these moral and ethnic colonies, several groups also fashioned colonies in the 1880s and 1890s for the farmer or urbanite desiring to enjoy the natural advantages of California’s climate. California orchards and vineyards bloomed and produced beautiful peaches, pears, and oranges during the rainy season. The sight was so spectacular that eastern tourists flocked to the fruit districts to admire the verdant crops of winter while imagining their homes snow bound and their lands dormant. One booster wrote that Pasadena, originally the Indiana Colony, “stands as the queen of the colonies, bedecked with garlands of flowers, and overflows with fruits and wines of rare excellence.” For that reason, tourism eventual eclipsed agriculture in Pasadena. Developers of the agrarian colonies helped farmers raise and market new types of crops

and hired men to plant orchards for the urban upper-middle-class wanting to retreat to the country.\footnote{R. M. Widney, “The Colony System of Southern California” in Ontario Land and Improvement Co., Ontario: The Model Colony of Southern California (Los Angeles: Times-Mirror Co., 1887), 33.}

These agrarian colonies required more capital than the other types of colonies because the settlers hired out the work. In the case of the Thermalito Colony near Oroville (Butte County), agents contracted to lay out orchards and care for trees or vines for residents. The non-farming colonist received the benefits of owning a 10-acre orange grove for $1,526. This included 10 acres of land ($100 per acre), planting and care of trees for one year, and 690 3-year old trees. If the colonist chose to live in town, the Thermalito Colony Company also offered ready-to-build house lots for $50 to $100.\footnote{Ontario Land and Improvement Co., Ontario: The Model Colony of Southern California, 33; Thermalito Colony Company, Thermalito Colony: The Pasadena of Central California (San Francisco: n.p., n.d. [ca. 1888]).} The agents proclaimed Thermalito to be the Pasadena of Central California, hoping to impart their vision for the place to Americans who had visited or, at least, heard of Pasadena’s overflowing and bedecked landscape. For a price, an urbanite had the opportunity to abandon the city, whether it was New York, Chicago, or San Francisco, and the problems attendant with industrialization and immigration in the Gilded Age.

The farmer or the urban dweller, therefore, had choices based on his available capital, lifestyle, and health. Boosters hoped to disabuse the hard working, healthy farmer of the notion that California was out of his reach without large amounts of cash. They proclaimed that the “poor man” needed only his own labor and the willingness to use it to succeed. John Brown, J. E. Newman, and officers advertised the John Brown Colonies in both Madera and Los Angeles counties, denying that California was “no
place for a poor man.” They clarified this contention by saying: “No place, it is true, for poor men who loaf around saloons, hunt for a soft job, and curse the country, but for the industrious, temperate man, who is able and willing to cultivate the soil.”

The poor man was rich in potential just like California, and the two needed one another. Moreover, colony administrators needed laborers to cultivate the land owned by the back-to-landers and health seekers of the era.

Owners of the Land

Most colonies were subdivisions of property owned by land grantees of the Mexican era, speculators, and the Southern Pacific Railroad Company. Starting in the 1850s, newcomers to California, both boosters and settlers, complained about landowners who owned large acreages, and their objections stemmed from a long history of debates over the nation’s land policies. During most of the century, farmers agitated for access to smaller parcels of land in the United States, arguing that speculators horded full sections (one section=640 acres) in order to profit from later sales. Disgruntled farmers argued that they worked the soil and deserved direct access to it. By the 1850s and 1860s,

---

369 John Brown Colony Co., Colonization in California, 20. When settlers or boosters referred to the “poor man,” they meant cash-poor farmers and mechanics, not the idle poor unwilling to work (see Chapter Five). In 1857, W. Stevens, a miner-turned-farmer, complained about a friend who was “regardless of the feelings of others—especially the ‘poor man.’” Such a state of society!! Educated to respect none but the wealthy, and despise the poor laborer.” Stevens claimed he went to California to earn enough to return east with a “handsome competency.” Stevens indicates that the transition between preindustrial attitudes about the economy and industrial capitalism was uneven. W. Stevens, “W. Stevens’ Book; Account of a Journey from Panama, Chautauqua County, New York, Feb. 2, 1852, to San Francisco, Aug. 2, 1852, and Further Account of Mining Experiences at Foster’s Bar and Ranching at Cache Creek,” 1852-1857, typescript, CSL. For other references to California and the “poor man,” see, Jerome Madden, The Lands of the Southern Pacific Railroad Company (San Francisco: Land Agent of the S.P.R.R. Co., 1883), 46; Immigration Association of California, Resources of the Southern San Joaquin Valley, California (San Francisco: Immigration Association of California, 1885), 78; C. H. Street and Co., California (San Francisco: C.H. Street & Co., 1890), 68; Jackson, Barbariana, 18; “What the Railroad Will Bring Us,” Overland Monthly 1 (October 1868): 302.
legislators agreed to transfer 40 to 160 acres into the hands of men and women willing to work the land.\textsuperscript{370} Congressmen passed appropriate legislation to quiet angry settlers and required small payments for these lands on the condition that families cultivate them. Thus by the time Americans reached the Golden State in large numbers, they expected California lands to be open for settlement by tillers of the soil and criticized the rancheros and how they held onto land grants assigned to them by Mexican officials. Californios and early American transplants attempted to hold onto their ranchos in the 1850s and 1860s despite the criticism against them.\textsuperscript{371}

In addition to land grantees, Americans acquired large acreages of California land during the first two decades of statehood. Americans used a variety of other techniques to obtain grantee’s lands and public domain. Incoming Americans purchased land from and made loans to indebted rancheros who needed cash after American annexation. Rancheros appeared before the land commission and fought in the courts to keep their land grants, accumulating debts to attorneys. Historian Leonard Pitt estimated that the owners of land grants lost two-fifths to one-quarter of their total wealth in the process of verifying the validity of their grants. All the while, the grantees also waged a virtual war against squatters on their lands. In California, Mexican-Americans had to pay for services in cash instead of hides, in part, because the hide and tallow trade ended with the gold rush. Even if someone was willing to accept hides as payments, much of the

\textsuperscript{370} Congress allowed settlers to buy as few as 40 acres of the public domain in 1832 under an amendment to the Land Act of 1820. The Preemption Act of 1841 authorized land offices to sell as much as 160 acres to farmers already settled on that land. Finally, the Homestead Act virtually gave 160 acres to farmers. To qualify for the “free” land, homesteaders had to build a house and pay various filing fees, but there were no per-acre costs if the settler lived on the land for at least five years.

\textsuperscript{371} Some of the Americans who settled in California prior to the gold rush received lands from the Mexican government or by marrying the daughters of grantees. See Douglas Monroy, \textit{Thrown Among Strangers: The Making of Mexican Culture in Frontier California} (Berkeley: University of California, 1990), 154-172.
Mexican cattle had been sent as beef to the mines in the 1850s or lost in the flood of 1862. The old rancheros did not fare well in the new financial climate, and lost much of their wealth in land. Their land increasingly went into the hands of capitalists and speculators who had purchased it or foreclosed on mortgages. Annexation and statehood required rancheros to modify their personal economies to suit the new American culture. A few men also accumulated land scrip under various land laws, especially the agricultural college lands, and the Big Four received public domain for building the western section of the transcontinental railroad. This meant that several hundred Mexican- and Anglo-American men owned millions of acres of California land of which none could be easily purchased by the small-scale farmer.372

During the late 1860s and into the 1890s, however, men who owned tens of thousands of acres chose to sell their lands to colony developers or participated in the colony system directly. Individuals sold to colonists to bring in needed cash income at a time when new arrivals desired smaller plots of land. After the Civil War, especially after the completion of the transcontinental railroad, demand for farm land increased. Those men who owned old ranchos or large portions of the public domain increasingly sold their lands to colonists, sometimes reluctantly and sometimes enthusiastically. The experiences of Abel Stearns, Elias J. Baldwin, and William S. Chapman demonstrate how various rancheros and capitalists obtained California land and how those lands became colonies.

In the case of rancho owners, financial troubles spurred both Mexican- and Anglo-Americans to consider subsidizing rancho lands into farm communities. During the Mexican era, Abel Stearns exemplified the assimilated Yankee who prospered financially from the hide and tallow trade but failed to remain solvent after annexation and statehood. Born in Massachusetts, Stearns relocated to Alta California in 1829, bartering American-made goods in exchange for Mexican cow hides. Eventually, he became a naturalized citizen and married Arcadia Bandini, the daughter of a local family. For all intents and purposes, Stearns had become a Mexican ranchero. He had a Spanish-speaking bride, acquired the title of the local elite, and owned enough land to support his own cattle; “Don Abel” lived and worked comfortably and successfully in the social economic world of Alta California.

Stearns and other rancheros were hard hit by the floods and droughts of the 1860s. By 1862, he owned 460,000 acres of the best ranch land in Southern California, including Rancho Los Alamitos, but the drought of 1862 worked against him. Consequently, Stearns started to advertise land for sale but rarely completed any deed transfers. On the one hand, Don Abel suffered to pay his bills and wanted to sell land for cash. On the other hand, Stearns enjoyed owning his rancho, allowing his horses and cattle to freely roam the grassy hills and pastures of his Southern California estate. Stearns’ uncertainty resulted in conflicts, and in July 1867 one of his colleagues addressed the issue. In a pointed letter, Alfred Robinson wrote to Stearns: “you never will make any sales of land if you do not make a price and stick to it. He [Sam Brannan] says, he has sent several parties to you, to whom you have mentioned a price and they had decided to purchase
then you wanted more. That is not the way to manage."\(^{373}\) By 1868, Stearns contracted with San Francisco financiers to sell his lands using the colony system, and advertisements for land in “Stearns’ Rancho” appeared in numerous California newspapers.

In contrast to Stearns, E. J. “Lucky” Baldwin represented the American who took advantage of the Mexican grantees to accumulate his land holdings. It was capital, not luck, that allowed Baldwin to buy, sell, and otherwise acquire properties at the most opportune times, including the lands of the three grantees, F. P. F. Temple, William Workman, and Juan Matias Sanchez families. Temple and Workman accepted a loan, with the three properties as security, to save their bank. Baldwin greedily accepted their lands to cover the mortgage and gained control of land that became the towns of Arcadia, Monrovia, Sierra Madre, Temple City, and much of El Monte, and City of Industry.\(^ {374}\) He then put the land into production, employing tenants and sharecroppers. The state’s notable historian Hubert Howe Bancroft reported Baldwin had 150 tenants on his land in

\(^{374}\) Temple and Workman survived the drought and invested their capital in various businesses and started several banks. By 1875, speculation in the Comstock Lode collapsed and the silver bubble busted. Fearful depositors withdrew their funds from Temple’s and Workman’s bank, forcing them to turn to Baldwin for a loan. When they were unable to pay the mortgage, Baldwin foreclosed on the mortgages. Workman committed suicide, and Temple had several strokes. Sanchez died poor and regretful since Harris Newmark warned him not to help Temple and Workman with the deal. These men were unable to weather the strains of losing their empires. Harris Newmark, Sixty years in Southern California, 1853-1913, ed. Maurice H. Newmark and Marco R. Newmark, 2d ed. (New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1916), 474-75, 478-79; Paul Spitzzeri, “Southern California Vanguards: The Workman and Temple Family from 1830 to 1930,” available online at http://www.homesteadmuseum.org/family/part1.htm, accessed 27 June 2006 and Paul R. Spitzzeri, ““To Seduce and Confuse”: The Rowland-Workman Expedition of 1841,” *Southern California Quarterly* 80 (Spring 1998): 31-46. For another example, see Cameron, “The California Mutual Benefit Colony of Chicago,” 2-13. The De la Guerra family lost Rancho Simi to a Pennsylvania syndicate. When no oil was found on the property, the syndicate sold the lands to a Los Angeles based company that then subdivided and sold the lands. Simi Valley, California, now has a population of more than 100,000, and may be best known for being the home of the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, the Rodney King trial, and the backdrop for several television shows, including “Little House on the Prairie” and “M*A*S*H.”
1891, and he purchased hundreds of farm implements, including eleven gang plows, for his workers. In addition to commercial agriculture, Baldwin also raised thoroughbred horses and ran them on his track in Santa Anita. Nearby Arcadia became a well-known wide open town in an era of when the Women’s Christian Temperance Union and the Anti-Saloon League actively tried to close saloons, but Baldwin prospered from visitors wanting to drink and gamble in his hotels and bars.375

Temple and Workman failed miserably, and it seemed Baldwin triumphed one more time. Yet soon enough Baldwin’s luck ran out. He too needed an influx of cash. During the 1870s, Baldwin needed money to cover mortgages on his real estate. In 1881, stock losses hurt his overall income, and Baldwin turned to selling subdivided land. Baldwin hired Nathaniel Carter, a “pioneer Southland booster,” to sell land in what is now Sierra Madre, a small town nestled in the foothills of the San Gabriel Valley. Within a year twelve families settled in Sierra Madre, and Carter became Baldwin’s agent for later sales. The irony of this is that the area’s famous and flamboyant purveyor of vice facilitated the development of a dry town to maintain his other projects, especially his horses at Santa Anita.376


376 The desire to foster morality in the state can be seen in the issue of horse racing. Farmers and civic leaders were divided. John Bidwell called horse racing cruel, and officers of several agricultural societies banned horse racing directly or gambling and alcohol which had the same effect at agricultural fairs. In contrast, Lucky Baldwin built the town of Arcadia around the Santa Anita race track. Baldwin also recruited families from Tennessee to colonize his lands and work his farms. Some of the young African American men also jockeyed for Baldwin. Former southerners living in Sonoma enjoyed horse racing and built a track near Santa Rosa. Richard Fulkerson built a track on his property, and in 1880 the “prominent citizens” of Sonoma County Agricultural Park Association included a race track on the 80-acre “park.”
Boosters grumbled about “idle” lands as unrealized wealth for the state, and in fact uncultivated lands vexed owners as well. William S. Chapman acquired thousands of acres of public domain by filing claims for agricultural college lands, exploiting personal connections with land office employees to facilitate his patents. At one point, Chapman owned approximately one million acres of land in California. Entrepreneurs of Chapman’s cohort consolidated holdings by using various federal laws intended for settlers—the Preemption Act of 1841 and the Morrill Land Grant Act, for instance. While settlers castigated speculators, this one ended up benefiting small-scale farmers by transforming his holdings into colonies. The investments necessary for large-scale irrigation in the San Joaquin Valley daunted even Chapman, and in 1875, Bernhard Marks convinced Chapman to subdivide his San Joaquin Valley properties for the benefit of the state, farm families, and Chapman’s pocketbook. Under the guidance of Marks, Chapman’s lands became the first of numerous successful colonies in Fresno. To everyone’s surprise, the colony system worked as a means to settle the arid, flat lands of the San Joaquin.377


377 Three colonies in the San Joaquin Valley failed prior to 1875 without irrigation works in place. Southerners of the settler-initiated Alabama Colony in Fresno, for example, had little knowledge of the valley’s conditions. During their first year in Fresno, they witnessed unprecedented rains followed by several years of drought. “Colonial History: An Interview with B. Marks of Dos Palos,” Fresno Daily Evening Expositor, 30 March 1892; Muriel Emery Wardlaw, “Early History of Fresno County: The ‘Alabama Colony,’” in The Early History of Fresno County: Articles which Appeared in the “Ash Tree Echo,” 1966-1987, comp. Muriel Emery Wardlaw, Jessica A Crisp, and William B. Secrest (Fresno: Fresno County Library, 2001), 86-89; Panter, “Central California Colony,” 1-2; Thickens, “Pioneer Agricultural Colonies of Fresno County,” 17-38; David Igler, Industrial Cowboys: Miller & Lux and the Transformation of the Far West, 1850-1920 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 65-66. When Charles E. Pickett protested against state aid to organized immigration schemes, he complained that too much land
The Southern Pacific Railroad controlled more land than Chapman and received more condemnation for it. The Southern Pacific, however, had nothing to gain by selling land to speculators. According to historian Richard Orsi, company agents did more to put settlers on railroad lands than expected. Company managers spent most of their time in the 1860s and 1870s building track, securing land grants, and buying out competitors.

But even during the 1870s, the Southern Pacific transferred some land to settlers with the assistance of several private organizations. The California Immigrant Union initially helped distribute Southern Pacific land in the 1870s, establishing Colton (near Riverside) as an agricultural area, and Wendell Easton of the Pacific Coast Land Bureau used his experience with irrigated colonies in Fresno to sell railroad land. By the mid to late 1880s, employees of the railroad refocused their attentions on running the lines and selling company lands. Settlement of farmers translated into rail traffic, which the Southern Pacific needed to keep running. In 1889, the Southern Pacific lured Bernhard Marks from his Fresno farm to run the Southern Pacific Colonization Agency. Agents went to the eastern United States and Europe to entice settlers and released a “barrage” of literature upon the world. These agents, as Orsi points out, “stressed the cooperative colony as the best technique for overcoming California’s farming difficulties.” As a result, farm families and former urbanites eventually possessed the lands originally was tied up for the current residents to find homesteads. He told the legislature: “We have already more inhabitants in our State than are desirable, under existing circumstances. Let them [the immigrants] remain away until that great reactionary and reformatory period (not distant) shall have arrived, when all these fraudulently seized upon public acres …shall be restored to their original status to be thus parcelled out and possessed.” Pickett underestimated the number of farmers failing to find land they could afford and farm without irrigation. Charles E. Pickett, Protest and Memorial against Granting Appropriation to the Immigration Aid Society (N.p., 1872), 3-5 and Land-Gambling Versus Mining-Gambling: An Open Letter to Squire P. Dewey (San Francisco: n.p., 1879).
belonging to grantees, speculators, and the Southern Pacific Railroad Company. The properties of speculators became the homes of fruit growers and farmers.  

Boosters, of course, had much to say about the distribution of lands, and they wrote ebullient copy about the value of small farms, fruit culture, and a new type of rural cooperation taking place in the colonies. The 1860s and 1870s had been years fraught with economic failures and disappointing immigration numbers. State promoters worked diligently to make California a destination for farm families but questions about land titles, successful crops, and transportation abounded. Boosters disliked the state’s image as a place where miners ran around after fanciful wealth and fancy women or greedy rancheros held on tightly to their landed estates. Farmers wanted perfect title to land, not legal battles. Newspaper editors regularly gave space to items in their columns about the ranchos being broken up because they worried that news of bogus titles and floating grants warded off settlers. By the late 1870s and early 1880s, colony development became tangible proof of their assurances: “One of the best signs of the times is the subdivision of large ranches into farms and small parcels of land, for the cultivation of semi-tropical fruits. The owners are beginning to see that men and women are more profitable than cattle.” Going to California seemed risky enough without having to get involved in a land of disputes. Colonies offered a safer avenue to land ownership in reality and in perception.

Colony promoters solved the perceptual problem of the ranchos by advertising the transformation of the rancho into the colony. In the process of subdivision, landowners perfected title and, in no uncertain terms, made that clear to buyers. E. J. Judson recounted the long history of Redlands in San Bernardino County to relay the advanced state of progress. Mexican governor, Juan B. Alvarado granted 35,000 acres to Jose del Carmen Lugo, Vicente Lugo and Diego Sepulveda in 1842, the Mormon settlers of 1851 received confirmed titles in 1853 from the land commission, and then the railroad allowed good eastern people to reclaim the land from “barbarism.” Thus by 1882, Redlands was ready to accept groups of “intelligent and enterprising people.” In order to be clear, Judson reiterated the status of the land: “The title to the land is based on Untied States patents, and is free from any defect or incumbrance [sic].” The colony system created order where the mixing of the American and Mexican systems had made confusion. On one 1869 map, created to advertise free lands to settlers, the cartographer outlined Spanish and Mexican grants, county boundaries, and U.S. land districts on his rendition of the San Joaquin Valley. The state and federal designations overlapped with the ranchos. The mixing of two incongruous systems created confusion for prospective settlers. It is no wonder immigration remained slow prior to the 1870s.380

Settlers worried about titles and other practical issues of starting farms on the Pacific Coast, such as crops and irrigation. Early on, California’s two season climate raised questions about appropriate crops, and as interest developed regarding the interior

380 E. G. Judson, Description of Redlands. Situated in the finest part of the celebrated San Bernardino Valley, San Bernardino County, California (San Francisco: Pacific Rural Press Print, 1882), 5-10; M. Walthal, Map of the San Joaquin Valley (Stockton: M. Walthal, 1869).
and southern counties, the issue of irrigation became more pertinent. Promoters provided information about water rights and irrigation works because settlers knew about western aridity and wanted assurances about water supplies. In promoting the Barton Ranch in San Bernardino County, W. P. McIntosh wrote, “It is a well-known saying in California that ‘Water is King,’ and the saying is true.” McIntosh and others answered burning questions of men interested in starting colony farms.

Irrigation of some type figured into most colony plans, if not all. Promoters explained that colony organization eliminated the most irksome aspects of providing irrigation. The colony directors used the corporation to amass capital to construct expensive ditches and hire supervisors. Corporate officers contracted to gain water rights, protecting individual users from the legal aspects of water usage in arid regions. Overland Monthly contributor George Freeman explained that the “mercantile value of water is fully appreciated” in Los Angeles and Fresno. In irrigated counties, it seemed to Freeman that each stream from a ditch had “almost as great a value as if its drops were liquid silver.” Irrigation works cost money, but they also helped farmers grow valuable crops. If Americans or Europeans knew anything about California, it was that the state

---

381 James Bardin, on his first trip to California, surmised that Humboldt County had little potential for the settlement of the “white man.” “No timber, no rain in the summer, nor but little rain in the winter, but snows in winter and but very little level land and that in valley so high that it could not be irrigated and all the high land is barren or so nearly so it might pass for barren. No grass, but produces the wild sage which is good for nothing.” James Bardin, 15 July 1855, Diary of a Pioneer, transcript, BANC MSS C-F 229, Bancroft Library.

382 W. P. McIntosh, A History and Description of the Barton Ranch (N.p., n.d. [ca. 1900]).

383 Donald Pisani identified four different doctrines that contributed to California’s water laws. California legislators attempted to reconcile American and Spanish/Mexican customs and the needs of miners and farmers. By 1872, a greater number of farmers demanded water rights and legislators retreated from the topic. Judges in various courts were left to the task of determining water rights on a case-by-case basis. Pisani also found that land, water, and mining companies (joint-stock corporations) took the lead in obtaining water rights. Pisani, From the Family Farm to Agribusiness: The Irrigation Crusade and the West, 1850-1931 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984). For irrigation in cooperative colonies, see Robert G. Dunbar, Forging New Rights in Western Waters (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983), 19-34.
had gold deposits and unpredictable rainfall thereby spurring colony promoters to give
significant attention to the water issue in their pamphlets. Even in the less arid micro-
climates of the state, boosters assuaged concerns about water. For the Thermalito
Colony, plenty of water flowed in the nearby Feather River, and the company laid piping
to transfer water to each farm. No matter what the location, colony companies advertised
their water supplies.\footnote{George E. Freeman, “Among the Irrigators of Fresno,” Overland Monthly 9, 2d ser. (June 1887): 621;
Ontario: The Model Colony of Southern California, 28-33. See also Joel Parker Whitney, California and
Colonization with Reference to the Washington Irrigated Colony of Fresno, California (Buffalo, N.Y.: Hass, Nauert & Klein, printers, 1879); Placer County Citrus Colony, Placer County Citrus Colony, in the
lower foothills of Placer County, California (San Francisco: Crocker & Co., 1889).}

Like the state boosters in general, colony agents also targeted farm families as
ideal immigrants. They promised good titles to land, water rights, and small plots,
“which may be cared for by the labor of an ordinary family.”\footnote{John P. Irish, “California’s Call to the Immigrant,” in California: The Land of Promise, 99.}
California had a surfeit of speculators and a shortage of laborers. Thus developers offered, in a majority of plans,
tracts in 10-, 20-, 40, and 80-acres on easy credit terms along with water rights attached
to the land or shares. Boosters assured eastern and midwestern Americans accustomed to
160-acre homesteads that small lots led to success, while large farms were doomed. The
Immigration Association of California officers told readers, “many failures have arisen
from attempting too much,” a sentiment echoed by newspaper editors, representatives of
the colonies, and other immigration societies.\footnote{Immigration Association of California, Resources of the Southern San Joaquin Valley, California;
“Mistakes of Farmers,” and “Economy,” Santa Clara Valley, March and June 1885; “Rules for Farmers,”
and “Why Some People are Poor,” Southern California Horticulturist, January and April 1878. California: The Land of Promise.}

Developers attempted to sell the colony as a destination for farm families, a place
in which they could establish profitable homesteads—farms and homes. This fact is
made manifest by their insistence that farmers pursue subsistence agriculture on a portion of their small-scale orchard lands. Subsistence guaranteed long-term success, especially considering that fruit trees and vines needed several years to mature, and colony directors wanted settlers to pay mortgage installments over the next three to five years. The Maclay Colony’s agent virtually screamed this point in his advertising material: “DO NOT BUY WITHOUT EXAMINING THESE LANDS, AND DO NOT BUY UNLESS YOU CAN SEE SUCCESS. We want No Failure in this Colony. Do Not Contract for our Lands unless you can PAY FOR THEM.”

Numerous promoters attempted to dissuade newcomers from relying on monoculture, whether it was wheat, melons, or anything else. Entrepreneurs, not families, had the capital to fund risky one-crop ventures; families needed the stability that came from raising their own food in addition to market crops. After describing “The Cold, Unvarnished Truth” and “The Wicked One-Crop Idea,” San Joaquin County promoter Wilson Ellis repeated his advice about how to succeed in California: “Do not forget that the surest path to prosperity is general or diversified farming….Place your main dependence on raising what you eat, and keeping out of debt at the stores. Then your fruit crop, hay crop, poultry crop, and other crops will be the profit on your labor.” One San Jose champion of small farms reminded farmers that subsistence crops led to success and the farmer who raised his own food was “absolutely protected against a total failure.”

389 Santa Clara Valley, May 1885.
These promoters wanted farm families interested in securing competencies, not gamblers speculating in the future values of lands or commodities. Through much of the nineteenth century, Americans accepted, if not embraced, the idea of attaining a competency, meaning the ability to attain the comforts of life while avoiding the undue risks to the family’s long term maintenance and independence. Each family defined the outlines of its competency, balancing the market and subsistence. More than just raising subsistence foods, a competency required reusing “waste” and recycling, e.g., raising hogs on whey and kitchen scraps. One booster described it this way: “The new settler who deserves success begins at bed-rock, keeps out of debt, buys as little as he can, wears his old clothes, works early and late, plants trees and vines for the future, leaves whisky alone, and has a definite aim and plan in life. Such a man can come to California with a small capital, and find it a ‘good State for the poor man.’” Families joined colonies intentionally to avoid risk and live well, and promoters needed as many successful colonists as possible for the colony to thrive.

In their promotional literature, agents calculated expenses to secure competencies and included these costs in budget mock ups for new colony residents. They recommended that settlers start with $1,000 to $2,000, depending on the colony or the date. The Fresno County Board of Trade told settlers that $1,000 would get them a nice 20-acre farm in one of the Fresno colonies. This included land, a “rough board shanty,” implements, furniture, livestock, poultry, and grocery money for four months. The

391 Immigration Association of California, *Resources of the Southern San Joaquin Valley, California.* H. S. Foote was vaguer: “The true ideal of rural life is to build a comfortable home and to secure an easy competency. It is next to impossible for a man to secure the full fruition of this idea if he takes not proper interest in his work.” *Santa Clara Valley,* May and March 1885.
vineyard needed time to mature, but in the meantime, men and women could raise certain items such as alfalfa and poultry. “Many a farmer’s wife has maintained herself and her family in comfort, until such time as the fruit ranch begins to bear, entirely by chickens, eggs, and dairy.” Developers offered credit terms and expected families to bring some capital and a willingness to work hard.392

On colony land, government land, or private land, in mining areas, and in agricultural sections, having a cow and a few chickens helped families procure inexpensive fresh food and extra cash. Ada Harvey, the daughter of a Washington Irrigated Colony agent, raised chickens on her father’s lot in the colony. She kept a strict account book for the year 1887-1888, indicating that she traded eggs and chickens locally for cash, clothing, and other items.393 George Boyd, another resident, ebulliently praised his wife “who is better than all the capital any man can have.” The Boyds brought $1,300 to start their orchard and home, but as he said, “My wife, with her cows and chickens, always adds from $15 to $25 a month to our income, according to the number of cows we have in milk.” Colonists, including Ada Harvey and the Boyds, added to their household economies by investing their time in subsistence agriculture.394

In most cases, farm families arranged the sale of their own domestic productions, but colony agents made it easier for families. M. Thomas Kearney described how “every

farmer keeps a few cows, and in the mornings the wagons from the creameries gather up the cans of milk” and returned the cans full of skim milk. Winter butter sold in the East for high prices, and local creameries in the 1890s installed refrigeration plants to make butter in the warm months. Colonists received two types of income, cash from the cream (market) and feed for the cattle and hogs in the form of skim milk (non-market). In addition to dairy and poultry, farmers raised strawberries, blackberries, peaches, figs, and alfalfa, all of which could be sold or bartered locally or used on the farm.

Wilson Ellis, William Harvey, and M. Thomas Kearney facilitated colony settlement, urging families to treat the colony farm as any other new farm. Small sacrifices of time and effort in the beginning paid off, but these promoters did not want to exclude the cash poor, hardworking laborer from coming because, as one booster stated, “Work, and hard work, is required to make a good home. One who is not afraid to exert himself will succeed.” Boosters invited men to come if they were willing to work for a year or more on another man’s land. The out-of-work and out-of-luck had an opportunity in the horticultural lands of Fresno where “Muscle and brawn are capital” and two “honest hands furnish capital enough.”

In their desire to attract permanent settlers, boosters admonished the man who wanted to get rich quick and praised the hardworking. In the same vein, California

395 Farmers who wanted to keep their own cream to make butter supposedly had no problem building milk houses out of native adobe to protect the milk from the hot San Joaquin sun. Fresno County Board of Trade, Fresno County, California: Its Resources, Climate, Productions and Progress, Also Its Attractions for Home Seekers (Fresno: Board of Trade, n.d. [ca. 1886]), 11. This might have been plausible; James Swift of Montecito (Santa Barbara County) “fitted up” an adobe ranch house on his property as a dairy house. Santa Barbara Weekly Press, 28 May 1881.

396 Martin Theodore Kearney, Fresno County, California and the Evolution of the Fruit Vale Estate (Fresno: M. T. Kearney, 1903), 20-23; Fresno Weekly Expositor, 14 February 1877; Fresno Daily Evening Expositor, 15 March 1893; Fresno Daily Evening Expositor, 27 April 1893.

397 “Fresno: Glimpses of the Heart of the San Joaquin,” Overland Monthly 9, 2d ser. (February 1887): 18; Immigration Association of California, Resources of the Southern San Joaquin Valley, California, 60.
writers also chastised the general malingerer; “The bleary-eyed tramps who loaf in the sunlight, and roast stolen chickens in the willows, and climb upon trains at country depots, to beg offensively and vulgarly for washy-money [sic] have no right to exist in California. There is work for all.” The agents of the Immigration Association of California recommended a settler bring $3,000 to start in a colony but some had the will to start “poor,” working government land or on the land of others first.398 Colony agents made land available to men of “small means” and “moderate means.” Enthusiastic Californians never wanted to dissuade the industrious but were always clear that in no other place were “stupidity and indolence punished more remorselessly.” Smart settlers raised their own food and raised market crops, and the promoters had advice for the farmers on both issues.399

Securing a competency was one strategy for a successful colonist to establish a comfortable home and prosperous business, but market crops also figured prominently in colony agents’ promotions. Few American farms in the late nineteenth century were solely self-sufficient, and there was no reason to expect differently in California. On the one hand diversity of subsistence items helped families save money on groceries or bring cash for other expenses (e.g., clothing, shoes, sugar, tobacco, or coffee). On the other hand, farmers paid mortgages, built nicer homes, and expanded the farm operation using profits from market crops. Even small incomes worked to make the family more comfortable or happy; father purchased new implements or hired some help in the fields,

398 “Fresno: Glimpses of the Heart of the San Joaquin,” 17-18; Immigration Association of California, Resources of the Southern San Joaquin Valley, California, 60.
399 A. A. Smith, “Kingsburg Colony,” Overland Monthly 9, 2d ser. (February 1887): 40; Jackson, Barbariana, 29.
mother happily relinquished her laundry or sewing duties, and hired hands replaced
children who then went to school for more months out of the year. Both approaches
fueled the economy of the farm as a home and a business. Colony agents, however, did
not expect many of the settlers to be experienced in all the aspects of planting, harvesting,
and marketing new types of crops, such as grapes and citrus fruit.

During the 1870s and 1880s, the colony system made the expansion of fruit
production possible, and the success of horticulture in these communities spurred groups
to found additional colonies based on specialty crops, especially in Southern California.
The southern part of the state remained sparsely populated throughout much of the 1850s
and 1860s because the transcontinental railroad delivered passengers to San Francisco,
Oakland, and Sacramento, not Los Angeles or San Diego. Despite its remoteness from
transportation networks, colonies attracted farmers starting with the first planned
agricultural community in Anaheim.

From the beginning, Anaheim farmers raised grapes for local wineries, and new colonists
in Riverside and Westminster also raised grapes while dabbling with other crops. Grape
growers in the south cornered the wine grape market throughout the 1850s and 1860s, but
they soon adopted citrus fruits as their primary commercial crops.400

During the 1870s, growers and experts planted oranges and proposed a shift to
citriculture based on pragmatic considerations. In 1871, Lyman White of Riverside
planted orange seedlings from Los Angeles, and soon his neighbors also planted citrus,
deciduous fruit trees, and raisin grapes while Anaheim growers raised wine grapes.

Along side their family gardens, vineyards and orchards took root. By the mid-1870s,

(January 1934): 53-73.
farmers imported varieties of Valencias and navels, but a new orange, the Bahia, impressed visitors of the Riverside exhibition in 1879. The products that White and others took to the 1879 fair started a new wave of planting orange groves. Californians now had two complementary varieties—Valencia oranges for summer harvest and navels for winter harvest. Growers made $800 to $3,000 per acre of fruit. By the 1880s, pests and diseases plagued southern grape lands and forced grape growers to uproot their vineyards. Developers opened new lands for citrus colonies, and by 1889 the southern half of Los Angeles County had enough residents to create a new county named for its most famous fruit. Riverside residents followed the example of Orange County fruit farmers and by 1893 legislators carved out Riverside County. Both of the new counties had been populated through the colony system, and farmers there devoted most of their lands to citrus fruits.  

Southern California fruit growers found hope in the new crop but were desperate for a better system of distribution. In the mid 1880s, orange growers sold their fruit under crude marketing arrangements and cursed the buyers who often dictated terms. Small-scale fruit raisers, in and out of the colonies, joined the region’s more established residents to find new ways to market oranges in the East. James DeBarth Shorb and William Wolfskill’s heirs, controlled hundreds of acres with thousands of trees, but almost all of the growers wanted a more grower friendly system. In October 1885, Shorb

---

401 Zierer, “The Citrus Fruit Industry of the Los Angeles Basin,” 53-73; Patterson, A Colony for California. Spanish missionaries and a few early American settlers raised oranges before the colonists, but Clifford Zierer demonstrates in his article that the colony system and the southern transcontinental railroads had significant roles in the expansion of citrus. Prior to the railroad, the Wolfskill family controlled two-thirds of the citrus production in Southern California in the 1860s. In order to sell their oranges in other parts of the state, the Wolfskills carted their fruit to the port to be sent up the coast in ships. See the California Agriculturist, 1 April 1874, for reports of orchards owned by the Wolfskils, B. D. Wilson, and L. J. Rose, all prominent viticulturists.
called for growers to unite and helped form the Orange Growers Protective Union of Southern California (OGPU). Since Shorb organized two colonies, subdividing Wolfskill family land, he well understood the nature of the industry. Colonists struggled to keep their homes, and even the more established orange growers did not have enough power to reconstruct the national citrus market.

The directors of OGPU hoped to usurp the power of eastern commission agents through “cooperation.” In the following years, groups of growers formed associations, such as the Pachappa Orange Growers’ Association in Riverside, which more effectively packed, shipped, and marketed fruit in various locales. After 1890, planters continued to search for mechanisms to better market their products, especially during the depression of the nineties when prices dropped due to the national depression. Growers reorganized once again in 1895. The Southern California Fruit Exchange (later renamed Sunkist) brought the local associations under one mantle and regained some control of the marketing process. Once again California’s agriculturalists chose cooperation to stave off “hard times.”

402 Herman Steen, Coöperative Marketing: The Golden Rule in Agriculture (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1923), 38-40; MacCurdy, The History of the California Fruit Growers Exchange, 10-35. During the 1880s, colonists in Riverside and other communities certainly joined the OGPU. Colony residents also joined other cooperative groups, such as the Grange. Since the most prominent growers controlled the Exchange, it is unclear what relationship small-scale operators had to these associations. Fresno, Riverside, and other fruit growing colonies, however, provide interesting case studies for scholars interested in the spectrum of operations at this time. Yet more careful examinations of these relationships may yield interesting results for future scholars. The company Miller & Lux has been held up as an example of agribusiness type ventures in the state. The firm owned 1.25 million acres in three western states upon which they grazed 100,000 cattle. David Igler called it “one of the nation’s largest industrial enterprises (Igler, 4). Yet settlers had varied experiences with the Miller & Lux firm that assisted their efforts. In 1872, managers of the company sent men to the Alabama Colony to help keep company cattle off the farmers’ unfenced lands. In 1880 William J. Browning, hired by Miller & Lux, took a team onto company lands in Los Banos to kill rabbits. These rabbits did not distinguish between company crops and non-company crops, and locals soon started rabbit drives to continue the weeding out of the farm pest. Miller & Lux also hired local farmers for special projects, such as digging the West Side Canal. Fresno Weekly Expositor, 21 February 1872; Igler, Industrial Cowboys, 114-16; F. F. Latta, “The Story of Henry
California historians have detailed the evolution of cooperative marketing associations and the lives of successful growers, but disregarded the fact that families actually lived in the colonies. In 1883, Thomas L. Magee, wife, and three sons boarded an emigrant train for California headed for Riverside. The Magees had settled in Prairie City, Illinois, after the Civil War but took advantage of the new southern railroad route to California. Railroad companies offered “emigrant” rates on westward bound trains, and families took advantage of the lower fares to relocate to California. On board, these third-class passengers found plain accommodations, often sitting on raw boards and eating self-prepared food. Slow freight trains pulled emigrant cars and allowed Pullman cars to pass. They received discounts for accepting the simple décor and delays en route. For the Magees, it took nine days to reach California from Kansas City. Rate wars on the southern routes led to the “Boom of the Eighties,” and new residents flowed into the Southland colonies at Riverside, Colton, and Ontario, among others. After almost twenty years, California boosters’ “Great Expectations” were being fulfilled.

Undeniably, landowners and promoters founded colonies to make money from the unsettled land and to attract immigrants to the state. Yet at the same time, colony surveyors and agents imbued unsettled lands with a sense of community, productivity, and morality to attract “home-seekers.” Colonies reflected the economic and social
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Hammer Mills,” folder 7, Box 6(1), and William J. Browning, “Personal Recollections after More than 60 Years,” folder 22, box 7(1), F. F. Latta “Sky Farming” Collection (uncataloged), Huntington Library; “Colonial History: An Interview with B. Marks of Dos Palos,” Fresno Daily Evening Expositor, 30 March 1892.


purposes of farms and rural communities, and developers facilitated both by providing vital resources. Irrigation champion William Ellsworth Smythe explained, “One of the greatest charms of our irrigation empire lies in the ideal social conditions it is developing. Farm life is being revolutionized. The big farm is passing away before the dawning era of the small farm. Shiftless and promiscuous methods in agriculture are giving way to intensive cultivation.” George Freeman called for irrigation because without it, a third of the arable land was only desert without scant moisture, “wholly inadequate to insure crops, and build up stable communities.”

As Smythe and Freeman indicated, they expected colonists to seek economic prosperity and find social outlets within the irrigated, cooperative communities. Since most colonies organized around moral values and cultural commonalities, the earliest settlers had social ties from the beginning. In 1884, for instance, five hundred Lutherans prepared to leave St. Louis to settle on Central Pacific land in the Sacramento Valley. Moreover, the colony system integrated smaller groups with similar principles to the originating settlers in places such as Westminster, California. Lemuel P. Webber, a Presbyterian minister, established a 6,500-acre colony on Abel Stearns rancho in 1870. Webber’s Westminster Colony, near Anaheim, attracted farmers from California’s coastal counties, mining areas, and San Francisco, as well as families emigrating from

---

New England, Mid-Atlantic, midwestern, and southern states. These people responded to advertisements in newspapers and immigrant society tracts, including the California Immigrant Union’s publications. One or two families from Brimfield, Illinois, or Los Nietos, California, found themselves living among virtual strangers, but they all sat in the pews of Webber’s church together and sent their children to the same schools. Community institutions and common values made strangers into neighbors.  

Promoters were gratified to see families taking up the small-plots they advertised. S. R. Magee, Thomas’s uncle, owned a two-story house and an orange orchard in Riverside, operating an ideal 20-acres described by developers. Even though Thomas Magee decided not to stay in Riverside for long, he got involved in community affairs, nonetheless. Settlers fostered social and economic development as they built homes and farms. Bernhard Marks started the advertising campaign in 1875 for the Central California Colony, inviting families to work hard on small plots, raise chickens and milk cows to survive, and plant fruit for the market. By 1880, the men and women of 69 households followed the path laid out in the promotional literature. Fifty-one of sixty-nine colonists lived with one or more family members, mostly on 20-acre farms. A. O. Anderson exemplified the model farmer. On twenty acres, he, his wife, and five children came to the colony with no more than $75. Without the money for a down payment,

---


407 In 1884, he joined the San Bernardino County Board of Health, and then moved to San Diego, joining its county board there in the late 1880s. Even though Thomas Magee worked as a physician instead of a farmer, he oversaw the county hospital/poor farm system, an extension of rural values (see chapter 5). Michael Kelly, ed., “First Annual Report of the Board of Health of the City of San Diego for the Year Ending December 31st, 1888” *Journal of San Diego History* 48 (Fall 2002); Patterson, *A Colony for California*, 193.

408 Six colonists owned 40 acres, two owned 60 acres, and two operated on 110 acres. Marks lived in the colony and purchased 120-acres for his family’s farm.
Anderson promised Marks he would “work it out.” By 1883, he sold the plot for $3,000 cash and bought a 40-acre farm closer to town. Life did not slow down for this family. Anderson started from scratch, planting a new orchard, and sent his children into Fresno to work at the fruit cannery.\footnote{Fresno Weekly Expositor, 5 June 1881. A. O. Anderson is listed in the census as an owner of 20-acre farm in the CCC. He had one acre in vines, four head cattle, and forty chickens. The Expositor author mentioned he also raised corn and fruit trees. The 1880s agricultural census forms only had categories for apple and peach trees, so it is unclear what type of fruit trees he planted on the 19 improved acres. Robert Montague also planted strawberries and blackberries in 1877. Prior to this small fruits were imported from San Francisco but were too expensive for most residents, but now “our citizens need not deny themselves the luxury of strawberries and cream on account of the exorbitant prices of the berries.” Montague also owned 20-acres in the CCC and had a family. Fresno Weekly Expositor, 14 February 1877. Agricultural and Population Censuses, Fresno, Fresno County, California, 1870, 1880; Panter, “Central California Colony,” 6.}

The Anderson family was one of many who built a competency using their own labor. Many of the Central California Colony (CCC) families raised poultry and dairy products for the household and for barter or sale. Forty-eight households reported to the census taker that they had poultry and dairy cows. The colonists could not rely too much on their orchards and vineyards. Considering the newness of the community, only thirty-one had a small number of peach trees or grape vines planted. The CCC residents planted and waited, living off of their own productions and small sales from their gardens, poultry yard, and milk pails. In the mean time, they built social networks around a local church, social clubs, and schools.\footnote{Fresno Weekly Expositor, 5 June 1881. A. O. Anderson is listed in the census as an owner of 20-acre farm in the CCC. He had one acre in vines, four head cattle, and forty chickens. The Expositor author mentioned he also raised corn and fruit trees. The 1880s agricultural census forms only had categories for apple and peach trees, so it is unclear what type of fruit trees he planted on the 19 improved acres. Robert Montague also planted strawberries and blackberries in 1877. Prior to this small fruits were imported from San Francisco but were too expensive for most residents, but now “our citizens need not deny themselves the luxury of strawberries and cream on account of the exorbitant prices of the berries.” Montague also owned 20-acres in the CCC and had a family. Fresno Weekly Expositor, 14 February 1877. Agricultural and Population Censuses, Fresno, Fresno County, California, 1870, 1880; Panter, “Central California Colony,” 6.}

Soon after settling into their new homes, colonists built social institutions. From schools and churches to lodges and granges, new residents quickly formed social unions with their neighbors. By 1877, the Fresno colony’s grange had 45 members and gathered regularly at Mr. Pratt’s house to practice singing and met at the Grange Hall weekly. Additionally, twenty-three children filled the seats of the schoolhouse just two years after
Marks started advertising the lots for sale in Fresno. CCC resident Lucy Hatch recalled how local women banded together early on to form “some sort of social center.” In 1883, Hatch donated enough land for a church, and locals provided funds to construct the building. At the first church planning meeting, residents, including colony agent Bernhard Marks and his wife, congregated to sign the church’s constitution and discuss construction ideas. The building became the center for several Fresno groups, including a Danish church and a chapter of the Women’s Christian Temperance Union.  

Fresno colonists were not the only colony residents to create communities in remote, arid locations. Westminster residents struggled to establish their farms on land known for dust, cactus, and critters, yet the difficulties they encountered fostered neighborly assistance. The initial colonists witnessed drought that desiccated the soil and endured various varmints. Badgers stole chickens, while rattlesnakes, rabbits, gophers, coyotes, mountain lions, and grizzly bears ravaged farms and scared newcomers. Farmers and their wives worked together with neighbors to survive these lean and nerve-racking years. Consequently, they formed social connections which led to the growth of social organizations in the colonies. The promoters wanted this type of association and promised sufficient roads to connect farmers to each other and to towns. Colony planners reserved lands for churches and schools and planted trees along the roads to create

411 Jessica A. Crisp and William B. Secrest Jr., “Central Colony Union Church—1883-1891, Fresno County, California” Fresno Historical Articles and Resources from the Ash Tree Echo, 1966-2000 v. 1 (Fresno: Fresno County General Society, 2001), 371-72. See also Patterson. J. W. North took up land in Riverside during the 1870s and joined the local subordinate grange along with founding members of the colony. Carr, The Patrons of Husbandry on the Pacific Coast, 250; Tom Patterson, A Colony for California: Riverside’s First Hundred Years (Riverside: Press-Enterprise, 1971), 32; Fresno Weekly Expositor, 7 March 1877, 25 August 1880
bucolic rural environments. Residents and colony agents often lived side-by-side, working together on building these local institutions.\footnote{Bollman, Westminster Colony, California 1869-1879, 56-65. The discussion of Westminster comes from Bollman’s study. This is a fine example of well-researched and well-written local history. For examples of boosters living in the colonies they founded, see J. W. North’s involvement in Riverside, Marks’s in the CCC at Fresno, and Joel P. Whitney’s involvement in the Placer County colony near his Rocklin home. Placer County Citrus Colony, Placer County Citrus Colony, in the Lower Foothills of Placer County, California (San Francisco: Crocker & Co., 1889); History of Placer County, California (Oakland: Thompson & West, 1882), 246-48.}

The Westminster colonists also relied on the older community of Anaheim for some services, but in general, colonists associated mainly with their neighbors in various social venues, including grange meetings. The activities of the Westminster Grange No. 127 demonstrate the interconnected nature of personal relationships and economics in the lives of California farm people. Westminster farmers added the Patrons of Husbandry gatherings to their weekly routine after Thomas A. Garey of Los Angeles helped the charter members start their chapter on 19 November 1873, including the colony planner Reverend Webber. Westminster grangers proceeded to open a cooperative store and warehouse. Prior to this, the colonists traveled over rough land to Anaheim for poor quality, overpriced goods. Shareholders in the colony’s grange store paid cost for sundries and implements and allowed non-patrons to purchase the same items at market prices. Members of this group socialized at Grange-style events, holding harvest feasts and Fourth of July picnics. During the 1870s, the membership of the local church and subordinate grange increased and needed more space than the local school house provided. With the store’s reputation growing inside and outside of the community, the Westminster patrons approved expansion of the store to accommodate more merchandise on the bottom floor and more space for churchgoers and patrons upstairs.\footnote{Bollman, Westminster Colony, 58-62.
Single men and women connected to the larger social body in the colonies by participating in the institutions created by farm families. At the Central California Colony in Fresno, fourteen single men lived alone and farmed or raised livestock. These men had access to the Grange, a railroad station, and colony services, making their lives easier than if they lived solitary lives on undeveloped lands. In addition, six women owned land in their names in the CCC and identified themselves as “farmers” or “fruit raisers” to the 1880 census enumerator. During the nineteenth century, most Americans considered farming to be a man’s occupation, but boosters advertised the colonies as ideal homes for industrious, educated women and promoted horticulture as an appropriate occupation for women not interested in more traditional sex-defined vocations, mainly teaching. Thus colonists integrated residents without kin of the colony into the social and economic functions of the family based community.

After the gold rush, Californians hardly even noticed the existence of bachelor farmers, but the idea of women “farmers” intrigued Americans on both sides of the Rocky Mountains. California’s boosters declared that the rural environments of colonies provided moral spaces for single women—including the unmarried or widowed—who needed to make respectable incomes. Invariably, colony agents trotted out the case of Minnie Austin, former San Francisco school teacher and resident of Fresno’s then famous Central California Colony. Sometime after 1875, Austin and three other teachers bought several adjacent plots in the CCC shortly after meeting Bernhard Marks. The four women worked in San Francisco but quickly tired of teaching. Austin directed most of the work on the farm initially and hired men to plant vines before she moved to Fresno. By 1878, Austin acquired a reputation as a successful vineyardist and managed the
operations while the other women assisted on the grounds. In that year, the group of young women inaugurated the “Austin” brand of raisins and opened the first packing house in the colony. When a reporter asked one of the four how the “ladies” did so well, Lucy Hatch told him “We studied and read….I didn’t know what I was undertaking; we just went ahead and worked.” Newspaper editors and colony promoters used Austin and her colleagues as models of successful, respectable women to be emulated by other middle-class women seeking remunerative employment.414

During the late nineteenth-century, middle-class such as Minnie Austin and Lucy Hatch women increasingly sought work in a time when society defined their lives in terms of motherhood and homemaking.415 In order to make the colonies into suitable destinations for these women, colony promoters highlighted the rural goodness of the new communities. Americans imbued rural places with moral virtue and greater industry while disparaging the city as a place of disease and dysfunction, and boosters referred to those endowments in their advertisements.416 Agents claimed that their colonies had all of the benefits of rural communities with institutions of social progress; they argued women should consider taking small plots for income within the protective environment of the colonies. Schools, churches, and lodges were the foundations of a social

414 Republican (Fresno), 15 April 1925.
community, bringing individuals together for edification and personal accountability. As a part of a community, colonists reestablished the structured, safe atmosphere of older communities and replaced the anonymous freedom of the frontier and urban spaces. Developers constructed rural landscapes as healthy locations for families, which seemed to make them appropriate places for an emerging class of women interested in finding work outside of teaching.

Across the board, state boosters advocated that women consider small-scale horticulture as a suitable vocation. In 1876, the California Immigration Union agents endorsed fruit culture, canning, fruit drying, and poultry raising for women because they “are employments that offer to women independent fields of labor that will neither break down their health nor keep them in perpetual bondage to monthly or weekly wages.” Like colony families, the single female might raise some fruit, milk a few cows, and feed a flock of chickens on a 10-acre farm, hiring out the more demanding work to male laborers. The author did not expect women to work in the fields at harvest or any other time of the year. He wrote, “We would not like to see American women, or any women in our country, doing rough work in the fields, though riding on a gang-plow is play in comparison with teaching or running a sewing machine.” Members of the Patrons of Husbandry, newspaper editors, immigration bureau officers, and colony promoters joined suffragists and female reformers in the drive to imagine women as “farmers” in California.

418 Supplement to All About California and the Inducements to Settle There (San Francisco: California Immigrant Union, 1876), 5. See also “Women as Farmers,” Santa Clara Valley, May 1885; “A Lady Farmer,” San Jose Mercury reprinted in Woman’s Journal, 12 May 1883; “Horticulutre as a Profession for
Middle-class women of the Golden State formally broached the topic of opportunities outside of education. Single and married women taught in both the mining and agricultural districts during the 1850s and 1860s, but California’s educated women desired a greater variety of options for self-support. A few women ventured into newspaper editing, publishing, and writing literature, competing with men in a limited sphere of economic activity. Finally, in the 1880s, the California members of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae (ACA) instigated an investigation of the merits and disadvantages of agriculture. They wanted to identify “not only opportunities of profit, but to the surroundings and character of work as bearing upon its attractiveness to intelligent women.” The investigating committee members focused on agriculture as means to achieve “profit, health, happiness, and mental growth.”

In 1887, an author for the Overland Monthly got hold of the ACA report, giving his personal a summary of this now lost document. The committee sent surveys to women voluntarily running farms or orchards in the state, asking these women for personal information about their families, details about their operations, and recommendations for future women farmers. Even though many of the women

421 Millicent Washburn Shinn graduated from University of California, Berkeley in 1874 and later edited the Overland Monthly from 1883-1894 when she resigned to go to graduate school. Ironically, after graduate school, her mother’s poor health forced Shinn to return to the family homestead and help manage the orchards.
successfully supported themselves and their families, some of the respondents warned of the difficulties they faced. One woman claimed “I have found agriculture a profitable and healthful enterprise. But for a woman it has cares and trials, and unless one has a strong constitution, and plenty of will power, and determination to succeed, I should not advise her to engage in it.” Another female farmer replied, “Only women of mature judgment, pluck, and native energy, should attempt it.” Women farmers in this survey disagreed about the merits of agricultural or horticultural fields for women generally, yet none indicated they had strayed from the Victorian ideal of womanhood. The praise for women farmers and colony life continued to find space in California literature.\(^{422}\)

Throughout the 1880s and 1890s, several women continued to recommend horticulture for women. Jeanne C. Carr, Theodosia B. Shepherd, and Marietta Stow were just a few of the leading promoters of the period. Jeanne C. Carr wrote extensively on the subject, and her credentials suited her to the task. Not only had Carr joined the Grange, she served as the assistant superintendent of education, and wrote for several journals on the subjects of botany, education, and horticulture. Carr had experience with trees and plants, and hoped to bestow her knowledge upon young women in a college of horticulture. On her property in the Pasadena, formerly the “Indiana Colony,” Carr raised numerous types of trees including Morus alba and Morus ruba, known commonly as White Mulberry and Red Mulberry.\(^{423}\)

\(^{422}\) “Agriculture as an Occupation for Women in California,” \textit{Overland Monthly} 9, 2d ser. (June 1887): 652-58.

\(^{423}\) Theodosia B. Shepherd, “Horticulture for Women,” \textit{Rural Californian}, May 1893; Charles Francis Sanders, \textit{The Story of Carmelita, Its Associations and Its Trees} (Pasadena: A. C. Vroman, Inc., 1928), 35-36. Jeanne Carr envisioned a horticultural college for women, in part, because she had no faith in the state’s land-grant university. Her husband, Ezra Carr, had served as the first agricultural professor there until he was dismissed by the University of California Board of Regents. Professor Carr lost his position after criticizing the regents, as he saw it, for ignoring the mission as stated in the Morrill Land Grant Act,
Mulberry trees figured prominently in the women’s horticultural movement of the 1880s. Reform minded women joined the “Ladies’ Silk Culture Association” in order to find more work for farmwives. Like poultry or buttermaking, the association’s members idealized sericulture, or the raising of silk worms, as another female domestic production, but more than that, they wanted to make horticulture an appropriate dominion for working-class women. Radical suffragist Marietta Stow had hopes of funding horticultural colleges for women by 1880. She complained that the marriage market after the Civil War left a “redundancy of unprovided women” who needed more than domestic work. Growing fruits, vegetables, and flowers would “save at least a part of the great army of pale and weary shop-girls and sewing-women who are literally [sic] dying by inches for want of fresh air and sunshine.”

Female writers justified women’s entrance into horticulture based on economic need, as Stow indicated, and personal fulfillment. Theodosia Shepherd, a married woman raising plants for her seed catalogs, reminded readers that “women have always loved flowers….Who can tell of the happiness their little flower gardens have given to women scattered here and there in lonely new homes.” Thus young women unable to find husbands might find comfortable yet profitable positions in agriculture. Even though Carr, Stow, and Shepherd focused their attention on the plight of California women—namely the regents failed to support the agricultural division. His dismissal sparked a controversy among the grangers, and soon after he received an appointment as the superintendent of agriculture. For the California grangers’ view of the university, see The University of California and Its Relations to Industrial Education (San Francisco: Benj. Dore and Co., 1874).

Second Annual Report of the California Silk Culture Association; Constitution and By-Laws (San Francisco: Women’s Printing Union, 1883); First Annual Report of the State Board of Silk Culture, for the Year 1883 (Sacramento: James J. Ayers, 1884); Mrs. J. W. Stow’s Circular: $25,000 to Establish Horticultural Colleges for Women (San Francisco: n.p., 1877). For Stow’s views on silk culture and horticulture, see her paper, Woman’s Herald of Industry and Social Science Coöperator at the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley. Solomon, In the Company of Educated Women, 45.
from the middle-class women of the colonies to the working-class girl considering gardening—, women across the country and in England also pondered about what to do with their “unprovided women.”

During the late part of the nineteenth century, English female reformers organized to find work for women, especially middle-class women bred into living “aimless” existences. One of these reforming women, Emily Faithfull (1835-1895), traveled to the U.S. several times to meet with American women’s rights advocates and to investigate solutions for Great Britain’s young women. Faithfull examined the state of women in factories and visited co-educational universities, but it was horticulture and sericulture that caught her attention while in San Francisco. In 1884, Faithfull interrogated Minnie Austin about life in the colonies. Colonization and silk culture fascinated Faithfull for the same reason it did American female reformers—the creation of paying work within a moral environment.425

Other reports came from abroad that reformers were interested in funneling working girls into horticulture. A reporter for The Queen told readers that young women might make good “practical gardeners” and would not lose their “social status as gentlewomen” in doing so. During her investigations of women in agriculture, American Maggie Downing Brainard heard that horticultural classes had been added to the curriculum in English colleges for women, a prospective model for the U.S. She wrote

425 For news of Faithfull’s arrival and plans, see Pacific Rural Press, 2 and 9 February 1884; “A Talk with Miss Austin,” in Alexander Bell, The Great Progress of Fresno Town and Country (N.p., 1884); James S. Stone, Emily Faithfull: Victorian Champion of Women’s Rights (Toronto: P. D. Meany Publishers, 1994), 7-34.
that the “same pursuit seems as well adapted to the one as the other.” To Carr, Stow, and Brainard in the U.S., horticulture represented an economically viable occupation in agricultural regions and employment they could justify in terms of Victorian standards for women.

Reformers had reason to worry about the fate of women after the Civil War. The war and its aftermath had upset the social order. First, more women were educated than ever. Women filled university seats while men were at war, and land-grant colleges after the war offered co-education. Second, the war reduced the number of marriageable men. More than half a million men died, and many came home crippled and unable to work. Third, temperance and women’s suffrage became important reform issues after the war. Eager adherents to social reform looked to temperance, suffrage, and spiritualism among others. Women reformers involved in these movements chose to marry like-minded men, or at times, not marry at all. And finally, capitalists expanded businesses and demanded more workers. The rich, the middle class, and the working poor inhabited the industrial cities that emerged during the 1880s and 1890s, and women of these classes had different roles in this new urban environment. Amid these larger social transformations, more women, educated or not, desired or required incomes.

Women reformers of the Far West, South, and North attempted to help working women and middle-class single women find work. They founded settlement houses,


employment bureaus, and protective labor organizations to train and prepare women for work. Carr and Stow recommended colleges for horticultural and sericulture training which were efforts to help working-class women as well-meaning as Chicago’s Hull House or Boston’s Women’s Educational and Industrial Union. Silk associations formed in several states with the assistance of state boards and agricultural colleges, including those of Pennsylvania and Michigan. Mrs. Belle Tanner of Charlotte, Michigan, requested silk worm eggs from the land-grant college administrators in 1894 and was one of many women who followed the directions provided by silk societies.

Wherever there were rural women, sericulture promoters instituted silk programs. Both the silk and horticulture movements were national in scope. Maggie Downing Brainard, a Mississippi resident, described her entrance into horticulture despite the “discouragement from croakers,” meaning the men who shunned the idea of women as farmers. She was quite encouraged by the eight California women she featured in an article for Californian Illustrated Magazine. Widows supported their children instead of becoming paupers. Georgia McBride took her fatherless children from Missouri to a small fruit orchard in San Jose where the little ones developed a “perfect character,” and she became the best example of a “model mother and a true woman.”

While female reformers exhorted the usefulness of farming for women, colony promoters welcomed

---

428 In California, three university professors served on the silk boards, including H. H. Behr (Botany), George Davidson (Geodesy and Astronomy), and E. W. Hilgard (Agriculture). State legislators funded the women’s silk movement after they formed the California Silk Culture Association best know as the “Ladies’ Silk Culture Association.” A Tribute to the Memory of Mrs. Harriet Anne Lucas from her Associates of he Women’s Silk Culture Association of the United States, Philadelphia (n.p., 1893); Woman’s Journal, 21 May 1881, 7 January and 18 November 1882, 12 May 1883, 24 May, 16 and 30 August 1884 [Penn., Georgia, Ohio, N.C., S.C. Texas, Iowa, and Mo.]; Belle Tanner to “supts of Agaculture Collage,” 30 March 1894, folder 34, box 873, Lewis Griffin Gorton Papers, 1893-1895, University Archives & Historical Collections, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

women farmers to contribute to their communities’ social and economic well-being. California’s boosters were not the croakers Brainard faced in Mississippi.

Amidst the social and economic challenges of urbanization and industrialization during the Gilded Age, the nation’s female reformers attempted to expand women’s sphere to include horticulture and floriculture. This movement to create a class of women farmers was not isolated to the West. Historians have described the West as a place unfettered by eastern mores, but unmarried California women struggled with the proscriptions of Victorian womanhood as they tried to find suitable occupations and decent incomes. State boosters took advantage of this and encouraged middle-class women to move into the colonies and manage small plots of citrus, grapes, or other specialty crops.430

Colony agents wanted to sell land and foster stable markets, which they did by packaging made-to-order communities. They combined the practical necessities (land titles and water) with the more ephemeral qualities of rural life that came from institutions and commitments to a well ordered social structure. As middle-class women took residence in the colonies, the community boosters highlighted two facts about making their homes in the rural developments. First, promoters portrayed the colonies as places that exemplified the feminized, settled West of culture and morality. Otherwise, respectable women such as Minnie Austin or Georgia McBride would not have even considered joining these communities. In other words, colonies were safe havens for delicate women and thus they were good enough for any family. Second, new settlers

---

430 For historians treatment of middle-class women in other western states, see Brenda K. Jackson, Domesticating the West: The Re-creation of the Nineteenth-Century American Middle Class (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005); Cynthia Diane Culver, “Gender and Generation on the Pacific Slope Frontier, 1845-1900” (Ph.D diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2004).
benefited by the presence of women. Female colonists started churches, literary clubs, and reform associations. Moreover, they countered the effects of the skewed sex ratio. One booster said, “immigration goes where it is invited,” and colony agents inscribed invitations to the colonies with promises that they had solved California’s peculiar problems.\footnote{Santa Clara Valley, March and July 1885.}
CHAPTER 5. POVERTY IN THE PROMISED LAND: RURAL SOCIAL WELFARE AND CALIFORNIA’S POOR

In 1902, a Los Angeles Times reporter described the county’s poor farm, a rural-version of the poor house, as a place of bounty and bucolic wonder. He wrote, “Wrapped in sunbeams and wreathed in flower gardens, the Los Angeles County Poor Farm visibly resents the incongruity of its name for it is rich in all the beauties of semi-tropical verdure, rich in the productiveness of its orchards and fields, and rich in the great permeating joy of life that trembles in every leaf and flower, transmitting the influence of its buoyancy into human hearts grown weary, dispirited and restless.” He and other reporters described the last stop for the most desperate people in the state, cloaking the true nature of poverty in visions of resplendent Southern California opulence. In the same paper, before and after this 1902 article, Times writers also published accounts of individuals with no hope except one—staying out of the poor farm. Fernando Chacon slit his own throat from ear to ear while in the Los Angeles County jail awaiting a transfer to the county farm in 1890. Other men such as George Deacin, Richard Hudson, Henry Fesler also tried to avoid going there by escaping or committing suicide. Deacin drowned himself in the river near the poor farm and “guessed it was no use to live, as he had neither kith nor kin in the world.” For despondent Deacin, the poor farm was a place wrapped in failure and wreathed in disappointment.432

432 “Poor Farm Amid Orange Blossoms,” Los Angeles Times, 16 November 1902; “For Indigents,” Los Angeles Times, 5 August 1888; “Ghastly Tragedy…Almost Beheaded Himself,” Los Angeles Times, 22 December 1890; “Southern California by Towns and Counties…Queer Old Man,” Los Angeles Times, 4 October 1899; “His Last Guess,” Los Angeles Times, 1 January 1903; “Seeks Death in Despair: Dreads Being Sent to the County Hospital, Would Rather Be in Grave Than at Poor Farm,” Los Angeles Times, 11 August 1909; “Glory Dies A-Shambling,” Los Angeles Times, 4 November 1934.
Readers probably did not pause to think too much about these two incongruous pictures given by journalists. State residents were equally ambivalent about California’s publicly-funded social welfare and how the counties spent their taxes on the poor. California had a beautiful climate, had overcome most of the problems of the 1850s, and seemed poised to provide opportunities for all comers by the 1870s and 1880s. Yet in the midst of all this, a pauper class emerged and forced Californians to provide relief for indigents and define the boundaries of worthiness for that aid. Residents borrowed the basic definitions of “worthy” and “unworthy” poor from other states but redefined these terms to fit the California experience. The poor-farm system suited Californians, as it had most Americans, because it balanced expense with charity by relying on the economy of the farm and providing a home for the down and out. Americans in the state transplanted this form of relief during the years when California transitioned from mining to agriculture because they had not yet committed to a systematic, permanent system of social welfare.

Americans in various states and territories adopted the poor farm system during the decades in which they relied more on markets for incomes and less on subsistence agriculture, including Vermont (1810s-1830s), Iowa (1860s-1870s), Michigan (1860s), Washington Territory (1870s), and Texas (1870s). During these years, these communities existed in a state of flux because emigration decimated populations in the East while western areas added new settlers. In the process, farmers in mature communities increasingly depended on larger economic forces, sending goods to urban centers and entering arrangements of credit and debt to fund agricultural production for distant markets. Without extensive kin networks, widows with or without children, out-
of-work laborers, and the aged sought refuge because they did not have the means for
self-support due to their sex, age, health, or inability to find work in off seasons.
Historian Michael Katz noted that “periodic destitution was one structural result of the
great social and economic transformations” of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth
centuries. Mechanization released hands and fewer domestic productions reduced
household incomes, both economically hurt families and communities.433

Individuals and broken families alike went to the local poorhouse or poor farm
only after exhausting all other resources in the community or from private charities.
Americans imbued poverty with a sense of shame, and going to the poorhouse signaled a
person’s failure to all who watched him or her go. Moreover, the “worthy” poor, or those
not expected to be breadwinners, had access to funds from a wider variety of sources.
Women, children, the aged, and the disabled expected to depend on the fiscal provision
of others (husbands, fathers, adult children, for example). Most community members
looked down on able-bodied men who were out of work, and these men had few choices
other than the poor farm. Many assumed that the “unworthy” poor must have become
indigent because of a character defect. It had not become clear to most people that there
were not enough year-round, full-time jobs for all of the able-bodied workers in the
nation. In essence, the nature of the economy had become more complex during the
nineteenth century, creating new classes of unemployed men. On the other hand,

Americans’ cultural values about work, indolence, and sin had not changed to meet the reality of the times.\textsuperscript{434}

Counties in a number of states built poor farms to provide humane care for the destitute without saddling communities with heavy financial burdens. Most Americans expected kin and neighbors to help community members first, but they also accepted that they had a responsibility to help those beyond the more traditional community systems of care. Yet, as tax payers, they only supported poor farms in part, expecting these institutions to generate some income and assuming that the “inmates” might do minimal work during their stay. Superintendents on these farms planted crops for sale or use by the staff and inmates in order to reduce tax-payer contributions. Overall, the poor farm system combined several functions; it reduced expenses, deterred people from accepting aid, and fought idleness.\textsuperscript{435}

When thousands of people descended on California starting in 1849, poverty was the last thing on anybody’s mind. Yet illness and disability thwarted the ability of men to make it to the mines or continue working once they reached the diggings. Men, American or otherwise, disembarked from ships or stepped off wagons after months of travel without fresh provisions. When H. M. Hayward arrived in San Francisco sometime in late 1849, he delayed moving onto the mines until he restored his health, which had deteriorated on the long trip around the Horn. Not all men were as wise or lucky as Hayward, going onto the mines weak and without antiscorbutic foods. Conditions in the mines were not much better, and the campers subsisted on rudimentary, unhealthy diets. Before long, men succumbed to scurvy, dysentery, tuberculosis, and

\textsuperscript{434} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{435} Katz, \textit{In the Shadow of the Poorhouse}, 16-24.
chronic diarrhea. Hiram B. Flagg mined for gold and watched as many of his friends
died from various diseases. He wrote to his sisters that “There is considerable sickness at
present.... Quit[e] a number of the Everett’s Co are dead.” In fact, only Flagg and twenty-
nine others of the 150-man company survived.436

As a result of these illnesses, individual doctors, fraternal societies, and city
governments established hospitals and pest houses to care for the sick and house the
dying. Ill travelers who landed in San Francisco and Sacramento did not have much
money after spending most of their savings on the trip and ended up in filthy, under-
staffed “hospitals.” In San Francisco, William Taylor, a Methodist minister, went to a
nearby hospital to minister to the patients in the fall of 1849. The ill who had money to
pay for services had nicer accommodations, but he recorded that the “city patients,
proper, were confined together as closely as possible, and allow room between their cots
for one person to pass. I thought the up-stair rooms were filthy enough to kill any well
man, who would there confine himself for a short period; but I now saw that in
comparison with the others, they were entitled to be called choice rooms, money might
well afford to pay high rates.” Nurses were few, and worse, they were unsympathetic,
rude, and vulgar men. By April 1850, the Odd Fellows and the Freemasons joined to
build a hospital for the destitute sick in Sacramento. As soon as argonauts landed in
California, illness became a problem to be dealt with by the few souls left in town.
Everyone else hurried into the hills to find gold.437

436 H. M. Hayward to “Capt’n G. W. Hayward,” 31 December 1849, folder 4 and Hiram B. Flagg to
Harriette A. and Ellen Flagg, 4 April 1850, folder 7, box 15, SMCII, CSL.
437 William Taylor, California Life Illustrated (New York: Carlton & Porter, 1858), 217-21; William L.
Willis, History of Sacramento County (Los Angeles: Historic Record Co., 1913), 137-40; William E.
McCann, History of Rural Alameda County (Oakland: Works Progress Administration, 1937), 624;
In the mountains, the weak and the strong alike fell ill after working hard in the hills while eating poor diets. Doctor James Tyson set up a tent-hospital in the northern mines on request of the miners. Some Oregonians brought a man on a litter, another man suffered with “bilious-typhoid,” and then two more men were “laboring under dysentery” in Tyson’s little hospital. He closed up shop in August because most of the miners moved on to a place rumored to be rich in gold. After a few months restoring the health of local men, Tyson filled his empty medicine bottles with the gold dust payments made by his patients. During his trip down the mountain, he saw three new hospitals along the trail. Tyson and his colleagues made handsome incomes with much less work in the early years of the gold rush taking care of miners’ “wasted frames.”

Soon after the gold rush, Americans dominated the political arena, and much of the relief of the ill fell to them. In the early 1850s, the search for gold dominated the thoughts of newcomers and influenced how the reluctant civic leaders managed the issue of poverty. Alcaldes, county supervisors, and state legislators expected that all able-bodied men had the opportunity to make their own wealth, but the indigent sick were truly worthy of financial assistance. Miner Edwin Flitner remarked in September 1850 “If a man has his health he can do well; if not his situation is a deplorable one unless he has money or friends.” The efforts of city officials and doctors to ameliorate the conditions of those without money or friends resulted in impromptu tent hospitals in town.

and in the mountains. But prior to 1855, men who could pay for their care or rely on personal acquaintances fared better because it was difficult to get help in California.\textsuperscript{439}

The poor health of gold rushers stemmed from two separate but related issues. First, men fell ill from food and water-related illnesses during travel and camping that would not have happened in their native lands. Second, healthy men left the towns for the mines as quickly as possible, leaving the weak and dying behind in San Francisco and Sacramento. William Taylor the minister reported on the wretched nurses of the San Francisco hospital: “One hundred dollars per month was about as low as anything in the shape of man could be hired, and hence hospital nurses were not only the most worthless men, but insufficient in number to attend adequately to their duties.” At home women would have nursed ill and injured men, but gold rush California attracted only a few women who mainly ministered to non-health related needs of men. As a result of these two facts, most of the earliest poor relief came in the form of providing vitamin C-rich foods to the sufferers of scurvy and quarantined areas for men with contagious diseases. Political leaders had no desire to create a permanent welfare system, and the new arrival wished only to become well-enough to move onto the diggings and make his “pile.”\textsuperscript{440}

By 1855, however, state legislators addressed the problem of the indigent sick and passed measures to establish emergency health care for incoming immigrants. Consequently, California’s first poor law codified the actions taken in the mining camps and towns in the early 1850s. Legislators bestowed upon the newly formed county boards of supervisors with the duty of taking “cognizance of all Indigent Sick of the county in which he resides.” The state sent funds to each county from the state “Hospital

\textsuperscript{439} E. Flitner to “Dear Brother,” 14 September 1850, folder 6, Box 16, SMCII, CSL.
\textsuperscript{440} Taylor, California Life Illustrated, 221.
Fund,” and the board of supervisors were allowed to spend that money to hire doctors to visit the sick or to build and maintain hospitals. The supervisors then decided on how to spend the state’s contributions based on their communities’ needs. Small mining camps had fluctuating population figures because miners squatted in the hills and nearby towns only as long as the placer gold held out. Thus few of these towns built structures to serve as hospitals, while port cities such as San Francisco and Sacramento required permanent institutions.441

Several points make it clear that the state expected only to support the indigent sick and not provide relief for paupers. First, in Section 2 of the above law, the state disallowed the counties from using state funds for any purpose other than the ill, and second, in Section 8, the state authorized the county to tax residents, but those funds also could not be used to support the able-bodied poor. Finally, legislators recognized the gold rush as the cause of the indigent sick population and the source of income for able-bodied emigrants. As a part of the 1855 law, the legislators raised money for the hospital fund by taxing sea-faring arrivals to the state. The state treasurer directed the revenue from bonds received under the “Act concerning passengers arriving in the ports of the State of California” into the hospital fund to later be transferred to the counties. As transplanted Americans, the legislators expected the able-bodied to work. Only those deemed physically debilitated could defined as “worthy” of assistance in the atmosphere of the gold rush.442

441 Frances Cahn and Valeska Bary, Welfare Activities of Federal, State, and Local Governments in California, 1850-1934 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1936), 137; Willis, History of Sacramento County, 137-40; Calif. Stat., chap. 57.
442 Calif. Stat., chap. 57; Cahn and Bary, Welfare Activities, 137.
County supervisors implemented the “Poor Law of 1855” in various ways. Most county seats in northern and central California were located in the middle of mining areas, and the supervisors spent as little money as possible caring for the mobile, “floating population” of gold seekers. County supervisors contracted with local doctors to visit the ill in miners’ cabins or temporary hospitals. As miners moved onto new locations, so did the farmers, merchants, and professions of those living in and around the county seats, making permanent facilities premature. During these unsettled years, any unused building served the function of “hospital.” In Fresno, supervisors rented rooms in William Henry’s Hotel in Millerton during the 1850s and 1860s until they could locate a building to purchase. In many cases, locals co-opted abandoned buildings, such as jails, brothels, and hotels. In San Diego, future wine-king Agoston Haraszthy presided as sheriff and struggled to keep his prisoners in an old stone jailhouse. The builders failed to use cement in between the cobblestones, and the first prisoner dug himself out using a pocket knife. San Diego officials retired the jail as a detention facility and allowed it to be used as the county hospital for a short period. Supervisors weighed costs against care of the indigent sick, often at the expense of the latter.\footnote{Patricia Murray, “‘In Indigent Circumstances and Worthy of County Aid:’ A History of Public Relief in Fresno County, 1857-1920,” parts 1 and 2, Fresno: Past & Present 21 (Spring/Summer 1979): 1-3, 1-4; Michael Kelly, ed., “First Annual Report of the San Diego County Hospital and Poor Farm to the Board of Supervisors, for the Year Ending June 30, 1889” Journal of San Diego History 48 (Fall 2002), http://sandiegohistory.org/journal/2002-4/1889.htm, accessed 7 June 2005; History of Butte County, California (San Francisco: Harry L. Wells, 1882), 149-51; H. S. Foote, Pen Pictures from the Garden of the World, or, Santa Clara County, California, Illustrated (Chicago: The Lewis Publishing Co., 1888), 140-41.}

As a result of the 1855 poor law and the efforts of the county supervisors, the state had a county hospital system to care for ill newcomers, but this system did not suit the economic changes after gold rush. Increasingly during the 1860s and the 1870s, the
state’s economy shifted towards agriculture. As a result, the county hospitals filled with able-bodied “paupers,” forcing state and local officials to respond to overburdened county facilities and the increased demands on the hospital fund. Over the course of the 1850s and 1860s, failed miners went home or struggled to make incomes as farmers or laborers. Increasingly, during these years, families set up frontier farms around the state. Separated from their kin networks, bachelors and young couples were one major disaster away from poverty. Consequently, individuals received free medical help from the county physicians and sometimes sought refuge at various state and county funded hospitals during periods of economic strain. Visiting officials to the state insane asylum in 1867 reported back to the governor that the poor had overrun the institution’s resources. They recommended new laws to deal with poverty and stated “It is a well known fact that many of the patients in this Asylum are subjects for an alms house and not for an insane asylum. A law obliging the counties to provide for their paupers will save to the state in money tens of thousands yearly.” These medical advisors worried about having 700-800 individuals housed in buildings designed for 400 and called the governor’s attention to the rising numbers of poor in the new state.

In 1872, the state legislators revised the duty of the county supervisors to include the care of the “otherwise dependent poor” and “provide a farm in connection with the County Hospital.” In other words, the code writers told the counties to build poor farms to house their paupers just as suggested in the state asylum report of 1867. During the

444 Political Code of 1872, sec. 4046 in Revised Laws of the State of California; in Four Codes: Political, Civil, Civil Procedure, and Penal, vol. 1 (Sacramento: T. A. Springer, State Printer, 1872), 617-20; Biennial Reports of the Directors and Medical Visitors and Fifteenth Annual Report, 5-15. The authors of the 1872 revised codes specifically cited Iowa’s statutes in the section on the board of supervisors’ roles and duties (615).
1870s and 1880s, supervisors started the process of establishing poor farms in several counties, especially in agricultural counties. By 1880s, there were at least 40,000 farms, and by 1900 there were 72,542 farms in the state. Agricultural counties instituted the poor farm system during the years of economic transition when farmers, laborers, and merchants became increasingly dependent on one another. As their economies became more complex, county supervisors added farms to their county hospitals or built separate buildings on farm grounds to house and feed out-of-work laborers, widows, and anyone else without the resources to do so on their own.

In Contra Costa County, officials waited until 1880 to look for a location for their poor farm. During the 1860s and 1870s, this inland county had a small population, and several doctors paid by the county watched after the indigent sick. By 1880, the population had doubled yet remained predominately rural. Residents migrated from the mineral districts, and newcomers joined them to farm and work on the docks located on the bay. Farmers demanded funding for roads, bridges, and schools in 1880, and the supervisors in Martinez allocated funds for these community projects as well as the poor farm. They called for bids from farmers willing to sell good farm land to the county. J. H. Carothers, a Pennsylvania-born physician, offered enough land for a sufficiently sized building and land for “garden purposes, raising chickens, etc.” It seemed obvious to Carothers that this would be enough to put the county welfare on a “proper Poor Farm basis” because the labor of the indigent could be made “somewhat remunerative,” raising their own food. His short proposal addressed all of the expectations regarding the poor farm. A small outlay of tax-payers’ money would establish an institution to utilize the resources of a farm so that the products of the soil reduced the county’s expenses by
feeding inmates or bringing in cash through sales.\textsuperscript{445} Carothers, the supervisors, and the state legislators learned about the social and economic role of the poor farm from their homes states, allowing them to transplant the institution to California in the late nineteenth century.

Poor farms functioned much like the family farm, providing work for any able-bodied inmates and funding the care of the poor at the same time. County supervisors and tax-payers wanted the poor farm to become as self-sustaining as possible and economy determined many of the decisions about the poor farm. Superintendents of these county farms pursued both commercial and subsistence agriculture to bring income into the operation for maintenance of buildings and to support the inmates, as paupers on the farm were generally called. The “county farmer” served the functions as the head of household on a typical farm of the era. He planned much of the agricultural operations, at times with input from the supervisors, labored on the farm, and interacted with merchants to sell and buy farm or household items. If the superintendent had a wife, she might cook or at least supervise the workings of the kitchen. Their children often did chores, as well. At the Sonoma County farm, Superintendent Jerry Claypool had several daughters who milked the cows and made butter for the family and inmates. The poor residing on the farm did chores appropriate to each individual’s age, sex, and health. Aged men might milk or water the stock, and young women helped to clean dormitories.

\textsuperscript{445} \textit{Contra Costa Gazette}, 7 February 1880; \textit{History of Contra Costa County} (San Francisco: W. A. Slocum & Co., 1882), 232.
or the dining room. Instead of grandparents, nieces and nephews, or aunts and uncles, the poor farm extended family included poor people from the community.\(^\text{446}\)

Because the income of the poor farm was important, county supervisors purchased land with good soil, water sources, and timber. The Contra Costa supervisors rejected Carothers’s proposal and sent a committee out to find the best possible location, as did their Sonoma County counterparts. Lewis Murdoch of Santa Rosa sold 150 acres of his fine, grape-growing land to Sonoma County and finally guaranteed access to local springs near his property. The supervisors understood the importance of fresh water for livestock and domestic use. Water, wood, and fecund soil were fundamental ingredients for a successful farm. In Sacramento, the county farm sat on 65 acres of the “most fertile character.” Examiners of the state board of health criticized Sacramento’s supervisors for its location because it was too far out of town and made transporting patients difficult. The examiners decreed that the quality of the land and bucolic setting provided “all that was desirable for an almshouse; but for the purposes of a City and County Hospital the whole institution is a wilful [sic] blunder.” The committee members who chose the site focused so much on the quality of the land that they ignored practical issues.\(^\text{447}\)

\(^{446}\) “Report of Sonoma County Farmer,” 1885, 1886, Bin 19, Row 10, Box 69, Sonoma County Poor Farm Records, Sonoma County Archives, Santa Rosa, Calif.; Sonoma Democrat, 13 January 1883 and 13 December 1884; “New Regime Proposed,” Los Angeles Times, 30 July 1901; “Santa Barbara County,” Los Angeles Times, 8 April 1897; “County’s Poor Offer Problem: Orange May Establish Farm and Hospital,” Los Angeles Times, 17 May 1909.

\(^{447}\) Contra Costa Gazette, 10 January 1880, 8 May 1880; Sonoma County Board of Supervisors’ Minutes, 6 and 9 January 1874, vol. 6, 304, 307 [hereafter Sonoma Minutes]; Kelly, “First Annual Report of the San Diego County Hospital and Poor Farm to the Board of Supervisors, for the Year Ending June 30, 1889”; California State Board of Health, First Biennial Report of the State Board of Health of California, for the years 1870 and 1871 (Sacramento: D. W. Gelwicks, 1871), 41; “A Poor-farm Purchased in Lost Nietos,” Los Angeles Times, 14 January 1887”; Los Angeles Times, 20 January 1887; “County’s Poor Offer Problem: Orange May Establish Farm and Hospital,” Los Angeles Times, 17 May 1909. County supervisors also wanted good farmers/businessmen to run the farms. See Los Angeles Times, 16 December 1896 and 30 July 1901.
In order to create a self-supporting poor farm, the county farmer needed good soil to produce crops for use on the farm and for sale. At first many counties leased the farm to the poor farm superintendent and gave him an allowance for each inmate, but by the 1880s prospective county farmers started bidding on the right to run the institution. In Sonoma County, board members awarded the contract to Jerry Claypool after he promised to house, feed, and maintain the indigents at a rate of 16 5/6 cents per person, per day in 1882. Claypool’s per capita rate represented a significant savings to the county, down from 50 cents per person just four years earlier. This system motivated the superintendents to be as economical as possible, which meant employing the cost-saving functions of the family farm.448

Poor farm superintendents planted commercial crops based on the soil and markets available to them, often following the lead of local farmers. In Santa Rosa, where farmers grew grapes to sell to local wineries, Jerry Claypool and other Sonoma superintendents tended the county vineyards. Claypool planted the same varietals as the poor farm’s neighbors, including L. J. Hawkins, Lewis Murdoch, and Peter Dolan who sold grapes to the same wineries. In 1888, the county had a credit at the winery of Isaac DeTurk for more than 46 tons of grapes. By 1891, the state viticultural commissioners listed the “Sonoma County Poor Farm” in its directory of grape growers and wine makers. The county farmer hired laborers to pick grapes, work that was too hard for the aged and infirm inmates, and negotiated rates of sale with men such as DeTurk, similarly to the heads of the Hawkins, Murdoch, and Dolan households.449

448 Sonoma Minutes, 10 November 1882, vol. 5, 430; Sonoma Democrat, 13 January 1883 and 13 December 1884.
449 Sonoma Minutes, 7 December 1882, vol. 5, 453; 6 December 1883, vol. 6, 135; “Report of Sonoma
On poor farms in other counties, superintendents also chose crops suitable to their locations. On the Los Angeles and Orange County farms, citiculture dominated the local economies. Los Angeles supervisors received a check for more than $10,000 for navel oranges grown on the farm in 1909. The reporter exclaimed, “Talk about paupers!” The county farmer in Orange, California, planted 1,000 Valencia trees on twenty-seven acres in 1914. The Valencia trees provided income to the county to run the operations of the county farm and pay expenses of the large, well-used county hospital. The Santa Clara poor farm in the 1880s represented the productions of the area as well. The valley land was well suited to cereals raised on the county farm, and the superintendent also raised various fruit trees and grape vines just as many of the local residents. County supervisors and farm superintendents chose crops carefully in order to make their poor farms successful, which required them to consider the local environment as well as demand and available markets.450

Inmates could not live off of wine grapes or wheat, so the county farmers raised subsistence crops for the tables in the farm house and the inmate dining rooms. On most of the farms, residents raised some poultry and had dairy cows while harvesting some fruits and vegetables for the tables (see Table 3). Very few superintendents remarked specifically about who did the work on the farms, yet it is clear that the superintendent

---

avoided chores normally done by women and children on family operations. Claypool’s daughters milked the cows in Sonoma, of course. In Los Angeles, inmates took care of cattle and milking, and one older inmate became known as the “chickenman.” Women, children, and the inmates, all of whom were in subordinate positions, took care of the domestic chores on the poor farm, leaving time for the county farmer to deal with aspects that brought him into the political and economic spheres of public life.\footnote{\textit{Labor Register}, 1899-1911, vol. 1, box 48, Papers of the Rancho Los Amigos Hospital, California Social Welfare Archives, University of Southern California; “Report of Sonoma County Farmer,” 1885, 1886, Bin 19, Row 10, Box 69, Sonoma County Archives.}

The family farm model for social welfare worked well in terms of practical issues such as funding, but it also kept the poor within an atmosphere of work. Since nineteenth-century Americans worried that charity bred idleness or drew the “unworthy” poor to government coffers, tax-payers and public officials appreciated the deterrent effect of the poor farm. Individuals in need of aid had to leave their homes to receive assistance, and once they arrived on the farm, superintendents expected them to work to their ability or leave. Each inmate stayed connected to the means of his own survival even if unable to participate in the farm’s maintenance. A semi-abled inmate might not do hard labor, but he certainly could at least make his own bed. Moreover, the disabled residents watched the staff, inmates, and hired hands as they completed chores on the farm. County farmers made work available for the inmates of all ages and sexes, and the supervisors dictated that inmates take heed of the farm rules about work. The poor in these institutions may have failed to find enough work to sustain them, but the
administrators guaranteed that no pauper forgot the amount of labor required for survival in the late nineteenth century.\(^452\)

Poor farm superintendents had the responsibility of providing the work for inmates and organizing their efforts. In Los Angeles County, Dr. E. L. Burdick ran both the farm and the hospital and kept extensive records on both operations. In his labor logbooks, Burdick noted the names, payments, and duties of each person working on the farm. Similar to the Sonoma farm, Burdick hired hands for the most arduous tasks, such as the harvest of oranges and lemons in the orchard. Unlike most of his contemporaries, however, he paid inmates a small wage, usually $2.50 per month to do regular chores. In 1900, Burdick employed Andrew Simonson and Charles Parsons to milk cows twice per day and Neal Nicholson as the “chickenman.” All of these men had various maladies and no longer had the strength to run their own farms. Simonson, for example, had arthritis and a hernia. He had survived typhoid fever, being a soldier in a war between his native Denmark and Austria, and decades of farm work in the U.S. He ended up on the poor farm as a 65-year old widower, capable of doing no more than his assigned chore. Burdick paid Simonson and others like him to give them a feeling of independence and guarantee that the men took their responsibilities seriously.\(^453\)

Legislators, supervisors and visitors reported on the work of inmates and expected this participation in their own sustenance. The Alameda County supervisors stated in their 1896 annual report that the inmates of the farm in Oakland had been brought under

\(^{452}\) “The County’s Poor,” Los Angeles Times, 6 December 1894; “Unemployed to Be Lost Tribe,” Los Angeles Times, 4 September 1915; Sonoma Minutes, 11 June 1881, vol. 5, 314 and 8 June 1883, vol. 6, 45-46.

\(^{453}\) Labor Register, 1899-1911, vol. 1, box 48, Papers of the Rancho Los Amigos Hospital, California Social Welfare Archives, University of Southern California.
“firm but not rigorous discipline.” When inmates disregarded social expectations about their contribution to the farm’s income, county supervisors enacted rules to force inmates to work. In 1881, Sonoma supervisors issued a set of rules for inmate behavior, of which four out of six dealt with some aspect of work. During most years, Timothy Keegan and other elderly men watered and fed the cows while women served food or cleaned the dining rooms. The supervisors then made it clear that each individual must “keep his or her person clean and their wards in proper order” and follow the instructions given by the county farmer. A few inmates who abused the system forced officials to post the stipulations in the wards to remind everyone that the county did not give anyone a free ride.454

State employees had broached the topic of work well-before the 1872 poor farm laws. Doctors prescribed work for the mentally ill and added working farms and gardens to the state insane asylums. As the representatives of the State Lunacy Commission examined the five state insane asylums and related institutions in 1904, they carefully reported on the state of the agricultural operations. The medical superintendent at the Agnews State Hospital, situated outside of San Jose, explained how the agrarian setting helped the patients recover for the report’s readers. He said, “But after all, neither amusement nor any other so-called moral treatment compares in beneficial effect with employment. Absolute idleness is disastrous to either the sane or the insane. If possible, every patient, physically able, should be induced to do something.” Even the most unwell patients could be given simple tasks at first and more complicated tasks as he or she became able. The superintendent added, “Many a patient beginning in this way has

454 Sonoma Minutes 11 June 1881, vol. 5, 314, 8 June 1883, vol. 6, 45-46; McCann, History of Rural Alameda County, 634; History of San Luis Obispo County (Oakland: Thompson & West, 1883), 180.
been led to higher and more orderly mental action, and to usefulness and more comfortable living, and often even to an ability to go out and care for himself.” Thus, work is good for the mind and body. And, of course, the state saved $800 per year on the eggs from the poultry yard kept by the inmates.455

This praise of work and its relation to mental health was more than rhetoric for the sake of the legislators. In 1850s California, doctors and superintendents incorporated the role of work and failure into diagnoses and recovery. Dr. Robert K. Reid, the state physician at the Stockton State Hospital, recorded the occupations and circumstances of men admitted during the gold rush. He sent almost every male he discharged to seek employment or to specific ranches and farms to work as hired hands. According to authors Warren F. Webb and Stuart A. Brody, Reid and his contemporaries prior to the Civil War “followed the precepts of ‘moral treatment’” and discharged most patients within six months of their stay. Their goal was to reintegrate individuals back into the general population as quickly as possible. Popular commentators and medical men blamed the gold rush for much of the early mental illness in California. They argued that both anxiety over wealth and disappointment over failure caused emotional distress beyond what these men could sustain. Moreover, the gold rush created a society with a skewed sex ratio, especially in the mining camps. American men seemed unsuited to live in this unnatural state of society, and a paucity of women underlay the leading cause of mental illness—masturbation. Gold fever and isolation from family members led to erratic behavior and alcoholism, as well. No wonder state boosters encouraged a strong

455 Fourth Biennial Report of the State Commission in Lunacy for the Two Years ending June 30, 1904 (Sacramento: W. W. Shannon, 1904), 70-71, 75.
work ethic among settlers to counter the male-centered, aggressive, and speculative influences of mineral California.\textsuperscript{456}

Doctors prescribed physical labor for the disappointed, lonely, and frustrated in California asylums. At Stockton, officials transformed a piece of the San Joaquin Valley into an American landscape with tree-lined walks and farms on the premises of the state’s first insane asylum. In 1859, a visitor reporting for \textit{Hutchings’ California Magazine} described the grounds for his readers. The imposing building sat on 100 acres surrounded by “beautiful flowers and luxuriant foliage” managed by the patients. The natural setting helped to “relieve it of that repulsiveness” seen in so many insane asylums. Staff and patients worked 20 of the 100 acres into a “state of high cultivation” producing fruit and vegetables, and they all looked forward to the next season when the 1,500 fruit trees promised to bear fruit. By 1886, the efforts of the patients were also directed into the new dairy barn and the laundry room, and by 1892, the broom factory also employed patients. Farm work, the laundry, and the factory reduced the costs of provisioning the indigent patients, but most of all these venues of work instilled values of industry and patience. The superintendent at Stockton reported the state legislature that insanity came to those who tried to get the “most out of life at the expense of overtaxed energies.” Their lives were dominated by ambition that carried them “beyond the limit of prudence and judgment; an ambition that is not satisfied with a competency, but has ever

in contemplation a greater accumulation of wealth; an ambition that aims at social
distinction and is not content with an obscure place in the great procession of life.\textsuperscript{457}

This drive for wealth seemed to infect too great a number of men in the state. Dr.
Reid’s diagnosis of Ewan MacKinnon in 1852 simply stated the general problem with the
socio-economic condition of California: “at home a farmer, here a miner, ‘suicidal.’”
Reid sent MacKinnon off to a rancho, and recorded the same fate for his other patients.
Medical attitudes about the value of work and the detrimental nature of speculation
survived the Civil War era and the gold rush. Dr. W. H. Mays commented on the state of
James Van Ness’s mind and found no other possible cause of his unbalanced state other
than “disappointment of his financial losses.” The mining era had ended, but the failure
in land mirrored the failure in the mines since the atmosphere of speculation and
accumulation seemingly contaminated all aspects of the economy. Van Ness had
mismanaged the family farm after his father died and lost his senses along with the land.
The details of his condition are not known, but by the time he was committed to the
asylum, the doctors described him as “dull and demented” and refusing to speak. Both
California doctors worried about how failure effected the mental status of their
patients.\textsuperscript{458}

The state asylum doctors encouraged the farmer Van Ness to work in the gardens

\textsuperscript{457} Reprint of “State Asylum for the Insane,” Hutchings’ California Magazine 4 (September 1859) in
California Territorial Quarterly 56 (Winter 2003): 33-35; Biennial Reports of the Directors and Medical
Visitors and Fifteenth Annual Report of the Superintendent of the Insane Asylum of California
(Sacramento: D. W. Gelwicks, 1867); Biennial Report of the Directors and the Thirty-third and Thirty-
fourth Annual Reports of the Superintendent of the Insane Asylum of the State of California (Sacramento:
James J. Ayers, 1886); Biennial Report of the Directors and the Thirty-Ninth and Fortieth Annual Reports
\textsuperscript{458} Dr. Walter R. Langdon to Mary Ann Van Ness, 26 March 1886 and Dr. W. H. Mays to Mary Ann Van
Ness, 26 April 1886, folder “Mary Ann (Elliot) Van Ness correspondence,” Van Ness Family Papers, ca.
1850-1890, BANC MSS C-B 462, Bancroft Library.
to reap the psychological advantages of physical labor. Within a year of working in the gardens, he improved. Optimistically, the doctor reported that “He eats well and likes to work. We consider him one of our best patients.” Without understanding the complicated nature of mental illness, Van Ness’s problems seemed to stem from an imbalance in his work ethic not the chemicals of his brain. Nineteenth-century doctors searched for outward causes for internal instability and its treatment; Van Ness’s doctors claimed the “chief aids in the restoration to mental health [were] occupation and diversion.” Because of cases such as Van Ness’s, officials continued to operate farms on asylum grounds into the twentieth century.459

Indigents had the opportunity to find some solace in the natural backdrop of the cultivated grounds surrounding poor farms and asylums, but in most cases life in these institutions were at best dreary if not outright depressing. Most county farms housed a number of aged men and a few elderly women in the 1880s and 1890s, many of whom expected to die there and then be buried in the nearby potter’s field. Old miners, former prostitutes, and widowed farmers relied on the county to help them in their final, lonely years. County physicians lost beds to individuals with no other disease than “Old Age” but had no place to send them. As early as 1883, the state legislators recognized the problem. As a result, legislators passed a law to provide funds to poor farms to support indigents over the age of 60 years. These men and women were lonely and embittered by their experiences in California and their demeanor infected the atmosphere of the wards.

They were the most desperate failures of the gold rush period; residence at the poor farm had become the strongest evidence for that fact.\textsuperscript{460}

The day-to-day experiences of inmates depended on the type of institution in which they lived. Throughout the state, three models of poor farms evolved after the passing of the 1872 poor law. The size, location, and configuration of these institutions significantly influenced the quality of these inmates’ lives. First, in Los Angeles and Sonoma counties, supervisors separated the indigent sick from the “paupers” by building separate buildings for each. Second, Fresno supervisors, in contrast, allowed the paupers to live in the county hospital under the supervision of the doctors and nurses while the county farmer focused his time on managing the farm. Third, in several northern and eastern counties, indigents lived in rudimentary cabins with few conveniences but passed their lives in a manner similar to that of the gold rush years.

Inmates’ lives revolved around the daily patterns set by the superintendants, which meant meal times punctuated the daily schedules for all of the residents. Everyone rose before breakfast to dress and tidy their sleeping areas. Healthier inmates might disappear temporarily to complete their chores, whether they were in the milk barn or kitchen. The morning meal brought every inmate, except for a few invalids, to a common room, and then the least able wandered off to the veranda or reading rooms while the rest cleaned. At lunch and dinner, working and convalescing inmates assembled once again to talk or grumble before preparing for bed. And thus the day went.

\textsuperscript{460} Calif. Stat., chap. 57. Author Vaughn Davis Bornet mentioned this law as being referred to as a “pioneer pension” to compensate the men who helped to build the state during the gold rush. Vaughn Davis Bornet, \textit{California Social Welfare} (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956), 29.
Everyday the superintendent’s wife or cook on staff prepared three unremarkable meals, but these moments of repast became remarkable for the simple fact that they provided inmates with something to do. A visitor to the Fresno farm noted that the ringing of the dinner bell created quite a stir. He wrote in 1891, “At the ringing of the bell the amount of activity exhibited by the various wards of invalids and antediluvians is wonderful. That sound causes them to forget their infirmities.” Reporters, grand jury members, and county supervisors visited poor farms regularly and often commented on the quality of the food. When a few Santa Rosa residents visited the Sonoma farm, they brought a complaint against the superintendent for mismanaging the inmates. At the inquest, several inmates admitted that they ate mutton two times per day but only complained that they wanted more meat in their meals, mutton or otherwise. In their testimonies, it became clear that the content of the meals mattered less than the fact that they occurred.\footnote{“The Hospital. Fresno’s Institution for the Poor. A Home for the Homeless and the Indigent,” \textit{Fresno Daily Evening Expositor}, 9 June 1891; \textit{Fresno Daily Evening Expositor}, 3 April 1889, 30 June 1890; \textit{Sonoma Democrat}, 10 and 17 November 1883; Sonoma Minutes, 6 November 1883, vol. 6, 113, 114; 7 November, 114-16; 8 November, 119-21; 6 December, 133-35; Jeremy Dwight Nichols, “The 1883 Menu at the Sonoma County Poor Farm,” manuscript in possession of author.}

Days passed into months, and many of the inmates spent the days with little to do if they were physically weakened from injuries or illnesses. Many of the aged men had suffered paralyzing strokes, were missing limbs, or felt the aches and pains of decades of hard work and hard living. The reporter visiting the Fresno farm in 1891 described the aged men as “old cripples, cranks and fossils” who hobbled out for their meals on wooden legs or used crutches to get themselves to the dining room. Younger disabled men joined the slow procession of fossils also. At Los Angeles, P. D. Kearns came to the
farm in 1889 at the age of forty-four. He came to California from Pennsylvania to mine, and he had survived pneumonia, arthritis, syphilis, and gonorrhea until a stroke finally sapped his strength. Doctor Burdick admitted Kearns and men like him who had lived the life of the “hard drinker and hard worker.”462

County physicians saw many hard drinkers and hard workers past their primes, and these disabled men became a part of the permanent population of poor farm residents. By 1880, at least thirteen poor farms existed in California, and most of the long term inmates were single and widowed, white men. Single farm laborers (the majority), miners, sailors, and carpenters appear consistently on the rolls of the poor farms. Without families, these men found it difficult to live independently. Debilitated old bachelors, such as Kearns in Los Angeles, relied on the state as did men whose families had died. After John Murnan’s wife died, he lived under the roof of one of his grown children. An epidemic of tuberculosis decimated the rest of the Murnan clan, leaving the father physically or emotionally incapable of facing the daily tasks of survival. These men had nowhere to go and became a part of a permanent class of poor farm residents who had little hope of leaving the institution alive.

Kearns, Murnan, and their fellow inmates became fixtures in the wards and dining halls, watching as the staff admitted and discharged other inmates. Short-term inmates mingled with the aged and crippled long-term residents but lived differently on the farms.

462 Personal History ledger, vol. 1, box 46, Papers of the Rancho Los Amigos Hospital, California Social Welfare Archives, University of Southern California. Report of the County Physician in the Sonoma Democrat, 6 November 1875; “County Hospital Report,” January 1885, September 1899, November 1900, uncataloged collection, Fresno County Free Library. A local historian rescued a number of documents regarding the orphanage and the poor farm from a dumpster in Fresno. These documents are currently uncataloged in a fruit box located in the California History and Genealogical Room, Fresno County Free Library, Fresno, Calif.
Martin Peter of Sonoma County came to the farm after being out of work for several months. In late summer and early fall, harvest had ended and work for the rainy season (plowing and planting) had not started yet. Without a family or piece of land, Peter sought refuge at the county farm and labored alongside the almost crippled milker, Timothy Keegan. Yet Peter, unlike Keegan, knew he would leave as soon as local farmers needed laborers once again. In 1885, he married the widow of local vinyardist, gaining access to the benefits of land and a family. With his own strength and the assistance of his new family, Peter then survived the depression of the 1890s. Phylloxera destroyed many of the grapevines of the Glen Ellen region where he made wine, but he returned to Santa Rosa, this time to redirect his efforts toward building a nursery to serve local farmers.463

Young women and children also became a part of the temporary population. Widows and deserted women retreated to the poor farm for short periods before reuniting with distant family members or remarrying. The stories of the young women who used the farms for assistance have been mostly lost, except for a scant amount of data left in the census. In 1880, Bridget McCarty came to the Humboldt County poor farm with two sons and no husband. He may have left her to find work or died, but for whatever reason she was unable to care for her boys alone. Sarah Shaw also needed help with her six children in Solano County. Her husband died, leaving her overburdened and certainly depressed. Both the McCarty and Shaw families were at the early stages of establishing their lives and had left their kin networks behind. Without family, these women relied on county charity in their hour of desperation, yet they did not need to expect a long

463 Peninou, History of the Sonoma Viticultural District, 106; Population Census, Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California, 1880.
widowhood. Women in these counties had a good chance of finding husbands since half to two-thirds of Humboldt and Solano counties were still male. Young mothers cycled in and out of the poor farms, leaving the aged indigents behind.\footnote{Population Census, Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California, 1880.}

The old timers of the poor farms watched as inmates came and went on a weekly and monthly basis. Their friends died, new inmates arrived, younger men and women moved on, and sometimes infants added new sounds to the wards (See Table 2). Unable to pay a doctor or find a private charity for women, Annie Reveal entered the Los Angeles County wards in Downey to give birth to her third child. Pregnant and two young ones in tow, she used the poor farm as a lying-in hospital and left soon after. Similarly, Louisa Lorch took a bed at the Santa Rosa facility but died soon after giving birth to her son. A poor, abandoned woman herself, Louisa left behind an orphaned child. Willie Lorch had strength and youth, and thus the opportunity to get off the farm unlike the elderly inmates. A local farmer wanted to adopt the boy in 1886. At six years old, he could be trained to work on the farm and give the adoptive parent years of service as a farm hand without wages.\footnote{Inmate Register, 1889-1897, vol. 4, box 47, Papers of the Rancho Los Amigos Hospital, California Social Welfare Archives, University of Southern California; Sonoma Minutes, 12 June 1886, vol. 6, 592-94.}

The nature of rural social welfare in nineteenth-century California created a depressing atmosphere on the poor farms. As the aged residents faced their personal failures, they accepted charity and the stigma assigned to it. A reporter visiting the Los Angeles farm could not convince the old men to pose for the camera because he found that “[w]ithout exception they are proud.” The reporter approached them as they lined up for dinner, but “at the approach of a camera fiend, consternation reigns, and they flock for
shelter like scurrying partridges.” These men’s tales saddened the writer, and he told his readers that while talking “their eyes often fill with tears” as they told stories of times before they became too “wrinkled and faded.”

On some farms these feelings turned outward, and male inmates fought each other and cursed the world for being cheated out of good lives. At Fresno in the 1890s, the supervisors isolated the aged men in “Ward D” of the county hospital because the patients seemed to suffer from too much contact with the aged inmates. The reporter stated frankly, “It is a well known fact that the contemplation of men of advanced years vexed with a consciousness of poverty and disappointments, is not a good thing to help younger patients to convalescence from acute illness.” He also noted that everyone called the ward “Battle Row” because the men fought over any topic of the day, from politics and religion to the daily card game. But the truth was, as the reporter noted, “The inmates of ‘Battle Row’ are perfectly aware they are human failures, herded together to die. Some men spent their days praying and sitting in the gardens, but always ended up back in Ward D where “a number of the occupants spend their hours in growling at humanity, swearing, playing cards and generally trying to kill time till one day Time steps in and kills them.” In other counties, men lashed out at their fellows or isolated to hide from facing their miserable lives. Watching young men and women leave the farm must have just added to the pain these human failures already felt.

The stories of daily life on the poor farms of California are hard to find, and it is just as difficult to determine how many individuals actually used the poor farm in any given year. Census enumerators occasionally visited poor farms, but their figures only

466 “Poor Farm Amid Orange Blossoms,” Los Angeles Times, 16 November 1902.
467 Fresno Morning Republican, 10 July 1898; Fresno Daily Evening Expositor, 9 June 1891.
provide historians with a glimpse of the institutions’ populations on the day of the visit. In several counties, a few logbooks are extant giving us a sense of why and how inmates arrived at the farms. Several state reports also furnish some clues to the overall trend of poverty in California. After 1872, California’s poor farm system accommodated both aged, crippled miners and the working poor who suffered from economic and personal disasters in increasing numbers. In 1880, 1,594 paupers lived in poor farms and that number grew to 2,600 by 1890. In that year, every county save five had already built poor farms. By June 1904, the number of inmates housed reached 4,163. These figures give concrete evidence to the rising number of poor individuals in the state.

The actual number of indigents in the state, however, was much higher than the reported counts in 1880, 1890, and 1904 indicate. Numerous short-term inmates, such as Martin Peter or Sarah Shaw, moved onto the farms for a period of months or several years, and thousands of other temporary inmates used the services of the county in between the decennial census years. Even some of the older inmates refused to stay put. Barbara Mall and her husband, in their sixties, checked in and out of the Los Angeles poor farm half a dozen times in the years 1889-1892. In the late nineteenth century, California experienced an economic boom and a concomitant increase in migrant laborers, which resulted in a new breed of transient poor. Supervisors and tax-payers cursed the tramps and hobos as able-bodied malingerers and thus members of the “unworthy” poor, but even the worthy poor spent much of their time looking for work and accessed county charity when under the most dire circumstances. Because of this, the examiners for the State Board of Charities and Corrections went through the books of the poor farm administrators to find the actual number of indigents admitted in the year
1903-1904. At first glance, they found just over 4,000 individuals yet found many more after further investigation. The number for the entire year turned to be approximately 18,000 inmates, more than four times the initial count. Historians have no way of reconstructing the numbers of paupers in the poor farms to compare to the census numbers of 1880 and 1890, but it is safe to say the numbers are higher than the figures reported to the Department of Interior by enumerators.\footnote{468}

In addition to the numbers of men, women, and children housed in the county poor farms, women and children also found assistance in a variety of other venues not available to men. Deserted wives and widows met the criteria of “worthy” in terms of nineteenth-century poverty, and they had access to a number of private charities. In San Francisco, women in need might go the Ladies’ Depository, the San Francisco Female Hospital, or the Ladies’ Protection and Relief Society. There were numerous examples of these types of benevolent associations throughout the state. Poor families also sent their children to local orphanages, and the state made provisions for half-orphans. Middle-class women raised funds for the hospitals and orphanages, and people sent petitions to county boards asking for mercy on poor neighbors. Moreover, county supervisors provided “outdoor relief” to families with the father and mother in the home, giving them cash payments, groceries, or firewood.\footnote{469} Across the board, Californians worried about the fate of women and children and made provisions for them outside of the poor farm system. Most importantly, families represented the foundation for

\footnote{468} “Record of Indigents over 60,” January to June 1890, Papers of the Rancho Los Amigos Hospital, California Social Welfare Archives, University of Southern California.

\footnote{469} “County Physicians Report of Disbursements of Appropriation of $300 for Relief of Indigents,” 1878, Bin 19, Row 10, Box 69, Sonoma County Poor Farm Records; Fresno County Board of Supervisors’ Minutes, 5 September 1895, book N, 507-08.
California’s transition into a culturally and economically stable place, and the state’s social welfare protected families who might not have received relief in the eastern states.470

Nationally, taxpayers complained about “outdoor relief,” and by the late century, officials abolished the practice in numerous American cities. People whined about the demoralization of the poor and the nation’s collective work ethic. It was for that reason that so many communities abolished direct cash payments to impoverished citizens. Historian Michael Katz argues that outdoor relief cost less than maintaining institutions, but the image of the idle poor goaded Americans into forcing the needy into almshouses to reduce the purported desire for charity. Immigrants brought their ideas about poverty and forms of assistance to California but had to renegotiate their views based on the gold rush and its aftermath. Immigrants from the East, Midwest, and Upper South parroted home-state attitudes but generally responded permissively to the needs of families and children.

Two specific cases, Sonoma and Fresno counties, demonstrate how Californians protected families and children using both outdoor relief and private charity. In Sonoma County, taxpayers supported a well-funded county hospital with a separate poor farm. In

the year 1887, the two institutions housed 60-80 indigents combined along with a six-person staff. The farm superintendent for that year reported spending $4,099.89 on food, clothing, and farm needs while bringing in only $779.38 for income. The poor farm alone cost the taxpayers $3,320.51 that year, yet they were still willing to pay cash payments to numerous families within the county. In that same year, the supervisors authorized cash payments to more than 50 households. The supervisors paid these families from $5 to $15 per month, spending as much as $412 in some months. While some of these payments went to help support orphaned children and a few aged men, most of the payments went to single- and two-parent families. The Curry family in Bloomfield received $10 per month through much of the year in 1887. Patrick, his wife, Ellen, and their two children lived among farmers but the husband remained unemployed. Nothing more is known about this family except that their neighbors and county officials were willing to give the Currys cash payments to stay in their home. No one expected them to go the poor farm.471

Fresno County residents also paid to build a nice county hospital with a farm and funded outdoor relief, but several women of in the city of Fresno also built an orphanage to protect local families. Prior to 1895, most Fresno orphans found homes with local women willing to foster them. Mary Donleavy and Laura Cannon received cash payments throughout much of the 1890s and provided homes for one to ten children. In 1894, however, the supervisors reconsidered the fostering system and announced their decision to send orphans to the state asylum in Vallejo (Solano County). The wives of

471 C. W. Hawkins, “County Farm Report,” 1887, Bin 19, Row 10, Box 69, Sonoma County Poor Farm Records, Sonoma County Archives, Santa Rosa, Calif.; Sonoma Minutes, 1887.
local farmers and businessmen took action, forming the “Orphans Home Association,” which promised to build an orphanage and accept $6 per month, per child, a $9 savings to the county. In 1895, the members of the association along with the supervisors purchased a farm to establish a county orphanage.472

This event sheds light into the state of orphanages in late-nineteenth-century California. The benevolent women in town had not protested the supervisors’ decision because they disapproved of the conditions at the state orphan asylum. They were willing to raise money and commit their time to the effort in order to keep the children within the community. Apparently, many of the “orphans” in Fresno still had one or two parents living nearby. John and Bell Hall of Fresno sent their two girls, aged 7 and 5, to the new orphanage in 1896. Fresno farmers suffered from the depression of the 1890s, losing their incomes because of a precipitous fall in raisin prices during the 1890s. We do not know why John Hall could not support his entire family, but the couple must have been in dire economic straits to make the decision. The Halls were not alone. In that year, twenty-eight children lived with the matron, Agnes McDonald, and only one child fit the category of a true orphan. Fifteen of the children had one parent living in town, and twelve had their both mothers and fathers still living. By 1900, only six of these twenty-eight children remained in the home. In order to leave these homes, the “orphans” had to be reintegrated into their birth families or adopted by local families.

472 Agreement between the Fresno County Board of Supervisors and the Fresno Orphans Home Association, 17 January 1895, uncataloged collection, Fresno County Free Library; Fresno County Board of Supervisors’ Minutes, 12 November 1892, 11 April, 2, 7 August 1893, book L, 1, 396, 603, 616; 5 September, 5, 18 October 1893, 9 May 1894, book M, 9, 78, 178, 463; and 10 October 1895, book N, 567; “Mrs. Mary M. Donleavy” in Vandor, History of Fresno County, 1128-29. The only report of Cannon is found in the local paper. She attempted suicide in 1896 when officials took her last charge from her. As in the case of Donleavy, the opening of the orphanage ended her work with children except for one she raised as her own. Fresno Republican, 21 February 1896.
Clearly, the Fresno community, including the organizers of the home, county supervisors, and taxpayers, wanted to protect families as much as they did children. It was for that reason the county’s citizens funded a local orphanage to keep the children close to family and friends.  

The Fresno orphanage was more than a warehouse, and its administration incorporated locals’ expectations. The county purchased the land from a local judge on behalf of the association. Judge G. A. Nourse had laid out gardens and orchards to beautify the property and bring him extra income. The association members and supervisors wanted this property for several reasons. Children benefited from the practical and symbolic purpose of the orchards. They ate the fruit and they lived in a natural, albeit managed, landscape. Within this environment, the children, like poor farm residents, stayed connected to the world of work. Twenty-five to thirty-five children regularly called matron Agnes McDonald “mamma,” and she provided maternal supervision. Fresno citizens expected the children to receive training to be industrious, moral members of the community, and they expected the children to learn the precepts of work and responsibility from Mamma McDonald in a home-like, farming atmosphere.  

Sonoma and Fresno residents wanted to keep families intact whenever possible even at the expense of their own feelings about the nature and causes of poverty. On the one hand, they wanted to deter the poor from seeking aid and enjoying their idleness. On  

---

473 “Report of Fresno County Orphanage,” January and February 1896, uncataloged collection, Fresno County Free Library; Population Census, Fresno, Fresno County, California, 1900. For evidence of half orphans being fostered, see Fresno County Board of Supervisors’ Minutes, 20 August and 5 September 1895, book N, 489, 507. Laura Cannon arranged with the mother in August 1895 to have an infant transferred from the county hospital to Cannon’s care.  
474 J. M. Guinn, Historical and Biographical Record of Southern California (Chicago: Chapman Publishing Co., 1902), 690. Lucy Hatch, one of the first female residents in the Central California Colony in Fresno, helped with the Fresno orphanage in the early years along with wives of local men (Guinn 690).
the other hand, they wanted to keep certain people in their homes, protecting women and children from the dangers of wage labor, prostitution, and vagrancy. California had had its share of the rowdy unemployed, prostitutes, and tramps. To the morally-minded reformers of Gilded Age California, it seemed easier to prevent good people from turning to vice and crime than to deal with the effects. For this reason, they started organizations and charity groups, hence the Fresno women established the orphanage. Moreover, neighbors of needy Californians wanted to keep their friends and family within in the community.

Citizens petitioned the supervisors to authorize “outdoor relief,” indicating that the recipient was worthy and the community wanted their tax dollars to support these people. The citizens of Toll House in Fresno County wrote to the board in 1890, describing the plight of Amanda Bradford and her five children. Her husband had died in an insane asylum, leaving them without an income. Over the last year, she had “done all she could to support them by cutting cord-wood with her own hands. They are now suffering for want of food and clothing.” Mrs. Bradford represented the epitome of worthiness, and the board granted her a monthly allowance. Newspaper editors in almost every county printed lists of individuals who received “outside allowances,” including Mrs. Bradford, the Curry family, and the foster mothers of Fresno. This shamed the receivers to a point for receiving charity, but it also meant that citizens knew exactly how much money they spent on their poor neighbors and who they were. Thus many of these lists represented their tacit approval of the county’s “Indigent Fund.”

---

475 Citizens of Toll House to Fresno County Board of Supervisors, 1 October 1890, uncataloged collection, Fresno County Free Library, California History and Genealogy Room; Fresno County Board of Supervisors’ Minutes, 11 April 1893, book L, 396 and 2, 11 January, 7 May 1894, book M, 261, 293, 459;
Rural newspapers editors helped the community keep tabs on their neighbors. Similar to their counterparts in rural Pennsylvania, Iowa, or New York, newspapermen printed stories about local people. The local paper became the conduit for news, local gossip, and useful information for keeping the community together. Reports of men and women going back East indicated to readers to watch their neighbors’ properties or to bring pie to a lonesome husband while his wife visited “back home.” Reporters mentioned specific people, and sometimes their personality quirks, for journalistic color and to provide information. In Santa Rosa, S. T. Coulter lost too many of his sheep to the depredations of wandering canines, and the Santa Rosa Times editor mocked Coulter for his southern accent with the warning “Look out ‘dorgs!” A Petaluma editor reported that Mrs. Mallaly of Bloomfield fell off her wagon so that locals knew why she was not in church or that they should visit her during her convalescence. Residents of these small communities used their newspapers to get news about even the most mundane events of rural life and the proceedings of the county supervisors, both of which were of interest to residents.476

From reading their local newspapers, county residents learned about new roads being built as well, how much was spent on maintaining the poor farm and other expenditures, which allowed them to engage the supervisors about social welfare spending. Toll House residents may have approved of giving an outside allowance to

Sonoma Minutes, 6 November 1883, vol. 6, 113-14 and 5 March, 11 April 1884, vol. 8, 173, 192, and vol. 7, 10 November, 1886, 7 December 1886, 4 January, 8 February, 8 March, 4 April, 4 May, 8 June, 6 July, 1 August, 5 September, 4 October, 8 November, 6 December 1887, 30-32, 49-50, 65-66, 82-84, 96-97, 111-13, 125-27, 144-45, 157-59, 176-79, 210-12, 218-19, 225-26. Sonoma County supervisors attempted to end all outdoor relief after building the poor farm in 1874. Sonoma Minutes, 7 April, 4 November 1874, vol. 6, 330, 381; Sonoma Democrat, 8 November 1879.

476 Santa Rosa Times, 11 October 1877; Petaluma Argus, 11 September 1874.
Amanda Bradford, but California taxpayers complained when they disagreed with supervisors’ decisions or the general administration of public charity. When Santa Clara County officials purchased a second poor farm, San Jose Grangers published a petition in the state agricultural paper begging the supervisors to “refrain from making any substantial or costly improvements, or large outlay of money on said farm until the wishes of the people of the county can be better understood.” These grangers and other Californians watched how the county spent their tax dollars and made sure their supervisors upheld the community will about who got charity and in what form.477

As the century turned, progressive reformers added their voices to the ongoing conversation about the management of the poor farms. During the late nineteenth century, several scandals exposed the deficiencies of the system. Old miners and laborers periodically left the farms without permission and returned drunk and disorderly. In Nevada County, home of some of the most prosperous and continuously running mines, progressive officials found 8 women “under forty and weak-minded” living among 77 men, a situation rife with opportunities for inappropriate behavior. The doctors surveying the farms in 1905 because they worried about the inefficient system and the quality of care that individuals received. Seventeen paupers lived on the farm in Crescent City (Del Norte County) where one manager and a cook administrated the 110-acre property. The visitors reported that the “inmates are mostly old miners, who prefer cabin life…. One woman lives outside in a cabin. She is cranky in disposition and prefers to live so. So do the other inmates.” It seemed intolerable to allow untrained, unsupervised personnel to care for the state’s indigent population, and state reformers intended to transform the

477 Pacific Rural Press, 9 February 1884.
decentralized social welfare into a respectable, controlled set of institutions, starting with this survey.\footnote{First Biennial Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections of the State of California (Sacramento: W. W. Shannon, 1905), 80-81, 87.}

Despite the state’s attempts to manage its social welfare, not all county administrators were willing to give up control quite yet. As of 1903, poor farms fell under the responsibility of the State Board of Charities and Corrections. The doctors visiting the poor farms in 1905 reported back directly to the state office. Reformers there hoped to create a hierarchy of state and county offices thereby bringing some oversight to poor relief. By 1915, officials in five counties relented to the new state board’s wishes and established Charities and Corrections offices in San Joaquin, Santa Clara, Alameda, San Francisco, and Los Angeles counties. Stuart A. Queen, representing the state board, begged Fresno County supervisors to do the same. Fresno officials chose to disregard the state’s request because locals worried about losing control over the terms of both tax-funded and private charity. Public welfare may have been disorderly, but those who funded it enjoyed the freedom of community control.\footnote{Orange County had just started its poor farm and county hospital a few years earlier. At this late date, they insisted on this type of poor relief to reduce costs. The poor farm was located where the present day University of California, Irvine Medical Center is situated in Orange, California. Stuart A. Queen to Fresno County Board of Supervisors, 27 April 1915, uncataloged collection, Fresno County Free Library; First Biennial Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections, 45-47. Author Thomas A. Krainz found a similar situation in Colorado where progressive reformers attempted to systematize social welfare by instituting a State Board of Charities and Corrections while local officials struggled to maintain control of implementation of assistance. Thomas A. Krainz, Delivering Aid: Implementing Progressive Era Welfare in the American West (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 2005), 12-14.}

The stories of Sonoma, Los Angeles, and Fresno poor farms indicate that social welfare was as “varied and permissive” in California as it was elsewhere in the country.\footnote{Katz, In the Shadow of the Poorhouse, 16.} In the West, public officials contended with the existence of former gold
miners and prostitutes as well as a diversity of residents unknown in many parts of the country. California’s poor farms housed French, Chileans, Canadians, Chinese, Irish, Hawaiians, and Americans from nearly every state in the Union, but Anglo Americans who migrated to the Far West used and adapted the poor farm system because it so easily integrated anyone desperate enough to ask for public charity. Its mere existence assuaged Californians’ concerns about the collective work ethic and a community’s duty to support its poor. Historians have not investigated the lives of the state’s least fortunate, and have acknowledged them only indirectly by examining the motives of Gilded Age and Progressive Era reformers, especially middle-class women involved in various charities. The poor farm may just be the final piece to understanding California communities and the state’s residents’ rural values. As exceptional as California may have been, the poor farm inmates attested to the myth of perfectibility in California. They had not found the Promised Land for which they had come searching.
EPILOGUE

By the early twentieth century, the poor farm became a contentious subject in the committee rooms of various government bodies and progressive organizations, but it was fundamentally a local institution created to serve the needs of both the paupers and the taxpayers that supported them. Residents argued about funding, administration, and management because the poor farms existed as part of their communities. Moreover, despite the impersonal nature of the capitalist market system driving the nation’s agricultural transformation in the late nineteenth century, Americans—even Californians—held onto the more intimate relationships within their families and communities.

In Santa Rosa, California, a scandal over the Sonoma County poor farm involved farmers, their neighbors, the poor farm superintendent, and county supervisors, exemplifying the interconnectedness of the lives of nineteenth-century Californians. On a November day in 1883, L. J. Hawkins accused Jeremiah Claypool of mistreating the inmates at the poor farm. The county supervisors had placed “Jerry” Claypool, his wife, and their children, in the position to watch over the area’s poorest of the poor while Dr. B. S. Young across the road treated the indigent sick as mandated by the state of California. Yet Hawkins asked the Board of Supervisors to investigate Claypool’s management, stating that “it is a sin against humanity, a disgrace and a foul blot and a burning shame on the fame and good name of Sonoma County and an injustice to her taxpayers, the way the poor inmates of the County Farm or Poor House have been treated since Mr. Claypool has had charge of the same.” This incident spurred an investigation in which witnesses testified for and against Claypool, and fortunately the local newspaper
editor printed much of the testimony shedding light on the workings of a small, agricultural town as well as the lives of its paupers.\textsuperscript{481}

Without incidents such as the grand jury investigation of Claypool’s conduct, there would be little extant documentation of California’s destitute other than a couple of newspaper articles and a few entries in the census. The lives of the residents of the farm, including Grandma Isaacs, Timothy Keegan, and Martin Peter, warranted no attention. They were failures in a land of opportunity. It is from this testimony that we know Keegan took care of the cows and that Claypool’s daughter made butter for inmates. At the local history annex in Santa Rosa, there are boxes filled with reports issued by the poor farm administrators, but few of them indicate as much about the internal workings of the poor farm as does the testimony at the grand jury.

This investigation also exposes a rift among a number of families in Santa Rosa. When I first came across this incident, I assumed that politics fueled the accusations. As the county seat, Santa Rosa brought together Yankees and southerners in the administrative halls of the county. Supervisors represented the Republicans of Petaluma and Democrats of Santa Rosa, as well as the mixed populations in other sections such as Bloomfield and Valley Ford. Yet after investigating the political affiliations of the pro- and anti-Claypool groups, no simple answer presented itself. L. J. Hawkins had called himself a “concerned neighbor,” and Mrs. Ruth Barnes claimed she was moved to visit the poor farm after hearing complaints about paltry meals served to the poor. There were no clues to why these particular individuals had come to testify against the poor farm superintendent, except for their names.

\textsuperscript{481} \textit{Sonoma Democrat}, 11 and 17 November 1883.
In the end, this two-page newspaper article led to hours and hours of research and eventually a greater understanding of community life in the nineteenth-century California. Ruth Barnes most likely heard the purported complaints in her own kitchen or parlor. L. J. Hawkins married one of Barnes’s daughters and convinced several family members to testify. Jerry Claypool also gathered the support of kin at the grand jury including his brother-in-law. More importantly, Barnes, Hawkins, and Claypool were related through bonds of marriage. Their families had traversed the nation, starting frontier farms together in Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, and California. On the trail to California, several men of the clan fell out over a subject long forgotten and the argument that began during their trip turned into a family feud. After living in California for thirty years, resentments filtered into land dealings and county affairs. Members of this Kentucky-based network of families were involved in much of the business of Santa Rosa, including the poor farm, the Grange, and the county board of supervisors. Moreover, they were farmers and farmwives who lived most of their lives scratching the soil and socializing within a small group of individuals.

This story is instructive because it complicates the picture of California history, especially its agricultural history. For whatever reason, historians have created a basic narrative about California’s past and directly connected the Mexican land system to the rise of large-scale operations, excluding numerous individuals in the process. In her article on the Central Valley, author Sally Miller summarized this simplified version of the state’s land tenure into a concise blurb:

Rather than the domination of homesteads occupied by small families, so characteristic elsewhere in the United States, the distinctive history of California agriculture involves far-flung large ranches that require seasonally hired hands employed at labor-intensive tasks. The old Spanish-Mexican land grants evolved into agribusinesses, rather than family farms; what developed was appropriately termed ‘factories in the fields’ in a classic study by that title published in 1939 by Carey McWilliams.483

The rancho has become the germ of California’s economic problems past and present. Yet by examining the thousands of choices made by settlers, boosters, and politicians, it is clear that there was no direct connection between the ranchos and agribusiness. Mexicans and foreign-born grantees lost much of their land to developers who gained little by owning unproductive lands. Many of the former ranchos are now towns, such as Pasadena, Anaheim, and Santa Rosa, some of which were formerly colonies designed to attract farm families. But before they became urban spaces, they were rural districts with thriving communities.

Californians had no idea that large-scale enterprises would succeed and eventually dominate the state’s economy. Booster-for-hire Mary Cone relayed this sentiment in 1876 in her book Two Years in California: “There is beginning to be much doubt as to the profitableness of the large-ranch system in California. It is a well established fact that very few of the owners of large ranches have become rich.” Her motives for writing such might be questioned since she, like other boosters, wanted to make California a welcoming destination for families interested in setting up homesteads. Cone may, however, have been right. Charles Champlin bought a “small ranch” in Solano County in the 1850s thinking the country would never be “settled up.” Champlin’s grandson

recorded that “tho we owned a small ranch, and our neighbors large ones, we have seen
those ranches go under the hammer, not once but many times, as owner after owner went
broke. We Champlins did not go quite broke.”

If Americans in the state had not planned or even witnessed the transformation described by historians, that narrative helps us neither understand how residents lived nor how they eventually amassed large-landed enterprises and built the power structures to protect them.

The large-scale operators of the early twentieth century had their work in front of them considering that so many Californians worked to subdivide land into small plots. During the nineteenth-century, Californians promoted the “colony scheme” to encourage settlement, and resurrected colonization after the depression of 1893 to continue the process of subdivision for families. Twentieth-century boosters published new pamphlets with shiny paper and color pictures to advertise the same bucolic benefits and social advantages as their nineteenth-century colleagues. Gilroy promoters, for example, subdivided Rancho Aromitas y Agua Caliente to sell to farmers and told prospective immigrants what to expect in a tract entitled Just a Word about Gilroy and Southern Santa Clara Valley (ca. 1900-01). The land, as the writer emphasized, was suitable for traditional midwestern agriculture: “Beans, potatoes and corn, mainstays of the old-time farmer, grow and mature in perfection all over the section we now speak.” But, more importantly, farm families need not worry about living in isolation because a “thrift and intelligent community of small farmers have built up homes all around the Aromitas Ranch. The town itself has a public school, a store, livery stable, and such other conveniences as usually develop with the establishment of a village. Church privileges

will of course be supplied as rapidly as the demand suggests its importance. Every comfort and want can and will be supplied.” Even in the twentieth century, boosters had to sell the idea of coming to the Far West in terms farm families understood—incomes and communities.\(^{485}\)

Colony agents and local promoters worried about the state economy because of the panic of 1893. Many of the products exported from 1880s and 1890s California were luxury items, i.e., raisins, citrus fruits, and wine, and consumers discontinued the use of these products. Californians of the new century continued to believe that the state’s future rested in the hands of the farmer. In 1902, A. T. Helm published his “Views of an Ex-Farmer” in the *Santa Clara Advocate*. After numerous years as a farmer in Illinois and Kansas, Helm had become a fruit dealer and member of the Business Men’s League on the California Central Coast. He told readers that “I think all will agree that we are an agriculture town, surrounded by rich farms and rich country; and as all prosperity lies in the farmer it is important that we secure the farm trade.” The dialogue between residents, boosters, and future immigrants continued, and colonization remained a tactic to attract settlers.\(^{486}\)

During the twentieth-century, private individuals and government officials both started colonies. In 1908, William E. Smythe started the Little Landers Colony, calling urbanites to one-acre sustainable farms in San Diego County. Smythe is best known for

\(^{485}\) *Just a Word about Gilroy and Southern Santa Clara Valley* (Gilroy: Jas.C. Zuck & Co., n.d. [ca. 1900-01]).

\(^{486}\) A. T. Helm, “Views of an Ex-Farmer,” *Santa Clara Advocate* 1 (April 1902): 13-14. For additional booster literature of the twentieth century, see the uncataloged collection at the Huntington Library administrated by Cathy Cherbosque, curator of Prints and Ephemera. For an example of efforts by individuals in eastern states to promote California colonies in the twentieth century, see the B. P. Woodward Collection of California Real Estate Promotions at the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. Woodward collected advertisement material and published announcements in a Connecticut-based paper also named *Advocate*. 
his efforts in the national reclamation movement and editing *Irrigation Age*, but he had established colonies previous to the San Ysidro site. He, like many of his contemporaries, questioned the values of the emerging industrial system. Colony lands seemed to be a simple way to get people back into the countryside. The phrase “A Little Land and a Living” embodied the colony’s purpose and provided the colony with a name. Families and retiring couples responded to Smythe’s advertisements and moved into the Little Lander Colony No. 1 during the mid-teens.\(^{487}\) Charles Weeks came to the San Fernando Valley in 1920 after establishing successful colonies in Winnetka, Illinois, and Palo Alto, California. Instead of raisin grapes or citrus, Weeks’ colony residents focused on poultry. Like Smythe, Weeks promised a well-rounded prosperity which included “health of body, peace of mind, social environment, and independence” as well as financial security. It was not riches that created true wealth but a well-lived life within a community. Not all private colonization efforts succeeded like the Charles Weeks’ Colony, and the state legislature stepped in to protect people who had wanted to participate in the Back-to-Land Movement.\(^{488}\)

In 1915, as a result of the renewed interest in colonization, the California State Commission on Colonization and Rural Credits investigated issues surrounding land ownership and agricultural colonies, which led to the organization of the State Demonstration Colony at Durham. Professors from the University of California and


\(^{488}\) Lee, “The Little Landers Colony of San Ysidro”; Meredith Berbee, untitled paper on the Charles Weeks colony, undated, in possession of the author. Berbee is a librarian at the Huntington Library in San Marino, and I would like to thank the author for sharing with me the research she did in the special collections of California State University, Northridge. See also a biography of Charles Weeks, in *The Valley of Heart’s Delight*, reproduced online at http://www.mariposaresearch.net/santaclararesearch/SCBIOS/cweeks.html, accessed 25 October 2006.
Stanford University reported negatively on many aspects of post-1900 colonization, employing the ugliest of nineteenth-century words—“speculation.” They worried that poorly administered colonies led to poverty instead of independence, yet the professors had not given up on the idea of colonization. Members of the state committee and San Francisco’s Commonwealth Club made their recommendations to state leaders, resulting in the state-sponsored rural settlement plan. Legislators appropriated money and appointed irrigation expert Elwood Mead to set up small, irrigated, diverse farms to be sold or rented. The state law gave preference to veterans but allowed citizens to apply for plots. Durham, like other colonies, encouraged commitment to the community and a strong work ethic in exchange for “employment and rural homes.”

By this point, the federal government had made its contribution to reclaiming the arid West for agriculture. In 1902, after years of lobbying reclamation, advocates succeeded in their efforts to get federal funding for irrigation products in the form of the Newlands Reclamation Act. Under this new law, as historian Donald Pisani explains, lawmakers continued the ideals of the Homestead Act by funding irrigation projects for 160-acre farms. George Maxwell, one of the bill’s promoters, opined about the goals of reclamation. He hoped “we may become a nation of rural homes, rather than a nation of large cities.” As a native Californian, Maxwell had lived through the colonization efforts of the 1880s and 1890s and briefly edited California—A Journal of Rural Industry. Certainly, his beliefs about rural life in the West had been influenced as much by what he

---

witnessed in the late nineteenth century as by the Back-to-Land movement of the Progressive Era, if not more. Moreover, neither Americans in eastern states nor Californians were ready to give up on the values purportedly bred in rural communities and on family farms.  

The Back-to-Land Movement, in part, inspired colonization efforts after 1900, but we cannot dismiss the precedents set by the colony agents in the initial movement. During the 1870s and 1880s, Californians witnessed the transformation of land from large uncultivated parcels to smaller, highly cultivated tracts. By 1890, the effects of colonization were clear in arid, relatively remote places such as Fresno. In 1860, only 59 farmers worked plots smaller than 50 acres in Fresno County. By 1890, that number jumped to 823 individuals. Simply, colonization worked as planned. The Back-to-Land movement seems to be just an agrarian response to increased urbanization and progressive ideals, but the plans used by the colonizing agents after 1900 mirrored the goals of earlier land developers. Back-to-Landers used the colonization plan because it had worked to distribute the land more widely in California.

Historians need to carefully analyze the census and listen to the voices of colonization during both centuries. If the events of the teens and twenties teach us anything, it is that growers controlled both land and capital, employing local enforcement agencies and governmental officials to wield power over migrant laborers. Large-scale growers expected the support of state leaders, but as legal scholar Victoria Saker Woeste demonstrates, smaller operators may have also been whispering in the ears of legislators.

---

in Sacramento during the New Deal. Woeste analyzed the census returns looking for median farm size instead of average farm size. As a result, she determined that the number of small farms in the state exceeds our expectations. Between 1900 and 1930, according to her calculations, most of the farms in the state fell within the 20- to 49-acre category. Farm size does matter, especially in locating sources of power and influence in productive agricultural states such as California.491

The emphasis on the rancho-to-agribusiness model needs to be abandoned not just to understand the past but also to correctly analyze the current state of agriculture. Recently the California Farm Bureau Federation reported that the size of California farms had increased but remained smaller than farms elsewhere in the country. On the organization’s “Food and Farm News” webpage for 1 February 2005, the Farm Bureau reported: “The average size of a California farm remains much smaller than the national average, according to a federal report released yesterday (Monday). The report says California’s average farm size grew slightly, to 347 acres. That’s more than 100 acres smaller than the national average, because California’s mix of crops allows farmers to succeed on smaller farms. The report said 77,000 farms operated in the state last year.”492 California’s issues are far more complicated than can be explained by blaming the rise of large-scale agribusiness enterprises. As California producers focus on traditional and organic export markets, growers will have to make decisions about how best to use land

and obtain labor. We cannot understand the changes to come if we insist on ignoring the existence of small farms in California, past or present.

Boosters promoted the state’s virtues to convince prospective immigrants that newcomers would find a tamed West. J. Ross Browne boasted of the role boosters played: “The power of the press is beginning to be understood. What brought the immigration of the past year to California? You and I did it, Mr. Editor, and Nordhoff and Hittell and Wentworth and Martin, of the immigrant Union, the Overland Monthly, and a few more of us. We told the people of the East that California is a good country—a growing country—a wonderful country for energetic and industrious settlers. …they began to believe us, and they came…. All because they read our descriptions. How else, indeed, would they know anything about the country?”

In the first wave of colonization, the parties most likely to profit from land sales joined state boosters, as Browne indicated, to sell the state to American farmers. By the early teens, state and federal leaders contributed their legislation to the cause. Had California been the wonderland that promoters described, there would have been no need to resurrect colonization after 1900. The second wave of promoters knew that the state still lacked a key ingredient to its success—families.

California’s boosters did not lie about the virtues of the physical landscape but resorted to hyperbole when describing the social landscape. Failed miners and

493 For insight into the other side of California agriculture, see David Mas Matsumoto’s autobiographical works; Julie Guthman, Agrarian Dreams: The Paradox of Organic Farming in California (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004); and Miriam J. Wells, Strawberry Fields: Politics, Class, and Work in California Agriculture (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996). Additionally, California recently surpassed Wisconsin as the leading producer of dairy products, much of which is taking place in the Central Valley. The Central Valley has been plagued with poor air quality for years, and the increased number of milk cows in the valley will certainly add to this problem.

agricultural laborers experienced life far from home and without the support of kith and kin, and they entered the ranks of paupers, doomed to live out their final years on the poor farm. They shouldered the shame of poverty and receiving charity but also of failing in a land of opportunity as described by boosters. Paupers and promoters both knew that only a few men would find great wealth in bonanza mines or ranches. It was for that same reason that midwestern and eastern families showed so much caution when choosing new homes. Even with several transcontinental railroads connecting California to the East and Midwest, the state still seemed too far in the Far West for many Americans.

In their drive for economic progress, nineteenth-century boosters could not envision the future problems of California—overcrowding, overburdened social services, and anti-immigrant legislation. On 10 October 2006, Congress passed legislation to build a wall between Mexico and the U.S. along the California and Texas borders to stop illegal immigration into these western states. Moreover, critics of the 700-mile proposed wall think that it will not be enough to stem the tide of immigration over the border. Yet prior to the Second World War, boosters advertised farm land, health benefits, and natural wonders, anything to attract new residents and tourists.

Over time, however, newcomers remade the landscape. Railroads brought new waves of “home-seekers” who moved into the old subdivided ranchos. Jeanne C. Carr, early resident of Pasadena and friend of the conservationist John Muir, witnessed the destruction of her lovely colony for the sake of progress as envisioned by the boosters. She reflected on a historical vignette of Pasadena sent to her by a friend and replied to the

author, “It does not tell how Satan entered into this Paradise; finding his opportunity in a branch Railroad…. The ideals of a community of fruit growers, were not those of numbers who came later, to bask in our winters [sic] sunshine; but emerging from the chrysalis state, found congenial society and settled down, to build ‘palatial homes.’”

While Carr went to Grange meetings and exhibited her silkworms at agricultural fairs, Pasadena had become a destination for eastern snow-birds instead of an agrarian idyll. Branch railroads promised to connect the state to markets and make California viable economically for farm families but instead fueled urban growth. This was unintentional, and to Carr regrettable.

---

496 Jeanne C. Carr to Frank Chauncy Patten, May 13, 1896, folder CA 56, box 5, Jeanne C. Carr Papers, Huntington Library.
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Table 1. Selected Wine Growers in Santa Rosa Township, Sonoma County, 1870s-1890s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Improved Acreage (1880)</th>
<th>Acres to Grapes (1880)</th>
<th>Other Products Raised/Made</th>
<th>Varieties Grown in 1891/Acreage</th>
<th>Organizational/Institutional Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaac De Turk</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Winemaker; breeder of thoroughbred horses</td>
<td>“French Varieties”/100</td>
<td>Bennett Valley Grange No. 16; State Viticultural Commissioner; Sonoma County Agricultural Park; Sonoma County Stock Breeders Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Adams</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Rosa Grange No. 17; Assemblyman in state legislature (1880). Influential in est. of the State Board of Viticultural Commissioners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Barnes/Ruth Barnes estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy (1870)</td>
<td>Zinfandel, Mission/20</td>
<td>Bennett Valley or Santa Rosa Grange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert P. Quackenbush</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Quackenbush</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William B. Cockrill*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.W. &amp; E.W. Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zinfandel, Mission/140</td>
<td>Santa Rosa Grange; Teachers’ Institute; Daily &amp; Weekly Republican (Santa Rosa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Crane</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sheep and swine (1870)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bennett Valley or Santa Rosa Grange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Mize*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Dolan</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Fulkerson*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Dairy, cattle, oats, barley, wheat, hay (1870)</td>
<td>Zinfandel, Burger/25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. T. Fulkerson*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy, swine (1870)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.S. Fulkerson*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zinfandel, mixed/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis J. Hawkins*</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Rosa Grange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Ort</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dairy, cattle, sheep, swine, wheat, hay (1870)</td>
<td>Mission, Muscat/4</td>
<td>Santa Rosa Grange; Sonoma County Agricultural Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.T. Coulter*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zinfandel, Mission/12</td>
<td>Santa Rosa Grange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Crane</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zinfandel, Morocco/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Improved Acreage (1880)</td>
<td>Acres to Grapes (1880)</td>
<td>Other Products Raised/Made</td>
<td>Varieties Grown in 1891/Acreage</td>
<td>Organizational/Institutional Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Poor Farm*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zinfandel, mixed/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis A. Murdock*</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zinfandel, Burger/30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** Ernest P. Peninou, comp., *History of the Sonoma Viticultural District: The Grape Growers, the Wine Makers and the Vineyards* (Santa Rosa: Nomis Press, 1998), 23, 112-16; 302-06, 339-43; Agricultural Census, Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, 1870; R. A. Thompson, *Resources of Santa Rosa Valley* (Santa Rosa: R. A. Thompson, 1884), 90, 93, 96, 103; *Sonoma Democrat*, 17 November 1883.

**Note:** Out of 159 grape growers in Santa Rosa, 93 committed 1/8-5 acres to grapes, another 36 put 6-15 acres to grapes, and only 30 individuals had grapes growing on more than 15 acres. I have chose the above individuals because I have additional information available on them. Santa Rosa Township is most interesting because of Isaac De Turk’s and Agoston Haraszthy’s influence on winemaking in the area.

*These individuals were related by marriage and blood through the Cockrill and Fulkerson families. See Chapter Five for a discussion of the role of the Sonoma County poor farm and various farmers. It was the county supervisors, however, who instructed Claypool to plant certain varietals for cash sales. Many of the families listed in the above table lived adjacent to the poor farm. Murdock sold 150 acres to the county for the farm.

**Table 2. Inmates at the Los Angeles County Farm for the Year 1890**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>No. on farm</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Discharged</th>
<th>Died</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>60*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>62*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** Handwritten copies of reports sent to supervisors in the “Clothing Issued Ledger, 1889-1895,” vol. 8, box 19, Papers of the Rancho Los Amigos Hospital, California Social Welfare Archives, University of Southern California.

*Discrepancies in the manuscript.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Date Hospital/Farm Est.</th>
<th>Acre-age, if known</th>
<th>Products Raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda (City &amp; County)</td>
<td>1860/1868</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Poultry, Dairy, Veg., Pork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>1857/1877</td>
<td>40-47</td>
<td>Pasture, garden, orchard, poultry, dairy, pork, fruit trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>Pre-1880/1880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>1870/1886</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Alfalfa, Hay, Gardens, Poultry, Dairy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1878/1887</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Poultry, Dairy, Veg, Fruit trees, Alfalfa, Vineyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>1873/1873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono</td>
<td>1897/1880s-90s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>1869/1870s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>1869/1890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>1853/1870s</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Dairy, Poultry, Pork, Fruit, Tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>1853/1870s</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Fruit, Veg., Dairy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1880/1880</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Poultry, Livestock, Veg., Fruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco (City &amp; County)</td>
<td>1867/1867</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Potatoes, Oats, Veg., Dairy, Pork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Veg., Fruit, incl. Citrus, Flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>1876/1876</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Veg., Fruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>1855/1870s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>1858/unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>1859/1874</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Fruit, Hay, Grains, Veg., Cattle, Poultry, Vineyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suisun</td>
<td>Before 1879/unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Counties with County Hospitals Established after 1880**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Date Hospital/Farm Est.</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Products Raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Del Norte</td>
<td>1912/1912</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Poultry, Veg., Dairy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Poultry, Veg., Dairy, Potatoes, Peas &amp; Beans, Fruit, Pork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>1900-1904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>/no farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** Sol. N. Sheridan, History of Ventura County (Chicago: S. J. Clarke Publishing Co., 1926), vol. 1, pp. 300-01; Peter J. Delay, History of Yuba and Sutter Counties, Los Angeles: Historic Record Co., 1924; History of Butte County, California (San Francisco: Harry L. Wells, 1882), 149-51; History of Santa Clara County (San Francisco: Alley, Bowen & Co., 1881), 147-49; H. S. Foote, Pen Pictures from the Garden of the World, or, Santa Clara County, California, Illustrated (Chicago: The Lewis Publishing Co., 1888), 140-41; Frank S. Wedertz, Mono Diggings (Bishop: Chalfant Press, Inc., 1978); Reproduction of Fariss and Smith’s History of Plumas, Lassen & Sierra Counties, 1882 (Berkeley: Howell-North Books, 1971); Department of Interior, Report on the Defective, Dependent, and Delinquent Classes of the Population of the United States, (Washington: G.P.O., 1888); First Biennial Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections of the State of California, (Sacramento: W. W. Shannon, 1905); History of San Luis Obispo County (Oakland: Thompson & West, 1883); William L. Willis, History of Sacramento County (Los Angeles Record Co., 1913), 140-42.
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