Germans are nothing if not about tradition, loyalty, symbolism and generosity. These traits, while not unique to Germans, German-Americans or any ethnicity for that matter, are examined here in the context of generating financial and moral support for various factions engaged in fighting WW I. Two families, one from South Dakota, one from New York City provide the context for this paper.

England and France were using loans and war bonds to pay for their role in the Napoleonic War and WW I. The United States eventually followed suit, when it entered the war.

Fundraising to support war is nothing new. Fundraisers have used “Thank you Gifts” to help raise money for decades. In the fundraising business there is an old adage, if it works once, beat it to death.
In this case, Frederick III took a page out of his great grandfather’s fundraising playbook noting how Frederick I funded the Napoleonic War of 1813. Then, the Prussian Royal family asked loyal German citizens for their gold (rings, jewelry, dinnerware, etc.) to support the Kaiser’s need for the materials of war. In exchange for their donation, they received an iron ring, following the practice of “a ‘Thank You Gift’ in return for a quality, soon to be appreciated premium.”

This was a sort of “Thank you” gift at the time, much like today’s fundraisers offer tote bags and coffee mugs for donations.

In her article “Secrets to Effective Fundraising Premiums” Katya Andresen reports from her research, premiums can work to boost donations in the short term, but create problems for long term sustained giving. She continues that in general premium gifts crowd out the “deeper, lasting and emotional connection with a cause”. The German-American Gold for Iron campaign with its thank you gift ring will prove an exception. In this instance the thank you gift has significant symbolic and historic value.

This paper will shed light on the hypothesis that: some premiums, under certain conditions CAN create a deeper, lasting and emotional connection with a cause.

The WW I experience of Sioux Falls resident Karl Hartig and the pre-WW I experience of N.Y.C. residents Herman and Gretel Muller will support the position.
Rings have been important in history. “Since it is without beginning or end, the ring is a symbol of eternity.” Rings also signify protection. Early rings were made of iron which was looked upon as a magical, but humble metal. With a citizenry primed for tradition and symbolism, Frederick used the ring and German generosity against Napoleon. Our pre-WW I German-American fundraisers continued the concept.

In 1910, the U.S. Census estimated there were 2.3 million German born immigrants living in the United States...and immigration was on the decline.

Marguerith Karoline Louise Werhmann, or Gretel as her friends knew her, and Herman Muller came to America mid to late in the first decade of the 1900’s, proved they had been vaccinated against smallpox, denounced the Kaiser and pledged their allegiance to the United States.
They were married July 19, 1910 in a German church in the town of Union New Jersey.

They settled in Yorkville, on the island of Manhattan, New York City. Yorkville has been knick named “Kleine deutschland” for the great number of German immigrants settled there.

The area was centered around 86th St, bounded by Lexington Ave on the west and 1st Ave on the east, and 96th Street on the north and 79th St on the south.
They rented an apartment at 413 E 84th Street.

Here they could maintain and practice their German heritage, share in social culture, engage their German traditions, and their generosity by supporting Germans left behind in the Vaterland with immigrants in America of a like mind and culture.
Not all the financial support a patriot gives goes to purchase the instruments of war. Some of it might go to one’s fellow citizens, those doing the fighting, and ultimately those who became the innocent victims of war.

Here is a picture postcard from 1914, by Bert Thomas, of an old British soldier pausing in mid-battle to light his pipe.

Titled “Arf a mo’ Kaiser” the hugely successful post card became the center piece for a campaign to raise funds to provide tobacco to British soldiers fighting in WW I.

By purchasing the postcard, patriotic British citizens raised over a quarter million pounds (nearly a million dollars today) for the “Smokes for the Troops Fund”.

A donation, with a thank you gift.

This same spirit of generosity was tapped as revenue world-wide. Here, in order of publication, during a three week period of early 1915, South Dakotan’s of all kinds learned about fundraising opportunities to support various victims of the war.

On January 29, 1915 the Yankton Press and Dakotan’s front page heralded American Red Cross Christmas gifts reaching 500 German children in
Berlin. Americans and Germans at the event joined in singing “Herh Deutschland” and “Long Live America”. This despite criticism from other Germans there that America was selling arms to the allies and was therefore anything but neutral in its war position.

On February 5, 1915 the P and D reported the story of Polish women appealing to the women of the United States for “aid in the name of humanity”, for the thousands of homeless Polish children made victim of the war.

Not all gifts were well received. February 14, 1915 the P and D reports that the War Committee of the city of Zwichkau (near Amsterdam) has refused American gifts to the German women and children there, again as a result of the hypocritical nature of statements of neutrality on the part of the United States.

In a special report for the P and D, February 16, a United Press correspondent interviews the Crown Princess of Germany. Her message: to thank the women of America for providing relief to “the German women and children who are the real sufferers of the war”.
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Finally, on February 19, 1915 from Washington D.C. Missouri Congressman Richard Bartholdt states: “should the United States ever become embroiled in war against the Germans that all German-Americans would rally to the defense of the Stars and Stripes”.

In spite of the blizzard of humanitarian support reported by the American Press, it wasn’t like the Kaiser’s Germany wasn’t extending its reach to secure, and in some cases command, support from Germans living in America.

Here, February 9 of 1912, the parents of one time Sioux Falls resident Karl Hartig got a letter from “Der Kaiser” directing the young man to report for duty... on the German side of the war, or “risk charges for violation of military duty according to Section 140 of the Imperial Code.”
Karl reported for duty with the United States Army.

While he didn’t see action on the front in Europe, he like so many others referenced here did what he could, what he thought was right...and felt good about it.
Another event demonstrates the power of emotional connections, feeling good, at the war’s end.

The birth of an un-named female November 6, 1917 to Margaret Zimmerman Hanley in New York City provided the opportunity for joy in that family.

The child’s birth coincided with the Allied Victory over Germany in the Alcess-Lorraine region of France. The Victory effectively signified the end of WW I. The next day, the un-named female became, Lorraine Alice, penciled in on the margin of the original birth certificate.

Today, at 96 Lorraine Alice (Muller) is alive and well in upstate New York. A living reminder of the joy that came with the end of the war.

But we are getting ahead of ourselves....
It is October 18, 1914, a year before the Germans sank the Lusitania and another year beyond that before the U.S. entered the war….

This story appeared in the New York Times with the headline: “The iron ring is worn by 10,000 New Yorkers of German Blood.” The subhead continues, “for the sake of the father land, these people are giving their gold and other valuables in exchange for the Historic Ring of Loyalty.”

German-Americans were taking a cue from the Kaisers old fundraising scheme and were fundraising for gold and saying thank you with an iron ring. Another donation with a thank-you gift.

The New York Times story tells of a small camera store up on Second Ave in New York’s Kleinedeutschland, where “women have been bringing their jewels and men their watches, musical instruments and money to receive in return the iron ring”.

The shop owned by Henry Mielke was overtaken with donations of all kinds, from little old ladies to poor young German boys. Newlyweds have come in and without speaking have taken off their wedding rings in exchange for the iron.
Donors also received a certificate from Fraulein Mielke. The certificate roughly translated cites a “Declaration to Diminish a War Emergency.” It recognized a donation of gold for the care of injured warriors (German Austrian forces) and for the needy descendants (wives, sons and daughters) of those having honorably fallen in the field as heroes.

The ring is inscribed on one side: *Gab Ich in Schwere zeit, Ihm gold fur dieses Eisen.....* I gave in troubled time, gold to him for this iron.....

The other side reads: *Dem alten vaterland die treue zue eweisen.....*(the iron) of the fatherland to demonstrate loyalty.

The fund was managed by the Deutsche Historiche Gesellschaft des Staates New York....the German Historical Society of New York State, and according to the published story, other donation centers were to be opened in other cities, and “boxes and packages were arriving from all parts of the United States from Salt Lake City, from San Francisco, from Kansas and from South Carolina.”
The German Historical Society was in no way connected to the German War fund. It was purely for relief of widows and orphans of German Soldiers already killed in the war. Giving German-Americans like Gretel and Herman Muller the opportunity to continue tradition, engage in symbolism and to be generous.

Herman and Gretel gave one silver mug and twenty pieces of gold and silver. The certificate cites the “iron remembrance ring representing a thank you from the Deutsche Historische Gesellschaft, the German Historical Society.

In South Dakota about this time, 1914-15, Germans outnumbered all other ethnic groups combined. Census reports 40 percent of South Dakota immigrants were German.

To date, research has not uncovered any participation or even awareness of the “Gold for Iron” campaign by Geman-Americans in South Dakota.

The Deutsche Freie Presse, also known as the Dakota Free Press, was South Dakota’s most celebrated German language newspaper, published from 1874 to 1950. At one time there were 50 German language newspapers published in South Dakota.
Scholars familiar with the newspaper are not surprised at the lack of documentation or lack of mention of the “Gold for Iron” campaign.

They offer several schools of thought on the lack of publicity and lack of participation in the “Gold for Iron Campaign” by South Dakota’s large German-American community.

Most of the German-Americans who made up the largest group of immigrants in South Dakota were not as wealthy as their big city cousins. They hadn’t even been that well established in South Dakota. Most of them didn’t live in clustered groups like Kleinedeutschland in New York City where culture and pride were easily shared.

In South Dakota Germans spread out across the prairie, unlike the Swedes, Danes and Norwegians who settled in communities.

Here in South Dakota, before the US entered the war, the war appears to have been waged primarily against German-Americans living in USA and in South Dakota.

In researching microfilm copies of the Yankton Press and Dakotan, dating six months before and after the New York Times story was published in 1914, not a mention appears in the popular South Dakota paper.
While the South Dakota Germans had their own German language newspapers, during the war they were censored by the state. Objectionable articles were redacted. It may have been out of fear of censorship that the Deutsche Freie Press avoided the campaign. On the other hand, a story about patriotic German-Americans as an example of good citizenship may have proved an acceptable story. We don’t know, yet.

Other speculation is that most of the Germans in South Dakota were Germans from Russia, and they had long ago given up the loyalty to the Fatherland when moving to and then later exiting Russia.

Research will continue on a possible connection.

There is one South Dakota connection which we can document.

The traditional and symbolic ring Gretel and Herman were given back in 1914 in exchange for their generosity to help the German widows and orphans of WW I is here today in South Dakota (hold up hand).

That the ring and paperwork still survive after nearly one hundred years is offered as testimony to some sort of “deeper, long lasting emotional connection with the cause.”
Additionally, Herman and Gretel donated to support war relief for Germans held as prisoners in Siberia later in the war around 1917.

They contributed toys and money to support US airlifts of Christmas toys to German children in a divided Berlin after WW II.

In this case, we consider the “Gold for Iron” campaign, an exception to the notion that fundraising thank you gifts are not effective in the long term. When the thank you gifts are rich in tradition and symbolism, we suggest they may well be powerful tools of philanthropy.

Danke Schoen Grosse Eltern. (Thank you Grandparents)
The Little Engine that Could: 
The Role of the Sioux Falls Stockyard in the Development of Sioux Falls
Michael J. Mullin

Abstract:

Upton Sinclair’s The Jungle made the meatpacking industry (in)famous, and though his novel focused on the workers “tied to the great packing machine” there was another central actor in the work.\(^1\) That actor, silent and underappreciated, was the Union Stockyards; the Union Stockyards provided the Big Five of Chicago’s meatpacking industry all of the animals necessary to create the modern meatpacking process.\(^2\) That Sinclair placed his story in Chicago is not a surprise, Chicago ushered in the modern meatpacking enterprise, but as one writer noted “Chicago was the center of the meatpacking industry for only part of its history.”\(^3\) This was not the case elsewhere. In places like Sioux Falls, meatpacking continued to dominate the economy for most of the twentieth century. For John Morrell to successfully operate, however, it needed access to livestock. The Sioux Falls Stockyard provided that access. This paper focuses on the Sioux Falls Stockyards in the years in-and-around the Great War. Examining the Stockyards will allow us to understand how the exchange between city and countryside is not nearly as one sided as we might think.

---

\(^2\) Sinclair’s The Jungle, p. xxxiii.
In his work *Rethinking Home: A Case for Writing Local History* Joseph Amato writes “the local historian must learn to switch between two narratives of the countryside. The first is the story of the dominance of outside forces. The second is the story of unique local people and their singular experiences.”\(^4\) I want to tweak his comment just a little, instead of focusing on local residents I want to concentrate on a specific institution, the Sioux Falls Stock Yard(s). This entity was, in many ways, the catalyst for the city’s growth in the twentieth century. More importantly, it was the lynchpin between countryside and city. While other scholars, most notably William Cronon in his *Nature’s Metropolis*, have documented the role of the stockyards in American history, the Sioux Falls Stockyard has not figured prominently in the telling of America’s economic transformation in the early twentieth century.\(^5\) This paper examines the role of the Sioux Falls Stockyards in the development of Sioux Falls in the years surrounding World War I.

Such an examination is necessary because Sioux Falls in 2014 bears only a feint resemblance to its namesake of 100 years ago. With today’s local economy centered on medicine and credit-card services, few local residents have a connection to the most important employer in Sioux Falls historically, John Morrell. Few people seem to remember John Morrell’s was not only the largest employer in Sioux Falls, but the largest private employer in


the state as late as 1958;⁶ it remained the third largest employer in the Sioux Falls Metropolitan Area as late as 2012.⁷ Though many might acknowledge John Morrell’s historic importance to Sioux Falls, few locals have any connection what-so-ever with the city’s surrounding countryside. This too represents an important development in our history. Sioux Falls, and specifically, the Sioux Falls Stockyard(s), served as the entry-point of the countryside and allowed Sioux Falls to become the economic engine of the region. As was the case Chicago and the Twin Cities, Sioux Falls colonized the countryside.⁸ The Sioux Falls Stockyards provided local livestock producers with access to national markets.

At the most basic level, the Sioux Falls Stockyards served as a lure for the region’s livestock producers. By providing producers a place to sell their animals, the stockyard’s operated as the gateway into Sioux Falls proper. One long-time employee of the stockyards tells of how producers regularly asked where they should shop in town, or if the yard might keep their check until they returned from shopping later that day.⁹ In this way, the stockyard’s provided an economic reason for coming into town and a source of income from which to shop in town. In this way the stockyards helped make Sioux Falls a “central place” in the economic development of the region.

The theory behind “central place” is that cities serve as magnets for the countryside, and the larger the city “the more goods and services” it can provide its customers.¹⁰ We should not be surprised then, that a bank and a restaurant eventually served the producers who

---

⁸Amato, Rethinking Home, p. 44.
⁹Jim Worster, private conversations as part of the Sioux Falls Stockyards Project.
¹⁰Cronon, Nature’s Metropolis, p. 279.
brought their animals to the Sioux Falls Stockyard. But there is something more to Sioux Falls as a “central place” city than banking or restaurants, and it explains one reason why Sioux Falls does not fit in to the traditional telling of American stockyards. It was not part of the Chicago hierarchy. William Cronon documents how both Omaha, South St. Paul, and Sioux City were within Chicago’s economic orbit; they were tied to the Chicago’s Big Five (later Big Four) meatpackers.\(^\text{11}\) But Sioux Falls was not. But why bring animals to Sioux Falls at all? The answer to this question is, of course, John Morrell & Company.

For most of the twentieth century the Sioux Falls Stockyard worked alongside, though independent of, the meatpacker. It provided the plant its beef, pork, and mutton daily. In the process of providing the raw material John Morrell needed to conduct its business, the now-closed stockyard provided Sioux Falls with the ability to challenge Sioux City’s economic clout in South Dakota. We forget that throughout our territorial period, and even into the early 20\(^\text{th}\) century, Sioux City was the dynamic engine of this region. What makes any study of the Sioux Falls Stockyard important, then, is it allows an opportunity to explore how Sioux Falls evolved as it did—geographically, economically, demographically, and perhaps even culturally. Though today’s talk focuses on the early years of the Stockyards, it is important to understand that this paper is the beginning of a larger “script” which will be used to help put together a new permanent exhibit on the Sioux Falls Stockyards which will be housed in the Horse Barn at Falls Park and will hopefully open in May 2016.

That the Sioux Falls Stockyard was not owned by a meatpacking company turned out to be a blessing in disguise for Sioux Falls. In 1919, the American Farm Bureau Federation entered

---

the meatpacking story. The AFB sought legislation that would separate the meatpacker from the stockyard. The AFB wanted the two activities legally separated. In August 1921 Congress passed H.R. 6320. Known as the Packers and Stockyards Act, stockyards became “quasi-public utilities” with specific employees required to register with the federal government; the yards were required to “maintain orderly accounts and accurate weights and measures” and make payments “promptly.” The Sioux Falls Stockyard was never owned by a meatpacker so the legislation actually helped level the playing field for the Sioux Falls enterprise. Three years later, Congress laid the groundwork for the Livestock Market News Service. The news service aimed to provide accurate information for a given stockyard and provide a uniform set of standards for the reporting of the livestock news across the country. This little known act paved the way for the daily livestock report that filled the radio, and then television, airwaves over the next six decades.

Now a reader might wonder why a study of the Sioux Falls Stockyards is even necessary, after all the economy of Sioux Falls is no longer driven by its connection to rural South Dakota. One might argue that such a study is necessary for precisely that reason, but there are other, more academic reasons for such a study. One reason a study of the stockyards is important is that the yards operated as “hub” for the regional economy. The Sioux Falls Stockyards spread

---

12 Two scholars take very different positions on the Stockyard and Packers Bill. Jimmy M. Skaggs argues the Act was done “because the Big Four were eager to be rid of the stockyards,” therefore “Congress had enacted the Packers and Stockyards Act in 1912 to facilitate the corporate divorce.” J’Nell L. Pate argues the Act came about by the lobbying of Gray Silver, on behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation, saying “Silver’s work and that of others paid off. On August 15, 1921, Congress passed H.R. 6320, commonly referred to as the Packers and Stockyards Act….” See Jimmy M. Skaggs, Prime Cut: Livestock Raising and Meatpacking in the United States 1607-1983 (College Station, Tx.: Texas A&M Press, 1986) p. 155, and Pate, Livestock Hotels, p. 33.

13 Packers Consent Decree: Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, Sixty-Seventh Congress, second (and fourth) session(s)... (Washington, D.C.: Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, 1922).

14 Pate, Livestock Hotels, pp. 32-33.

15 Pate, Livestock Hotels, p. 36.
Sioux Falls’ reach far into the countryside. The Stockyards set the stage for the road system that developed in Minnehaha County and much of southeastern South Dakota. Paved roads in and out of Sioux Falls gradually reoriented the producers’ orientation from Sioux City and toward Sioux Falls. Equally important, because of the railroad’s late arrival to Sioux Falls, the stockyards (in conjunction with John Morrell) oriented Sioux Falls toward the Twin Cities rather than Chicago. Whereas Sioux City and Omaha were within Chicago’s financial orbit, particularly when it came to food production, Sioux Falls was not. This proved both a blessing and a curse for the stockyards over the course of its existence, but it clearly influenced the eventual economic orbit of the city as a whole. Finally there is this, the stockyards give us an entry for understanding America’s changing dietary habits. The stockyards mirror a shift from pork to beef in the American diet. For all these reasons the Sioux Falls Stockyards are a worthy topic for historical inquiry.

There is a reason the stockyards were an unrecognized economic engine in Sioux Falls: most of the public does not separate the stockyard from John Morrell’s meatpacking operation. In his *Comprehensive of Minnehaha County*, Charles A. Smith devotes a number of pages to the “Sioux Falls Stockyards Company,” but he is not interested in stockyards. Instead, he spends his time discussing the evolution of meatpacking in Sioux Falls and does not mention stockyards at all.\(^{16}\) This is a common theme among writers on early Sioux Falls. While it is true that John Morrell purchased hogs, cattle, and sheep from the yards, the two enterprises were separate businesses from the outset. If Morrell was the catalyst for livestock production in the region, the stockyards were, at least for the first half of the twentieth century, the face of that

business. Producers brought their animals to the stockyard where buyers, often from John Morrell but sometimes elsewhere, purchased the live animals for the slaughterhouse.

The importance of having a stockyard was not lost on the early residents of Sioux Falls. If Sioux Falls was going to emerge as the dominant city of Minnehaha County, let alone South Dakota, then having a stockyard was essential. It would bring producers into town and allow local merchants to sell products beyond the confines of the City. The question was where to locate the stockyard. There are some important, and fairly logical, considerations when it comes to location(s). Countryside residents needed easy access to it; railroads needed to be able reach it; ideally a processing plant would be located nearby (though it did not need to be adjacent to it). In Sioux Falls, these questions took nearly twenty years to answer.

In 1889 R.F. Pettigrew began soliciting funds for a “Sioux Falls Stock Yard Company.” Pettigrew’s original plan called for the plant’s construction on a forty acre plot near highway 16, three miles outside of Sioux Fall’s original city limits, at approximately the intersection of what is now 26th street and Marion Avenue. While outside of Sioux Falls, the Pettigrew’s location placed it closer to the “Omaha” railroad tracks, a line that ran through Parker and Lennox. Here is one of the first things to remember about the stockyard story, it will both influence, and be influenced by, the dominant transportation mode of the period. But in this case there is something more, the railway was oriented toward Omaha, and to lesser degree Sioux City. Livestock producers were looking elsewhere to dispose of their hogs and cattle. Another reason for this particular site was its proximity to one of the few bridges that connected western

Wayne Township, Section 25. Some say Wayne Township is closer to 33rd and Marion than 26th and Marion.
Minnehaha County with Sioux Falls. This bridge offered an opportunity to re-direct farmers. Sioux Falls could become the livestock’s producer’s outlet for their animals.

Pettigrew’s plan called for not just a stockyard, but a packing plant too. In March, 1890 a six-story, 436' by 160' building began taking shape. In addition to the main building, a hog house three-stories high and 50' by 80' was planned. This company would process meat for “individuals” not the commercial market. In this way Pettigrew’s plant would not require any government inspection. From the beginning then, this proposed stockyard shows two important themes that a history of the stockyard(s) will reveal: the importance of connecting transportation systems and the influence of federal government in the development of commercial food production in the United States.

Following the depression of 1893 Pettigrew sold his company to A.J. Pettengill, who reorganized the company under the “Northwestern Packing Company” name in 1895. It was under Pettengill’s supervision, and as the Northwestern Packing Company, that the original plans of 1890 were completed. Pettengill had his own difficulties operating the plant in 1899 he sold control of the NPC to others who renamed the enterprise A. Lester Heyer Packing Company. In July, 1899 the Heyer Packing Company butchered its first 150 hogs, a packing company was in business. One month later a lawsuit forced the closure of the packing plant and with it any hope of creating a stockyard(s). When a new stockyard opened in 1915 it would not be on the western edge of Sioux Falls, but along the east bank of the Big Sioux River. This

---

18 Smith, A Comprehensive History of Minnehaha County, p. 41.
19 “South Sioux Falls Suburb Development Partial Timeline” [p. 3].
20 There is some confusion about when in July the company began operation. Gary Olson argues it was July 3, but another piece, “South Sioux Falls Suburb Development Partial Timeline” says it was July 18th.
location had profound implications for Sioux Falls, not the least of which was the future direction of the City’s growth—westward.

The Stockyards location along the Big Sioux River seems natural. When one thinks about animals, one wants to locate the animals, whether alive or for slaughter near water. The obvious reason is for waste, power, and animal need. But in the case of Sioux Falls’ stockyard there was another reason: a meatpacker had opened up for business. Sulzberger & Son refurbished an old linen factory along the Big Sioux River in what became known as the Green Packing Company in honor of the property owner. Two Years later Green Packing Company sold the property to John Morrell in 1909. Two years later Morrell’s began construction of a larger building on the site of its present location. John Morrell’s expansion meant it needed more animals for processing and this provided the opening necessary for the Sioux Falls Stockyard. For the next fifty years the Stockyards provided John Morrell the animals necessary to keep 3,500 men employed.

With the development of Morrell’s it seems logical to place the stockyards next to a packer, after all this is what was done in Chicago and the Twin Cities. However, in those places the packers owned the stockyard themselves too. A variant of this took place in Omaha, where the Union Pacific Railroad controlled the bridge crossing the Missouri River; the Union Pacific forced developers to locate the stockyards where the Railroad wanted them located. But this did not happen in Sioux Falls. The stockyards opening coincided with the arrival of the Great Northern Railroad, but the Great Northern was a branch line from Watertown rather than a direct connection with Minneapolis. This means that the Sioux Falls Stockyards were different,

---

21 Smith, A Comprehensive History of Minnehaha County, p. 227.
22 Smith, A Comprehensive History of Minnehaha County, p. 228.
from the very beginning, than those in Sioux City, Omaha, or Chicago. But if it was not the railroad which spurred the stockyards creation, what was it?

For most of Sioux Falls’ history the strength of the economy depended on working relationship between farmer/rancher and local businessman. While medicine and credit-cards drive the current economy, Sioux Falls historically operated as the interface between Dakota agriculturalists and the wider —world. It was in Sioux Falls where farmers marketed crops, sold livestock via commercial exchanges and did the shopping not possible in the surrounding communities. In this transaction, roads were essential—whether railroad or paved county and state highways. In this sense, Sioux Falls fits neatly into national discourse for state’s like South Dakota had just witnessed the transformation of its highway system.\(^2\)

It was the car which allowed the Sioux Falls Stockyards to emerge as an important element of South Dakota’s economic development. South Dakota farmers were more dependent on trucks than elsewhere in the nation. South Dakota livestock producers ranked number two in the nation when it came to ownership of their own mechanized vehicle. While they might plow with horses, they delivered their goods to market via the horseless carriage. Though South Dakota had few paved roads there were 30,000 cars registered in the state by 1912.\(^2\) By 1920, South Dakota trailed only Nebraska, which had a 75.6 percent automobile ownership rate, in the proportion of farmers who owned automobiles.\(^2\) The quick growth in automobile ownership forced local counties to spend $17.4 million on roads throughout the state between 1900 and 1919. It is not, surprising, then, that the State of South Dakota created

---


\(^2\) Pomeroy, *The American Far West in the Twentieth Century*, p. 175.
its own State Highway Department in March of 1917. 26 Unfortunately a bridge for automobile traffic was not constructed over the Missouri River until 1926, which meant that any opportunity the Sioux Falls Stockyards had to challenge Sioux City for West River livestock was a number of years away. 27

While Morrell’s location certainly influenced where the Stockyard went, it was not the only factor. Wind patterns also determined its location. In Omaha, St. Joseph, and St. Paul, northern winds prevail and the decision to place the stockyards in the southern portion of the city. Elsewhere, in Wichita, for example, the owners of the stockyard owned land in the northern portion of the city, so he built the yard there. 28 In Sioux Falls, eastern winds prevail so it seemed logical to build the yards east of downtown. The result determined Sioux Falls directional growth over the next century; Sioux Falls grew west of the stockyard and meat processing plant. The Big Sioux River represented an actual line of demarcation between the city and the countryside. Workers crossed one way to work while animals came from the other direction. The stockyards literally became where country and city met. As William Cronon noted in his study of Chicago, the stockyards, when combined with the meatpacking industry, “established intricate new connections among grain farmers, stock raisers, and butchers” which resulted in “creating a new corporate network that gradually” altered America’s relationship with her food, and here again stockyards played an underappreciated role. 29

26 Schuler, Pierre Since 1910, p. 76.
27 Schuler, Pierre Since 1910, pp. 78-79.
28 Pate, Livestock Hotels, p. xiii.
The Stockyard(s) of Sioux Falls opened at a time of change in the meatpacking industry. Initially, the slaughter of animals and their subsequent packing took place in separate facilities, and the operations were relatively small. Moreover the production of meat was both seasonal (usually November to March) and done in conjunction with other “mercantile activity.” Commercial enterprises during this period were localized, Cincinnati, the hub of America’s pork-production before the American Civil War only produced 30 percent of the nation’s processed pork. What allowed later enterprises to reach a truly national market was the railroad. Specifically, it was the creation of integrated systems that brought cattle from the hinterland to stockyards in Chicago and elsewhere. The railroad pushed the livestock market westward to places like Chicago in 1865. With the development of “icehouse technology” operators could work year around. By 1880 meat production numbers in the winter and summer were virtually identical. The railroad and icehouse technology allowed meat packing to leave rivers or lake locations. Iowa saw the development of “interior” packers in places like Cedar Rapids in the 1870s. The “Liverpool-based” John Morrell moved his operation from Chicago to Ottumwa in 1877. Ottumwa eventually became the leading “packing center in the Midwest from the 1880s on” and it was to there that the John Morrell’s plant of Sioux Falls originally sent its meat to be processed.

30The Sioux Falls Stockyard(s) opened in the second of four phases associated with the meatpacking industry of the Midwest. Wilson, Tied to the Great Packing Machine, ebook, p. 7. Phase One ran from the 1830s until the Civil War; phase two occurred from 1865 to the early 20th century; phase three was the “early direct buying” development which Wilson lists as occurring between the 1920s and 1950s. The final phase was “direct buying” which occurred in the 1960s to early 2000s. See ibid, pp. 7-29.
31Wilson, Tied to the Great Packing Machine, p. 8.
32Ibid.
33Ibid, p. 9.
34Ibid., pp. 9-10.
36“John Morrell and Company Collection,” Box 1, 1909-1949 pamphlet; Siouxland Heritage Museum Collection.
By the time the stockyards opened, John Morrell was not only sending some carcasses to Ottumwa, but was beginning to pack animals in Sioux Falls too. With meatpacking a year around industry by 1915, John Morrell’s needed more animals, and the stockyards provided the extra animals to keep the plant profitable.

The standard interpretation of stockyard development is its reliance on the railroads. Warren Wilson, for example, argues “all the trunk-line railroads except” two “invested large amounts of capital in both stockyards and stockcars for the livestock trade.”\textsuperscript{37} Railroads came late to Sioux Falls, and then only grudgingly. The rails that connected Sioux Falls to the larger world were spur lines. The Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul came to Sioux Falls in 1879, followed by Rock Island railway in 1886, and then the Willmar & Sioux Falls set up shop in 1888. These lines connected Sioux Falls to larger, more extensive networks. It was not until 1915, when the Great Northern system, absorbed the South Dakota Central line that Sioux Falls found itself connected with a dominant railway player. But the stockyards and meatpacking plants were already operating, so the railroad never played a major role in the shaping of the endeavor as it had in Omaha and Chicago.\textsuperscript{38}

Before talking specifically about the Sioux Falls Stockyards, I need to spend a minute or two talking about the pre-1900 transportation routes that had, and continue to have, a profound impact on what became South Dakota. Historically, West and East River South Dakota have had very tentative economic ties. In 1865 Congress authorized three wagon roads through Dakota Territory. One of the routes proposed routes connected Sioux City to Fort

\textsuperscript{37} Wilson, \textit{Tied to the Great Packing Machine}, ebook, p. 10; the two railways that invested in stockyards or stockcars were the Baltimore & Ohio and the Great Canadian, ibid.

\textsuperscript{38} For a discussion of how the Union Pacific influenced Omaha’s meatpacking and stockyard industries see Lawrence H. Larsen, et. al., \textit{Upstream Metropolis: An Urban Biography of Omaha & Council Bluffs} (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007), pp. 109-111.
Randall and extended northward to a second trail; this second trail “was intended to give St. Paul a direct route through central Dakota’ and ran from the Minnesota border to Fort Thompson, then northward to the Cheyenne River and then westward to Belle Fourche in the northern Black Hills. The final route was “to begin at the mouth of the Niobrara and run along the southern base of the Black Hills.”

On the eve of World War I, Sioux City was South Dakota’s dominant city. There were two reasons for this. First, at the local level, and here I mean southeastern South Dakota. When residents turned to mixed agriculture in the 1890s they needed a market for the animals they raised. While a few might be sold locally, Sioux City had an already established stockyard. This meant that when John Morrell’s opened in 1909 and the Sioux Falls Stockyards a few years later, they were going to have to re-orient the direction producers looked when it came to selling animals. At the state-level, and here I mean West River South Dakota, railroads ran through Sioux City, not Sioux Falls. This meant any producer sending cattle by rail bypassed Sioux Falls entirely.

The construction of the Sioux Falls Stockyard(s) differed in some profound ways from those constructed in places like Omaha. In Omaha railroad traffic predated the construction of the stockyard. Indeed, investors learned no “stockyards could succeed in Omaha without the cooperation and participation of the Union Pacific Railroad.” In Sioux Falls, the construction of the stockyards coincided with the expansion of railroads into Sioux Falls. This means that unlike

---


40 This remained the case well into the 1930s, where West River producers sent their animals to Sioux City rather than Sioux Falls because that was the way the rails ran. See Paula M. Nelson. The Prairie Winnows Out its Own: The West River Country of South Dakota in the Years of Depression and Dust (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1996), p.124.

41 Larsen, et al., Upstream Metropolis, p. 110.
Omaha, no railroad dictated the location of the stockyards location. What did influence the stockyards location was the presence of a meatpacking plant. In 1905 “the Dakota or Green Meat Packing Plant” opened just a little south of present day John Morrell. In 1909 John Morrell purchased the Green Plant, and in 1911 expanded to its present location. This, it turns out, was a blessing in disguise for the City of Sioux Falls.

What is often missed in the story of the Sioux Falls Stockyard is timing (and technology). The years preceding World War witnessed the transformation of entire ecosystems into cropland. In North America approximately 1,067 billion acres of land were converted to animal and crop production. These acres are nearly double what Russia converted during the same period, and Russia ranks second in transforming natural grasslands, or ecosystems, into cropland. This was when much of the Dakotas and western and southern Minnesota was settled. This means that as the Sioux Falls Stockyard emerged, a growing number of producers occupied the surrounding countryside, and they needed a market for their animals.

The arrival of John Morrell in 1909 and the stockyard’s opening in 1915 provided a catalyst for Sioux Fall’s growth. The city’s population “was two and one-half larger” in 1920 than it had been at the turn of the century. One reason for this is the city had become a “hub” city for the surrounding region, and the stockyards had played a significant role in this development. At the same time, the surrounding country-side was being transformed.

---

45 Joseph A. Amato. *Rethinking Home*, p. 43.
46 Olson and Olson, *Sioux Falls, South Dakota: A Pictorial History*, p. 75.
Whereas early homesteaders in Southeastern South Dakota were farmers, the lands opened at the end of the 19th century were ideally suited for livestock production. South Dakota had approximately 136,000 head of cattle in 1880. It had 950,000 head when the blizzards of 1886-1887 hit. Following the blizzards, farmers in the region began shifting “to units of more conventional size, to diversify, and especially to grow fodder for livestock.” This means that when the stockyards opened in 1915, stockmen were in the process of changing their livestock operations. Stockmen now relied less on pasture lands for their animals and more on fodder.

But there was more to it than this. Events at the national level were also important in the success of the Stockyard(s). The development of “dressed beef” for example, meant the concentration of the packing trade. By the time the stockyard opened most major cities saw “the slaughtering of cattle by butchers” a “thing of the past.” One result of this change was that small town merchants now sold previously dressed beef or pork to their neighbors. At the same time, his clients were now consigning animals to the stockyard. What was happening was the demise of what Robert Wiebe called the “isolated community.” Sioux Falls was leading South Dakota into the emerging consumer culture, but it was doing more than that. The stockyard’s transitioned local livestock producers and neighboring merchants into new ways doing business. The growth of the stockyards meant a contraction in other markets. For example, before the rise of John Morrell and the Sioux Falls Stockyards a local producer might be able to sell a cow in the local market, to a local butcher. Once dressed beef became the

49 Schell and Miller, History of South Dakota, p. 245.
dominant meat consumed throughout America, this was no longer possible. Though talking about another stockyard and packing operation, one Iowa farmer noted “a few years ago nearly all of our cows and heifers, what is called butcher stuff, were bought by butchers....Now Armour furnishes the meat to those places, which throws us off that trade....Our market has changed altogether.” On a much smaller scale, Sioux Falls Stockyards, did the same thing here.

For most of its history, the Sioux Falls Stockyards dealt more in hogs than in cattle, though beef became more important as the twentieth century progressed; a history of the stockyards, then, provides an opportunity to examine the changing food habits of the American consumer. The reason one should know that hogs were more common than steer or sheep is that pork had an advantage in the growing meatpacking trade. First, in the area of America’s diet, Americans were used to dressed pork. Since the colonial period Americans had salted and smoked their pork. This helped preserve more of the animal for market. Salt and Smoke were not as efficient on beef as it was on pork. Whether in the form of bacon or ham, Americans had come to accept that hogs could be butchered elsewhere, smoked, and then sold thousands of miles away. Unlike ranchers, South Dakota farmers could raise hogs alongside their crops. Hogs were more efficient than cattle in converting grain to meat and in producing offspring. As new farming operations came under the plow in America’s tall grass prairies, farmers sold their animals to seasonal pork processors who operated during the slow winter months. It was hogs, not cattle that brought John Morrell to Sioux Falls.

---

But when Morrell’s opened another meat product was becoming more common: “dressed beef.” This development was tied up in changes in railcars, specifically the refrigerator car of the 1870s. Before refrigeration, packers sent beef eastward where local butchers did the actual processing for a local market. Unfortunately only fifty-five percent of a steer was used in this system. This meant shippers were “effectively” throwing “45 percent of the money they paid the railroads” away. If packers sent only the edible beef, not the bones, gristle, and other waste products they would use their railcars more efficiently. In order to accomplish this, however, the packers had to first develop a marketing system for their beef. By the start of the twentieth century the packers had done this. Over the last two decades of the 19th century the packers had undersold local butchers and “profoundly disrupted the traditional American beef trade.” The fight over dressed beef had been long and nasty, but it was over when Morrell and Company opened in Sioux Falls; now the Sioux Falls Stockyard could count on cattle being sent to their pens and chutes. After all, the edifice of John Morrell’s literally looked down on the yards themselves and they wanted to participate in the dressed beef trade.

One result of this development, outside of the stockyards, was the demise of local slaughterhouses. Local slaughterhouses could not compete with the likes of Morrell’s, Swift, or Armour; local butchers became retailers for the meatpackers since they could not “earn a profit if forced to sell at dressed beef prices.”

---

56 Cronon, *Nature’s Metropolis*, p. 244.
Three elements were necessary for the growth of stockyards in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries. They were “efficient stockyards companies, interconnecting railroads, and modern meatpacking facilities in the same location.”\textsuperscript{57} One reason Sioux Falls entered the stockyard trade so late (compared to Sioux City, Kansas City, or Omaha) is that the city’s rail connections lagged behind some other cities, most notably Sioux City and Omaha. \textsuperscript{58} The railroad companies invested large amounts of capital in both stockyards and stock cars. As was the case in Chicago, railroads helped the Sioux Falls Stockyards access a wider market. The Chicago and Northwestern Railroad completed their bridge over the Missouri during the first decade of the twentieth century (construction of the bridge began in the fall of 1906 and the first passenger train over the expanse occurred in October 1907).\textsuperscript{59} In theory this opened up western South Dakota to the stockyards and John Morrell. Until then, and even afterwards, western livestock producers had sent their animals to either Sioux City or Omaha, depending on which rail line the producer was closest too.

The second transportation development was the automobile. Though South Dakota had few paved roads there were 30,000 cars registered in the state by 1912.\textsuperscript{60} By 1920, South Dakota trailed only Nebraska, which had a 75.6 percent automobile ownership rate, in the proportion of farmers who owned automobiles.\textsuperscript{61} The quick growth in automobile ownership forced local counties to spend $17.4 million on roads throughout the state between 1900 and 1919. It is not, surprising, then, that the State of South Dakota created its own State Highway

\textsuperscript{60} Schuler, \textit{Pierre Since 1910}, p. 68.
\textsuperscript{61} Pomeroy, \textit{The American Far West in the Twentieth Century}, p. 175.
Department in March of 1917. Unfortunately a bridge for automobile traffic was not constructed over the Missouri River until 1926, which meant that any opportunity the Sioux Falls Stockyards had to challenge Sioux City for West River livestock was a number of years away. Rail traffic, however, allowed the Sioux Falls Stockyard a tentative entrance into the West River livestock pool.

One reason the railroad was so slow to reach Sioux Falls was opposition to it from local farmers. This seems counter intuitive, but Jon Lauck argues that many of the regions farmers were not influenced by the late 19th century Grange movement, but were interested in preserving “an economic order of decentralized farms not dependent on larger economic forces.” The result was a subordinating of “certain economic activities to the needs of” the “yeoman-centered agricultural order.” These same farmers were likely to oppose the emerging county and state highway system for the same reason. They feared the transition from “labor” to “money” for road construction. Economic isolation had, by the turn of the twentieth century, proved problematic for South Dakota producers. More importantly, it meant South Dakota lay outside the emerging network of national rail systems. Now, as John Morrell’s butchered hogs and the Great War ground on, the isolated communities described during the early Progressive Period, sought engagement with the industrial capitalism of urban America and that engagement come via the stockyard.

Scholars of the meatpacking trade identify four distinct patterns when it comes to the men involved in the day-to-day operations of the plant. Sioux Falls fits into the fourth pattern:

---

62 Schuler, Pierre Since 1910, p. 76.
63 Schuler, Pierre Since 1910, pp. 78-79.
65 Barron, Mixed Harvest, pp. 21-27.
it is characterized by a lack of racial diversity among its workforce (at least until the late 20th century) and a workforce divided by the efficacy of unionization. In towns like Sioux Falls, packinghouse employees might continue to live in surrounding communities rather than in Sioux Falls itself. As meatpacking evolved in the Midwest, and these patterns impact the stockyards associated with them. Pattern one concerns what happened in terminal-market areas. Cities such as Chicago, Omaha, Kansas City, East St. Louis, and Milwaukee enjoyed an “early status as large industrial centers.” This allowed them draw workers from well beyond their immediate locale. These cities also saw successive waves of new ethnic groups enter the plants as the years progressed. The experience here is what Upton Sinclair described in The Jungle. The second pattern, one that characterized the operations of Indianapolis, Wichita, South St. Paul, Sioux City, and St. Joseph, did not experience the “new immigrant ethnic-succession pattern of the large cities.” In these cities “amalgamation characterized their workforce evolution.” The final pattern of packing communities involved those cities participating in “the direct buying interior of of the Midwest.” Here, workers in cities such as Albert Lea, Cedar Rapids, Mason City, and Topeka, entered the packing trade only after meatpacking replaced older industries “in prominence in the early twentieth century.”

Sioux Falls fits more neatly into the second pattern described by Warren Wilson, but not neatly. Meatpacking was the major employer in Sioux Falls before World War I began, but packing failed to draw workers from outside the region. Most of the workers who migrated into Sioux Falls for packing jobs came from Northwestern Iowa or Southwestern Minnesota.

---

66 Wilson, Tied to the Great Packing Machine, ebook, p. 66.
67 Wilson, Tied to the Great Packing Machine, ebook, p. 65.
68 Wilson, Tied to the Great Packing Machine, ebook, p. 66.
Moreover, ethnic diversity did characterize the packinghouse over the course of the 20th century, but it was primarily white in the pre-1920 period. Finally, unlike the third pattern Wilson described, packinghouse employees were more likely to leave Morrell’s for other employment, especially after 1980, rather than vice-versa.

The Sioux Falls Stockyard was not really a single yard, as were all stockyards in the early 20th century the yard was broken down into three distinct “yards” or areas. There was the yard for cattle, another for hogs, and in Sioux Falls a third area for sheep. Each yard had its own workers and each area had some distinctive chores. In the case of Sioux Falls, the various yards were a godsend to farmers for they were beginning to diversify their agricultural output. As real estate values went up (and this was particularly true around Sioux Falls) livestock raisers turned to corn to fatten their animals up. In the Chicago area this led to producers buying “stockers” and turning them into “feeder” cattle.69 In South Dakota, farmers often relied on the stockyard workers to help them. Commission Men working on behalf of the Stockyards spent Friday and Saturday visiting farms and farmers soliciting business. In some cases, the commission men working hogs might “chalk” the hogs a farmer want to send to market when it came to sell.70 Having established a relationship between livestock producer and the Sioux Falls Stockyard, the link between city and country was nourished by a personal relationship, not just an economic one.

This relationship was cemented at the Sioux Falls Stockyards restaurant. 71 One of the things forgotten about the Sioux Falls Stockyard was the importance of the grounds restaurant.

---

69 Cronon, Nature's Metropolis, p. 222.
71 Worster, “Reflections” p.4; Sioux Falls Stockyards was not the only yard to have a restaurant, Chicago's Union
As was the case in Chicago during its early days, the restaurant allowed producers to do more than just sell animals. “Customers came to the city as much to participate in its broader cultural marketplace as to buy and sell produce.”

The Sioux Falls Stockyard, then, operated at an actual and symbolic level. It actually was where livestock producers entered the national, and ultimately international, market. When Norwest or First National Bank opened alongside the yard, livestock producers cashed their stockyard check at a Sioux Falls bank, not a local bank back home. With money in their pocket, these same producers began purchasing goods in Sioux Falls, initially things they could not purchase at home but eventually even groceries which were simply cheaper than in neighboring communities. As a result, South Dakota producers moved ever more directly into Sioux Fall’s economic orbit. On the symbolic level the stockyards were where county and city met, ranchers and farmers moving one way, bankers and commission men moving the other. Quietly, intently, and for most of the twentieth century, the Sioux Falls Stockyard(s) was ‘the little engine’ that drove the growth of Sioux Falls.

Stockyards had a hotel and restaurant attached to it. See Cronon, *Nature’s Metropolis*, p. 211.

Clash Between Norwegian Ethnic Preservation and Anti-Hyphenism in the Upper Midwest 1914 - 1922
Lynwood E. Oyos

How does one define American nationality?
Is there any room for ethnic pluralism? The answer came during World War I when the quest for national solidarity reached its peak. By 1917, proscriptive measures were being used against non-English groups in the American population. As John Higham, in his excellent work, “Strangers in the Land”, writes, “World War I called forth the most strenuous nationalism and the most pervasive nativism that the United States has known. The so-called American patriot demanded uniformity not only of culture and language but also of political thought.

Following the Civil War, immigrants from the Balkans and Eastern Europe began arriving in the United States. Native born Americans looked at them with suspicion and disdain. Norwegian immigrants, who began coming to the United States in 1825, feared that the impact of this unfamiliar alien movement would have a negative affect on established customs and traditions. Hjalmar Boyeson, a professor at Cornell University, criticized this unrestricted immigration. Stressing the constructive aspects of Scandinavian settlement, he said the cities are now filling up with tribal foreign proletariat clamoring for bread and circuses as in the days of ancient Rome. American citizens identified the people of these regions as radical, warlike, politically corrupt with many of the men engaged in banditry. The Saturday Evening Post asked, “Why try to educate men inherently incapable of
receiving American ideals? Why try to change people who are biologically unfit? Why the post now asked, “Why try to make Americans out of those who will always be Americanski.” Norwegian-Americans felt they were a step up from the influence of the South Europeans. The editor of the Decorah Posten wrote, “The South Europeans came to benefit from what has already been accomplished. These city dwellers are politically corrupt.” The editor went on to say he feared the country’s standard of living would decline.

At the beginning of the 20th Century, the constant flow of immigrants from Norway helped maintain Norwegian-American communities in the Midwest. Newcomers went to these locations. Settlements in America were highly concentrated, creating strong ethnic institutions. Once established, these institutions operated on the side of ethnic preservation. In 1910, it was estimated that there were 1,650,000 people of Norwegian descent in the United States. During the pre-World War I period, they will make substantial gains in fostering cultural values. They also made limited gains in politics. Knute Nelson, a Minnesotan, had been elected to the House of Representatives and from 1892 to 1896 was governor of Minnesota. There were approximately 400 Norwegian newspapers; the 3 majors ones were the Skandinavian (Chicago), Daglig Tomide (Daily Times in Minneapolis) and the Decorah Posten, founded in 1874 and a paper of high quality.

Achievements by individual Norwegians also strengthened Norwegian-American self-esteem. Roald Amundsen sailed through the Northwest Passage, Fritzof Nansen’s expeditions to the North Pole and Greenland on the polar ship Fram (Forward), musician Ole Bull and writer Henryk Ibsen helped build respect for the Norwegian-Americans. Statues
of Leif Erickson were erected in Chicago, Duluth and St. Paul. The claim was made that he
was in the New World long before the Pilgrim fathers and Columbus.

There is also the question of the Kensington Stone in Alexandria, Minnesota found
by a Swede, Olaf Odmen. The runic inscription reads: “8 Goths and 22 Norwegians on a
journey westbound from Vinland”—and dated to the mid-1300s. Current studies indicate
that the Stone is fraudulent. The foremost ethnic symbol for Norwegian-Americans was and
is May 17, Sytande Mai. The day recognizes the dissolution of the Swedish-Norwegian
Union.

The years between 1895 and 1914 can be described as the Norwegian-America. An
important part of this was derived from the popularity of Lodge nights in the United States.
On January 6, 1895, 18 young men in northern Minneapolis, 14 of them Tronders, organized
Nidaros Lodge I. The Sons of Norway was a social organization that provided insurance
benefits to its members. A second major organization was the Bygdelag movement. The
Bygdelag was composed of societies or lags that had folk or cultural roots. A lag was
composed of immigrant families from a specific Norwegian bygde—a rural community,
valley, district, or fjorde area. Basically, they were people who resided in agricultural
communities. Their societies lacked the refinement of urban societies who did not want a
nation of peasants. The Norwegian-Americans bygdelag want to recreate family traditions
from the old country—their cultural heritage, language, old traditions, and customs. The
bygdelag arranged annual reunions or stevne when they would bring back memories of the
land that they had left behind. In some ways, the bygdelags conflicted with the development of a common Norwegian-American identity.

A third association was the Nordmanns Forbundet, founded in 1907. They celebrated Norway’s separation from Sweden, two years earlier in 1905. The Forbundet claimed 20,000 members by 1914. Overall these associations had as their purpose:

1. A concern for mutual economic aid and support for life and health insurance
2. National and church related interests
3. An emphasis on their traditional culture

Many of the societies stated in their by-laws that a major purpose was to preserve the Norwegian language, customs, and traditions with emphasis on their common cultural background. The use of English could indicate cultural loss. It would sweep away the understanding between parents and children. Between 1895 and 1914, the efforts to foster cultural values exceeded all expectations. Efforts to create a Norwegian-American literature were underway. Many Norwegians developed a certain faith in a permanent Norwegian subculture in America. One long-term American politician said, “These people are attempting to build a little Norway in America.” Ole Rolvaag’s response was, “The above quote is an obvious lie.”

Norwegian-Americans together with their compatriots in the homeland made plans for a centennial celebration during the summer of 1914. They would celebrate what had taken place in the small town of Eidsvall, not too far from Christiana, on 17 May 1814. At Eidsvoll, an agreement between Sweden and Norway was made to create a dynastic union between the two countries. It acknowledged Norwegian self-government in domestic affairs.
and suffrage. While the celebration was taking place, the major powers on the European continent girded for war.

Two months and 14 days later, the holocaust of August 1914 became the prelude to four bitter years of deadlock in trench warfare that cost a generation of European lives and in 1917, with the United States entering the war, led to a bitter attack on Norwegian-American ethnicity.

The Scandinavian countries declared their neutrality in 1914. Norwegian-Americans, in the first years of the war, had mixed feelings toward the combatants. There were some who refused to support the British because they considered them to be snobs. Norwegian-American newspapers during the first years of World War I tended to be for the Allies. This was particularly true of papers with the largest circulation. The Minneapolis Trident expressed deep distrust for Germany. The Fargo, North Dakota Fram (Forward) and a Norwegian-American intellectual Waldemar Ager in his paper Reform at the outset of the war absolved Kaiser II of responsibility for the war. They urged Scandinavian countries to organize a common front against the “Cossacks” threat in case neutrality failed. The Russian threat to Norway and Sweden was soon forgotten when the Russian said Narvick would have minimal value as a Russian port. A number of Norwegian and Danish-Americans favored the German cause because of traditional church ties.

As the war progressed, the Norwegians discovered that neutrality did not deter the Germans from destroying half of the Norwegian merchant fleet. Over 1,000 sailors who had never harmed a German were killed by gunfire, bombs, and drowning.
On April 6, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson, who promised to make the world safe for democracy, called for a declaration of war. Norwegians living in the American Midwest tended to be divided regarding the war. There was a bloc of ten—two senators and eight men from the House of Representatives who voted on the war resolution. Nationally, 82 U.S. Senators and 373 Representatives voted in favor of going to war. Senator Asle J. Gronna of North Dakota and four Representatives opposed the resolution. Their action created an image problem for Norwegian-Americans.

The all-out assault on anything associated with the “Hyphen Mentality” began shortly after the United States entered the war. Nativists created an atmosphere of intolerance and demanded 100 percent from Norwegian-Americans and other Hyphenates who continued to practice non-American cultures. The quest for national solidarity gave rise to proscriptive legislation and active measures against non-English (language) people. Midwestern Norwegians tended to be divided with regard to the actions of the nativists. There were several educators who questioned maintaining foreign languages in the public schools. They were willing to stress one nation, one language, and one flag. English should be the only medium of instruction in the high schools.

In May 1918, Governor William L. Harding of Iowa issued a proclamation that prohibited the use of any non-English language in conversation in public places, over the telephone, in public addresses and at church services. People could speak Norwegian at private religious meetings in homes. Foreign languages newspapers were censored, some were suspended. The patriots wanted union in political as well as cultural expression.
Efforts were made by immigrant families to display loyalty to their new homeland. A number of bygdelags sent their sons to the Army. Knute Nelson, a leading spokesman for the Norwegian-Americans wrote that “All sensible men agree that the Governor of Iowa is going too far in this matter both from an ethical and a legal standpoint. All we can do is support the government in word and deed and let the native born Americans see that our people are worthy of American citizenship.”

At Granville, North Dakota, several citizens decided that Bert Folstad, a Norwegian cobbler was insufficiently patriotic. They took the town’s fire engine in the middle of the night and hosed down his place of business that was also his home, broke the windows and thoroughly soaked everything. After his bath, Folstad was dragged to the town hall in his underwear and forced to kneel before a crowd of approximately 100 people and kiss the American flag.

As early as the spring of 1915, the term hyphenism denoted maintenance of a residual loyalty to an overseas homeland that supposedly precluded a full and absolute commitment to the United States. Former President Theodore Roosevelt may have coined the term that was to be popularized. Roosevelt wanted a firm stance against Germany and those Americans whose only God is money and the evil enemies of America, the hyphenated Americans. He asserted that the hyphen is incompatible with patriotism. Through learning and writing English, through an oath of allegiance in word and deed and renouncing every prince, potentate, or foreign government one will become a true American.
President Woodrow Wilson told a group being naturalized that they must leave other countries behind them. They must not be looking over their shoulders and seeking to perpetuate what they intended to leave behind them if they were to become thorough Americans. A man who thinks of himself as belonging to a particular national group has not yet become an American. As late as 1919, immigrants seemed stubbornly unimpressed by America’s having gone to war and Wilson’s efforts to get their support of his goal to have the United States join the League of Nations. He fiercely lashed out at them saying “Hyphens are the knives that are being stuck into this document.” As he often charged in defending the Versailles Treaty.

In 1919, American xenophobia reached new levels under the influence of the Red Scare. Bigotry swept the country. Norwegian leaders formed “For the American Heritage.” It was founded in Eau Claire, Wisconsin with Rolvaag as its leader. One of their first tasks was to stop leaders of the Norwegian Lutheran Church in America from removing Norwegian from its name.

In summation: the hyphen and what it stood for was terminated with World War I. The Norwegian Americans had been compelled to take a defensive position and to endure disdain for their ethnic identity by the intense nativism and nationalism during the latter stages of the war. In a climate of intolerance and hysterical agitation the hyphen had to go. In the 1920s, the Lutheran Church gradually conducted services in English and Norwegian was no longer heard in the sermons or hymns. Augustana College participated in the switch to English. Men like Ager and Rolvaag were particularly sensitive to the diminished use of
their native language. A somewhat bitter Rolvaag said, “We are too intellectually lazy to remain a bi-lingual people.” Knowing they had lost the language conflict, Ager and Rolvaag would attempt to keep Norwegians and society in general knowledgeable about their customs and traditions through newspapers and literature. Rolvaag did so when he wrote his trilogy “Giants in the Earth,” “Peder Victorious,” and “Their Gather’s God.”
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Almost from the very outset of the Great War, Theodore Roosevelt offered his opinion on those of dubious loyalty to the United States. Perhaps still stinging from his father’s purchase of a substitute to soldier in his place during the Civil War or recollecting his own “bully” experiences in the Spanish-American War, Roosevelt could brook no perceived disloyalty to the United States. Nor could he understand or accept that the United States should not enter the war almost from its onset. For Roosevelt, never a tremendous fan of Kaiser Wilhelm II, the atrocities of the German military against innocent Belgian civilians and the perceived violation of American maritime rights was sufficient to turn his initial, briefly neutral status to one of eager combatant. Through much of 1915 and 1916, Roosevelt kept up the attacks on President Woodrow Wilson, denouncing his foreign policies, urging U.S. involvement and offering his own services on the field of battle.¹

Speaking shortly after the sinking of the Lusitania and President Woodrow Wilson’s “Too Proud to Fight” declaration, Roosevelt let forth with a stream of invective, aimed in part at the president but also in response to comments made by Wisconsin’s Progressive Republican Senator Robert LaFollette’s mild justification for the sinking. Roosevelt declared: “I abhor Germany for having done it but I tell you my friends while I abhor the Hun without our gates, I abhor still more the Hun within our gates who apologizes for,
condones, excuses such infamy. That is the type of man who earns measureless contempt and scorn for our people on the other side.”

Although he had faint hopes of the being asked to run as the Republican candidate for president in 1916, that honor went to Charles Evans Hughes, one of the more lifeless characters ever to contest for the presidency. Roosevelt considered Hughes to be a “powerful, cold, selfish man” who would be little better than Wilson in the White House as he knew “nothing of war, and is both obstinate and narrow”. Moreover, Roosevelt fumed that Hughes’s “over caution, his legalism, his sluggish coldness of nature, and his sheer inability to grapple with great issues, [will make] him a complete failure.”

Roosevelt’s dislike for Hughes could not match his loathing for Wilson, a man the former president referred to as a “Byzantine logothete,” “exceedingly base,” with a soul “rotten through and through” and who possessed “merciless vindictiveness and malice.” That said, Roosevelt set to campaigning energetically for the former justice of the United States Supreme Court, urging that Hughes’ mildly stated need for preparedness far outstripped the president’s continuing call for neutrality beyond the ideological. Given the reticence of Americans towards entering the conflict, it is entirely possible that Roosevelt’s support of both Hughes and the war actually hindered the Republican cause.

The race proved an incredibly close one as voters struggled to discern a considerable difference between the two candidates, each of whom foreswore leading the nation into a European war. However, when the votes were finally tallied the Democrats’ “he kept us out of war” campaign marginally defeated Hughes’ tepid argument for preparedness and
mobility. Only with the passage of several days could the Democratic Party claim victory, 9.1 million votes to the GOP’s 8.5 million. Percentage figures made the margin appear all the more close: 49.2% v. 46.1%. Had only California voted to support Hughes, Wilson would have been a one-term president. Roosevelt could not claim to be happy, nor did he make the attempt.⁷

Efforts to the contrary, war did present itself to the United States with the resumption of German attacks on neutral vessels, whether merchant or passenger, and the interception of the Zimmerman note which encouraged Mexico to commence warfare against the United States, forcing a two-front war on the soon-to-be enemy, did not win friends to the Central Powers’ cause. Rather, taken as a whole, Wilson felt obliged to present a declaration of war to the United States Congress. Acting with celerity, Congress did so on April 6, 1917, Good Friday.

To Roosevelt’s dismay, but not his surprise, the war did not come with unanimity. While millions of individuals across the nation looked fondly upon Germany as their natal state, Irish partisans rooted for England’s comeuppance. Moreover, the “hyphenates” of the nation, came in for the wrath of the former president. According to Roosevelt, hyphenates had no place in American society. In a series of speeches delivered in 1917 and 1918, Roosevelt continuously called for an end to fifty-fifty Americanism, the elevation of English as the national language and loyalty but to the flag of the United States.⁸

Roosevelt maintained a special disdain for those representatives in the United States Congress who could not bring themselves to vote in support of the nation’s entry into the
war. When Congress offered up its tallies in support of Wilson’s call to war, fifty members of the House voted in opposition to the measure as did six members of the Senate. While opposition to the war could be found throughout the United States, representing pockets of passivism, German loyalists, Irish partisans, isolationists and socialists opposed to any war seemingly in support of capitalism, the largest body of opposition harkened from the Midwest and Great Plains. Republicans voting against the declaration of war included Senators Asle Gronna of North Dakota, Robert LaFollette of Wisconsin and George Norris of Nebraska, all states tainted with varying degrees of agrarian radicalism and more than a hint of Germanic heritage.

And although Roosevelt could have singled out any of the 56 legislators who had voted against American entry into the Great War, he targeted those he could clearly tie to the Nonpartisan League (NPL) and/or the Industrial Workers of the World (the IWW, or the “Wobblies”). Facing direct attack for their position were North Dakota’s Gronna, Wisconsin’s LaFollette and Minnesota’s Republican Representative Ernest Lundeen.

During his national speaking tour in the immediate aftermath of the war’s declaration, Roosevelt waved before his audiences a letter purportedly tying the NPL to the IWW and the cause of socialism. Moreover, Roosevelt declaimed that the letter, as well as the actions of the organizations, clearly revealed a disloyal, as opposed to an intellectual, opposition to the war.

LaFollette and Gronna solidified their positions as dangerous non-patriots during the People’s Council meetings of September 1917, held in St. Paul, Minnesota. LaFollete’s fiery
speech denouncing the war, calling for increased taxation on the wealthy in support of the war effort and a fervent attack on profiteering corporations brought him enthusiastic acclaim from the conventioneers as the meeting’s keynote speaker. In the immediate aftermath, he also received considerable acclaim from others opposed to the war.13

As he toured the Midwest and Great Plains on the 4th Liberty Loan drive in October 1918, Roosevelt could declare LaFollette, Gronna and Lundeen to be among the most sinister men in America. For as Roosevelt made his list of malefactors, he: “include[d] of course, according to their capacities, the shadow Huns, who dance with him when he dances. Shadow Huns like Gronna and Lundeen. I abhor them, but praise heavens they don’t represent the American people. I wish to heaven it were possible to give Senator LaFollette and his followers, the Shadow Huns, the Huns within our gates, over as a free gift to the Kaiser and while these men in khaki fight against the Huns without our gates let us war against the Huns within our gates.”14

Initially, Roosevelt supported the goals of the NPL, even welcoming them. Roosevelt recognized that the nation’s farmers found themselves in difficult times. Their concerns—political, economic, social, etc.—were real and in need of redress. Roosevelt, however, averred that those concerns must be addressed by methods beyond those of “state socialism”.15

Roosevelt may have turned from his early support for the Nonpartisan League due to his belief of its ties to the IWW and violent socialism, as well as poor advice. His old friend Gifford Pinchot urged him not to believe all that his cowboy friends from western
North Dakota told him of the organization. Moreover, according to Pinchot, Roosevelt’s listening to farm advice from a member of the Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce, could only be considered “exceedingly dangerous”. Farmers and ranchers varied considerably in their economic needs, a fact Roosevelt chose not to take into consideration.

TR’s support for the war ran deep almost from the moment of Franz Ferdinand’s dying breath. He encouraged his sons to commence training exercises run by his old friend General Leonard Wood at Plattsburgh, New York, over the summer of 1915. Ted, Jr., participated, as did young Quentin. Archie’s training for war started at Harvard with mandatory exercises, continuing on at Plattsburgh. Kermit made only a brief appearance at Wood’s camp.17

Richard Derby, TR’s son-in-law, spent the early days of the European war near Paris, serving as a volunteer physician at an American-sponsored makeshift hospital. Ethel Roosevelt Derby, the former president’s younger daughter, spent the early days of her marriage serving as a nurse, working beside her husband.18 Roosevelt’s elder daughter, Alice Roosevelt Longworth, remained aloof from the war in its early iteration, as did her husband Ohio Republican Congressman Nicholas Longworth, a man well past his prime in terms of battle, having been born in 1869. Daughter-in-law Eleanor, married to Ted, Jr., associated with the YMCA, becoming the first woman to arrive in the war zone under that organization’s auspices.19

When the war came to America in April 1917, the Roosevelt sons were not only ready to serve their nation, but were somewhat overeager to do so. Kermit finagled a
position as an honorary captain with the British army. Assigned to the Mesopotamian theatre of the war, he earned Britain’s Military Cross for a fool-hardy move that resulted in the capture of Turkish forces. Kermit later transferred to the American Expeditionary Force and served in France, distinguishing himself as an artillery commander at the Argonne, making the “old lion” proud.21

Archie was the first of the president’s sons to meet the “great adventure”.22 Severely wounded in March 1918, near the Marne-Rhine Canal, initial fears for his life fell to concerns for the preservation of his limbs. His father expressed the family’s pride before Archie received the Croix de Guerre, and many times thereafter.23

Later that summer of 1918, Ted, Jr., encountered his “great adventure”. Wounded and gassed, he was awarded America’s Silver Star and its Distinguished Service Cross, as well as France’s Croix de Guerre. While over two hundred of his comrades paid the ultimate price, young Ted refused to give up command of his battalion, or to be evacuated until the three-day assault at Cantigny had drawn to a close. His superiors declared Ted’s heroism to be unequaled.24

Perhaps the dearest of the Roosevelt children was the youngest: Quentin. Although but 19 years old and having somewhat imperfect vision, the handsome favorite of the family memorized the eye chart and joined the United States Army Air Service. Quentin departed for France following several months’ training. On July 10, 1918, he claimed his first victory in the air, downing a German plane. Of a previous dogfight in which his son had
engaged, Roosevelt wrote to daughter Ethel of his immense pride in the press reports of
Quentin’s feat. Whatever now befalls Quentin he has now had his crowded hour . . .” 25

It was, however, doubtful if she held this letter before Quentin engaged in a fatal
chase at Chamery. Two machine gun bullets to his head, and his plane crashed near the
front lines of the battle on July 14, 1918. Once they learned of the pilot’s identity, German
forces buried him with honor on the battlefield, but only after taking a number of ghastly
photographs of Quentin’s mangled body lying near his destroyed airplane. The photographs
would cause the paterfamilias immense sorrow in the remaining months of his life.26

Tentative news of Quentin’s death, couched initially as his being missing in action
after the downing of his plane, reached the Roosevelt family at Sagamore Hill just two days
following his loss. Once confirmed, Roosevelt offered a brief statement to the thronging
press outside his door. “Quentin’s mother and I are very glad that he got to the front and
had a chance to render some service to his country, and to show the stuff that was in him
before his fate befell him." 27

And although Roosevelt attempted to celebrate his son’s death in battle as a true
sign of manhood, he could be discovered on occasion staring into the nothingness,
murmuring “Poor Quinikens”, or offering to Kermit’s wife Belle Willard Roosevelt: “It is no
use pretending that Quentin’s death is not very terrible. . . . It is useless for me to pretend
that it is not very bitter to see that good, gallant, tenderhearted boy, leave life at its crest.”
As Quentin’s letters arrived from France even after his death, the wound freshened with
each delivery by the postman.28
On the public front, Roosevelt offered a number of remembrances of his son via his regular columns in the Kansas City *Star* and *Metropolitan Magazine*. Each column allowed Roosevelt to criticize President Wilson, a war effort he did not perceive to be sufficiently fervid, hyphenated Americans, slackers and “Shadow Huns”.  

Perhaps the best known of his columns appeared in the October issue of *Metropolitan*:

> Only those are fit to live who do not fear to die; and none are fit to die who have shrunk from the joy of life and the duty of life. Both life and death are parts of the same Great Adventure. Never yet was worthy adventure worthily carried through by the man who put his personal safety first. Never yet was a country worth living in unless its sons and daughters were of that stern stuff which bade them die for it at need; and never yet was a country worth dying for unless its sons and daughters thought of life not as something concerned only with the selfish evanescence of the individual but as a link in the great chain of creation and causation, so that each person is seen in his true relations as an essential part of the whole; whose life must be made to serve the larger and continuing life of the whole. Therefore it is that the man who is not willing to die, and the woman who is not willing to send her man to die, in a war for a great cause, are not worthy to live.  

> These are the torch-bearers; these are they who have dared the Great Adventure.

While clearly implying the sacrifices of his family, most particularly that of Quentin, the boy’s name was not mentioned.

The war played heavily on Roosevelt’s mind. And, accordingly, despite his increasingly infirm body, he promised to undertake a tour of several western and Midwestern states to encourage the 4th Liberty Loan. More vigorously than bond sales, he took to the platform to offer commentary on the course of the war, the president, the Democratic Party, and slackers, specifically those of a “hyphenated” nature. The guise of the Liberty Loan tour allowed Roosevelt to clear his mind and share his thoughts on matters
related to the Great War, patriotism, loyalty and the Nonpartisan League of the northern Great Plains.  

In a speech in Billings, Montana, October 5, 1918, Roosevelt let loose on the organization he had once felt common cause with: the Nonpartisan League. Before an audience of 7500, Roosevelt allowed that at one point he had held true sympathy for the causes of the League, its purposes and some of its methods. And it is feasible to see that the Progressive Party’s titular head in 1912 could have common cause with the socialistically inclined NPL with regard to powerful business concerns, an expanded electorate, improved working conditions for women and children, etc. In essence, Roosevelt and the NPL, in its early configuration, had played for the same team: improvement of an increasingly industrialized society in which people felt the crush of big business upon their bodies, minds and souls. The NPL that existed in the early autumn of 1918, when Roosevelt delivered his Billings speech, however, as well as ones in Bismarck and Minneapolis, was not yet the institution that would give the state its socialist taint. The legislature that would produce the state bank, state hail insurance, the homebuilders association, the state mill and elevator and the Industrial Commission, among other measures dubious to the maintenance of capitalism, had not yet been elected.  

It is clear that his speeches targeted not a socialist organization but rather one whose leadership railed against the war. That Montana had already met its quota for the Liberty Loan allowed Roosevelt considerable leeway to only briefly mention the need for continued funding for the war effort. Rather, the key portion of the October speeches
condemned the NPL for comforting and aiding German spies, a charge similar to one made in a recent Kansas City Star piece. In so far as the NPL dared,

\[
\text{the most prominent leaders of the league were playing the game of sedition and disloyalty, and that they were seeking to acquire power by pandering to and influencing the base spirit of greed and envy and ignorance and class hatred.}
\]

Referencing League founder A.C. Townley’s words against enlistment, Roosevelt roared “There is not a German abroad or a pro-German at home who does not wish success to the NPL under its present control.” Both the NPL and the Industrial Workers of the World should only be considered “anti-American” and should be “repudiated by every proud American”. Throughout his Liberty Loan tour of the west, he wore a black arm band in honor of his lost son.

Although Roosevelt could call to mind elements of the NPL’s socialistic agenda to bolster his new-found disdain for the organization, his declaration for Americanism, as well as for an end to hyphenated Americans and shadow Huns, brings to the forefront that his deep-seated and new-found hatred for the League might not be situated in the socialist program it had yet to implement. Indeed, in his speech at Billings, Roosevelt even offered that socialism had a place in the American economy with federal control of flour mills and elevators with terminal grain elevators conveniently located for the benefit of farmers.

Just days after his return to Oyster Bay, Roosevelt lashed out against the NPL in a letter to Gifford Pinchot. While including comments in opposition to its socialistic bent, he both started and concluded his rant against the League with charges of disloyalty, pacifism,
and pro-Germanism in the body’s leadership which would undoubtedly taint its farmer members. Its leadership, Roosevelt averred, should be stood up against a wall and shot. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota and Montana were particularly rife with disloyal elements.36

The Republican press offered up the reminders that Roosevelt did not need regarding his lost son, and the potential for future losses. In The Farmer and Townleyism: Carry the Truth to the People, Jerry Bacon, editor of the Grand Forks Herald, provided a collection of Townley’s statements against the war, particularly against the conscription of the farming and laboring classes at the expense of their lives, while those of the moneyed classes profited with their sons safely at home. According to Bacon, Townley urged a Devils Lake, ND, crowd on June 5, 1917, official registration day for the draft, and a single day later at Williston, ND:

The nation demands that you give yourselves and your sons and your brothers and your husbands and your sweethearts to be taken across the seas and spill their life’s blood on the fields of Europe and then comes to you and asks you to subscribe for the Liberty Bonds to pay for the expenses of the war. This is the injustice of the war and the manner in which officials of the administration are carrying into effect.37

The flower of the young manhood of this nation is going across the water to bleed, as we are told, for the honor this country, but it needs some effort for me to believe that these young men are going to fight for the freedom of democracy.38

Such words could scald the man who had sacrificed his own, most precious son, turning him against an organization he had once favored. The former president lashed out
in mourning, perhaps goaded along by advice from well-meaning friends, ignorant of the situation facing the nation’s farmers.

---
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Frank Farrar was elected governor of South Dakota at the age of 39. He served as governor of South Dakota from 1969 to 1971. On June 14, 2013 his life-size bronze statue was added to “The Trail of Governors” in a ceremony at Pierre along with statues of Harvey Wollman and William Janklow.¹ The statues of Arthur Mellette, Harlan Bushfield, and Walter Dale Miller were placed last year.

Frank Leroy Farrar was born in Britton, South Dakota on April 22, 1929. He became a Boy Scout which gave him a sense of citizenship and responsibility. He went on to become an Eagle Scout. He was later named a Distinguished Eagle Scout. He became a Scout Leader and Troop Chairman.²

Farrar represented Britton at Boys State and was elected Governor of Boys State. He was elected president of his high school student body and held the same office at the University of South Dakota where he earned a Bachelor of Science Degree in business in 1951, and his law degree from the School of Law in 1953. After graduation, he studied tax law at the University of Indiana. He worked his way through college as a janitor, dish washer, and bus boy. He was a swimming instructor and took part in intramural sports.³

Farrar joined the South Dakota ROTC his second year at USD and was commissioned a Lieutenant. He enlisted in the Army Reserve in 1949 and was on active duty during the
Korean conflict from 1953 until 1955 when it ended. He attained the rank of Captain in the U.S. Army Reserve.⁴

On June 3, 1953, Farrar and Patricia Henley were married at Fort Benning, Georgia. They met while both were attending USD. Five children were born to them: Jeanne, Sally, Mary, Anne, and Robert. Each one graduated from USD. Patricia taught at Summit high school. Later, she worked in her husband’s law office.⁵

After his discharge from the Army, Farrar worked for the Internal Revenue Service. It was 1957 when he returned to his hometown of Britton to practice law. He became president of the Young Republicans and the Marshall County Republican Party. He took flying lessons and logged over 17,000 hours of flying time.⁶ He served as Marshall County judge and states attorney from 1959 until 1962. He was elected president of the South Dakota State’s Attorneys Association. At the age of 33, Farrar was elected South Dakota attorney general. In 1963, the Young Republicans named Farrar, “The Man of the Year”. He became the first attorney general to be elected to a third term since 1930. In this election, he had the largest winning majority for any GOP state candidate. He was attorney general for South Dakota from 1963 until 1969 when he ran for governor.⁷

Farrar carried 61 counties in his bid for governor. He led all Republican candidates with 42,000 votes, a 58 percent margin over Robert Chamberlain, his Democratic opponent. He received considerable coverage in the press pointing to his reputation as independent of the Republican leadership and predicted a progressive and economy-minded administration.
On January 21, 1969, at the age of 39, Farrar addressed the Legislature as the state’s new governor and outlined a very ambitious legislative program. He believed that young people would remain in the state if jobs were available. He proposed efforts be accelerated to attract new businesses to South Dakota and to assist in the expansion of existing industries.

Farrar traveled to 25 states in search of new industries during 1969 and reported that 34 new businesses entered the state. In addition, 37 existing firms expanded their operations. Altogether, 2000 new jobs were created for South Dakotans.

Farrar recommended several reform measures. He proposed a revision of insurance laws to provide greater protection for policy holders, updating the state Banking Code, and changes in state labor laws. He called for lowering the voting age from 21 to 19. He also asked for the creation of a Division of Consumer Protection in the Office of the Attorney General.

The governor’s reception room is in the west wing of the Capitol’s second floor. The massive mahogany desk, conference table, couch, and chairs date back to 1910. Leather upholstery covers the couch and chairs. In 1969, the state Historical Society employees discovered the original governor’s desk and chair in a storage unit. Gov. Farrar sent the furniture to the State Penitentiary where inmates restored it. The governor signs special proclamations at that desk yet today.

Rural Electrification was at the forefront of news in the state. Farrar solved to resolve differences between private and public power companies. He suggested a Gas and
Electric Council to establish fair rates, settle territorial disputes between private and cooperative companies and protect consumer rights. Rumors began traveling throughout South Dakota suggesting that the governor was against rural electrification.

Farrar recommended an executive reorganization program and revision of the state constitution. He said, “We cannot run government in 1969 on the rule book of 1889.”Another major goal was that property tax should be a local decision, including consolidation of mill levies for local units of government such as cities and townships. Legislation was passed on a Vietnam veteran’s bonus, and easing nonresident waterfowl hunting restrictions.  

Farrar addressed the problem of tax reform. He asked for increased aid to education and property tax relief at the local level. He said could only be financed through a higher sales tax or some kind of income tax. He suggested the Legislature use the recommendation of the Papke Report which was a $20,000 study of tax alternatives. It was commissioned by the Legislature the previous year and conducted by Dr. James Papke of Purdue University. Its purpose was to devise an acceptable tax program that could be referred to the voters for approval. Many of the suggestions from the Papke Report were implemented.

Not knowing exactly where the money was going to come from, Farrar requested a 30 percent increase in aid to education and $1.6 million more than previously appropriated for institutions of higher learning and public welfare programs. To provide needed additional revenue, he recommended tax adjustments, including a broadening of the sales taxes. He concluded that his proposals would keep the state on a pay-as-you-go basis and
leave an estimated cushion of $3.1 million in the general fund.\textsuperscript{14} The \textit{Minneapolis Tribune} described Governor Farrar as “a progressive Republican” with “unflinchingly conservative economic views.” Farrar further stated that government is here to serve the people and not the other way around. By the time the 1969 Legislative session ended, 80 percent of Governor Farrar’s program had been enacted into law.\textsuperscript{15}

Some of these enactments included local municipal taxing powers, creation of a 13 member commission on Constitution Revision, a three-member Gas and Electric Council, lifting a non-resident waterfowl hunting ban, and authorizing a Vietnam veteran’s bonus. Legislators agreed to increase the sales tax from three to four cents along with higher excise tax on liquor and cigarettes.\textsuperscript{16}

A bill creating a Gas and Electric Council was passed in the Senate. Three South Dakota newspapers conducted a poll and the result indicated that public opinion was divided and the measure was to be put on the 1970 election ballot. Republicans in the House sponsored a bill to repeal the statute. This eliminated the need for the issue to be placed on the November ballot. This also prevented a full study of the proposal by the people in order to make an intelligent decision and a chance to vote on it.

Farrar raised a few eyebrows when he suited up and played basketball on the Pierre Governor’s high school basketball team and participated in pre-game warm-up activities. He exercised by swimming in the Missouri River and took to the field during hunting season. Farrar enjoyed running and other outdoor sports.
In his State of the State message to the 1970 Legislature, Farrar outlined a multi-point program for making the 1970’s a “Decade of Development” for South Dakota. He pointed out his goals as:

1. Increasing job opportunities in new and existing industries.
2. Providing parity of opportunity for farmers and ranchers.
3. Expanding tourism, the travel industries, and recreational opportunities.
4. Shaping state and local government to provide more services with less administrative expense and fewer employees.
5. Continuing to meet the great challenges of health, education, welfare, and human services programs.
6. Continuing with unity of purpose to achieve solid growth. 

Some of Farrar’s initiatives backfired politically, most importantly, a measure to create a Gas and Electric Council. Viewing the law as a direct challenge to their operations, the rural electric association cooperatives in the state reacted strongly to the measure and led the effort to get the law appealed. The REA’s influence played strongly in the next election. At this time in South Dakota, rural electrification was important to farmers, ranchers, and rural communities in the state. Richard Kneip spoke out against the proposed Gas and Electric Council initiative at the National Farmers Union Convention which was held in Huron, South Dakota. This speech caused many citizens to question the feasibility of such a council and it activated more rumors. Farrar was never against rural electrification. He did want it to be done in a fair and equitable manner.

Republican Frank Henderson and Democrat Richard Kneip announced they would be candidates for governor in 1970. Farrar won nomination over Henderson in the June
primary with more than 58 percent of the GOP vote. The unpopular Gas and Electric Council law, although repealed, had cost Farrar considerable public support. His desire to regulate electric cooperative utilities may have cost him the election.

An editorial in the *Rapid City Journal* summarized Farrar’s term as governor in the following words: “Farrar earned his job by aggressiveness as attorney general. Farrar was a hard-working and industrious chief executive.” Farrar brought life, growth, jobs, and physical exercise to our citizens.

Farrar enjoyed the beauty of the Capitol grounds. By 1970, there was dwindling gas in the water feeding the Capitol’s Flaming Fountain which caused the groundskeeper to consider capping the well, but Gov. Farrar suggested that the Flaming Fountain become part of the memorial honoring fallen soldiers. Brookings Sen. John Bibby, whose son had been killed in Vietnam, initiated the funding. The proposal would take 16 years to become a reality. The Flaming Fountain makes the Veterans’ Memorial more special and gives children a chemistry lesson as well.

Farrar and his family returned to Britton, where he went on to practice law after leaving the Capitol. He continues to be active in the banking business and takes responsibility for civic affairs. He considers some of his accomplishments to be reforms in the insurance industry, improvements in the state’s economy, and success in protecting consumers from special interests. He said that he hoped he had contributed to the betterment of the state and encouraged others to climb a little higher mountain.
Others have said he revived some of the populist spirit when as attorney general he took on insurance, securities, and utility interests. His concern for the average consumer won him a great deal of grassroots support that contributed to his gubernatorial triumph in 1968. His tell-it-like-it-is manner angered certain power brokers, but he had the courage of his convictions and that is what is important.

In 1992, at age 63, Farrar was diagnosed with non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma and given two months to live. He was doing triathlons then and asked his doctor if he could continue doing them. His doctor said, “If you feel like it, go ahead”. He kept doing triathlons while they were giving him chemo and in six months, his cancer went into remission. He has been cancer-free ever since.

In 2006, Farrar finished the Florida Ironman in less than 17 hours. The ultra-distance at the Ironman triathlon includes a 2.4-mile swim, 112-mile bike ride, and a 26.2-mile marathon. When asked why he does it, he said, “Because it saved my life”.

---
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Anna Thompson: A Prairie Woman's Journey through the Great War Years
Myron Sougstad

Anna Thompson, was an artist, a school teacher, a single homesteader, and a farmer's wife who shunned most of the traditional roles of women in her era. She was a graceful, well educated, and talented lady who was loved and admired by everyone who knew her. Clearly she was a person who followed her heart and her dreams without fear. During the Great War Years 1910-1920, Anna was in the prime of her life. In 1909, at the age of 29, she married Emil Sougstad a former student who was 9 years younger. All of her children were born during this decade. This was a very unique time on the northern plains. Hard times of the past decades gave way to new economic prosperity. The automobile became the mode of transportation and social changes were taking place. Anna's life during this very unique era on the great plains was framed by her earlier life experiences and life during this era shaped many of the events in her life in the subsequent decades.

Anna kept post card correspondence, photos, and paintings from her earlier days as a single homesteader as well as a daily diary, photos, and paintings from her life during the 1910-1920 era. From these we are able to gain an insight into her journey through the Great War Years.

1880-1890 Childhood on the Homestead in Hanson County Dakota Territory

Anna was born in Hull Iowa in January 1880. Anna parents, her grandmother and older brother had emigrated from Norway in 1876 to join Anna's uncle in Hull Iowa. By this time, all of the homestead opportunities in that area had been taken. These were times of
extreme hardship as a grasshopper infestation ruined crops for more than 3 years. Anna's father Erick Thompson supported the family with his profession as a shoemaker. Anna, her 2 brothers, mother, and grandmother joined her father in 1882 on the homestead in Plano township about 15 miles northeast of Mitchell. Her father had gone to South Dakota 18 months earlier to establish the claim and build a sod shanty. The family wrote about the crowded conditions and some of the hardships of living in a sod shanty. For example they tell of snakes falling through the roof, and the inside of the shanty being either wet at times or very dusty. By 1885, there were 8 people living in the sod shanty.

The weather had a big impact on the lives of the families who attempted to till the region of tall prairie grass with few if any trees. For the settlers arriving in the early 1880's, there was no historical weather data that would make them aware of cyclical weather patterns and the extreme fluctuations that existed on the northern plains. Coming from Norway, where they lived with more proximity to oceans, the weather had less fluctuation.

The period from 1880-1890 was of above average rainfall, and unusually moderate weather provided ideal growing conditions for that region. To some degree, it was a sense of false security for the earliest settlers. Wheat yields in the newly tilled farm land were excellent. In 1886 with several years of good crops and prices, and with supplies coming via the railroad, Erick was able to build a wood frame house in. The family did endure hardships of that era, including massive prairie fires and the blizzard of 1888. Because the grade school Anna and her siblings were attending was just across the road, they were able to get home safely in the blizzard. Some neighbors were not as fortunate.
Settlers and business people were arriving in mass. During this era, the city of Mitchell grew from 320 in 1881 to 2200 in 1890.

1890-1900 Growing to Adulthood

Times became much more challenging during this decade. The above average rainfall and good growing conditions of the 1880s gave way to the reality of the cyclical nature of weather on the great plains. From 1893-1899, the region suffered from a severe drought. The depression of 1893 brought lower farm prices and railroad failures caused high shipping costs for the farmers. During this time frame a sizable number of farmers failed. Erick was able to keep going with the large family on the homestead because he had the skill of a shoemaker he had learned in Norway. This provided a much needed supplement to the farm income.

Anna finished the eighth grade at a one room school and at the age of 14, she took on the role of a teaching assistant at the school. One of her 5 year old students, Emil Sougstad, would later become her husband.

Anna wanted to further her education. Because their farm was almost 15 miles from Mitchell, it was not possible to ride a horse to and from school every day. Anna moved into Mitchell to a boarding house and attended Mitchell High School, graduating in 1899. Most of the young women in her situation did not have the opportunity to finish high school, but Anna was determined.

In 1899, her older brother Andrew who was in the Service in the Philippines contacted malaria and died in 1900.
**1900-1909 Adventures of young adulthood**

Anna was not satisfied with just a high school diploma. She enrolled at Dakota Wesleyan and attended one year of normal school to get a teaching credential. She returned to the farm where she taught school for four years at a local one room school. In 1904, her father passed away at the age of 54.

With her interest in art and music, Anna wanted to further her education. In 1905 she returned to DWU and graduated in 1907 with a degree in Art. Few women from the rural life were able to complete a college education, but with her interest in art, she was determined to follow her dream.

In 1906, 26 year old Anna began dating 17 year old Emil Sougstad. Neither of them ever dated anyone else.

In September 1907, a minister from Artesian visited their local church and told them of the homestead opportunities in Western South Dakota (Meade Co.) Anna was fascinated by the thrill of this adventure and within two weeks, she had made arrangements with the County Superintendent to be gone for a week to travel to Meade County and stake a claim. There was no hesitation on her part. Anna was dating Emil, but Emil was attending college at DWU and while she was 27, he was only 18. Anna, in her dairy makes no mention of the age difference, only expressing concern that it would be some time before they would build their future.

She also convinced her brother and two of her single girl friends to join her. The goal was to find adjacent quarters of land and build their shacks at the intersection. In her
diary of September 22, 1907 she writes: "Went to church and S.S. with Emil. Preacher here to supper, talked land and have now decided to go out sixty miles from Rapid City to file instead of out to Pierre. Played and sang after supper. Went to church with Emil in evening. Almost had a runaway"

On September 30, 1907, Anna and her friends boarded the train for Wasta. She writes "Went to Mitchell at 4:30 (PM). Got to Wolsey at 6:45. Waited there till 10:15. Got to Pierre at 1:20 (AM). Had to ride on the platform part way, such a crowd. 15 in our party. Got to bed at 2:45." On Tuesday October 1, they crossed the Missouri by ferry to Fort Pierre and boarded a train to Wasta. They had to purchase 3 tickets, one from Mitchell to Wolsey, Wolsey to Pierre, ferry across the Missouri to Fort Pierre, then take the train to Wasta. According to her diary, she paid $1.31 for the ticket to Wolsey and $3.40 for the ticket from Wolsey to Pierre.

On October 1, 1907, they were transported via wagon by a "spotter" to potential claim sites near Bonita Springs, over 25 miles north of Wasta. They were able find available claims, however Anna did express some disappointment in her quarter section. In her diary on October 2, 1907 she writes" Fine morning. North west wind in p.m. chilly. Got up at 6:00. Our party drove over country & selected quarters to file on. Feel rather blue about mine. Got to bed at 9." After returning to Wasta the next day, they stayed overnight and then took the train to Rapid City to validate availability and file the actual claim. The railroad connecting Rapid City to Pierre had just been completed in July of 1907 and regular service had begun in early September 1907. The railroad connecting Rapid City to Fort
Pierre had been built from the west. Anna wrote of seeing Indian camps in Rapid City and of climbing a hill in the city to a point where Mt Harney was clearly visible. At this time the population of Rapid City was around 2500, which was about half the population of Mitchell.

Two days later, the girls made the return trip to Mitchell. Anna returned to finish her teaching contract.

In March of 1908, Anna and her girl friends along with Anna's brother Oscar, returned to the claim and immediately built their shanties. Anna retained all of the post cards she wrote to Emil and other family and friends and all of the cards she received. She also took several photos of the homestead at various times and she painted pictures of the sod shanties.

Her post cards depict many of her experiences. On one occasion she writes. "Today I killed my first rattle snake" On another she writes of making a trip into Wasta for supplies. On August 3, 1908 she writes, "Am in Wasta today. Got very tired after that long ride. We three girls came down with Ernest. We will go back tomorrow. We have vowed never to go to town again out here. It is too far. It took all day to get across this country and it was an extremely rough ride. I doubt that I will make this trip again" Later she also wrote, "It is almost impossible to turn this land over. It is difficult to get any garden to grow." I do believe she found the soil a lot less friendly than the soil in eastern South Dakota. The summer of 1908 was a year of above average rainfall in Meade County, but still hard to grow crops.
She also wrote several cards to Emil as they planned for him to come out for a visit. Emil made the trip to visit her in late September of 1908.

In late November, 1908 she returned to Mitchell, having spent 1 year on the homestead, so it was now hers for a small fee. She would have had to remain much longer to get it completely free. She never expressed any regrets for the experience. In one of her postcards dated Oct 8, 1908, she mentions "I am going to hate to leave this place." Several months later in her 1909 dairy, she mentions that she had been talking to a friend about other homestead opportunities. She truly enjoyed the adventures.

In late 1908, Emil was dating her regularly and was very persistent in his courtship. In her dairy December 26, 1908, she writes of getting her ring from Emil, but also expressed her thoughts that it might be too soon.

In her dairy in January 1909, Anna describes how Emil is anxious to get a date for a wedding set soon. In February, she writes. "Tonight I am going to talk to Emil about delaying a date for at least 6 more months" Emil had finished three years at DWU, but did not enroll in the fall of 1908 for his senior year, because he was intent on marrying Anna. Anna felt that Emil's parents, while they did not express any concern over the age difference, would be disappointed if Emil did not finish college and become a Methodist minister as Emil's father had hoped. Anna was 29 years old and she would be marrying a 20 year old man. Anna never expressed any written thoughts about this unusual difference in age. If she had any concerns, she kept them to herself.
However Emil was determined and somewhat reluctantly she agrees to a date in April. She writes in her dairy of her reluctance. "I am not sure this is the right time yet".

The wedding date is set for April 8, 1909.

In her dairy she writes of the planning and preparation for the wedding. Her primary focus is on getting her clothes prepared, decorating the home, and planning the meal. She writes of the wedding day. "Emil's eyes are filled with tears as we recite the vows. I notice Mom is crying too, but I held mine back"

The wedding ceremony was described in detail in the Fulton Advocate. Some of the excerpts from that article" At noon, today at the handsome home of Mrs. E. Thompson occurred one of the prettiest weddings every held in the County, when her only daughter, Anna R. was given in marriage to Emil B. Sougstad. Following the ceremony and congratulations of the assembled friends, the guest gathered around the banquet board and enjoyed a full course dinner. A feature of the dinner was the hand painted souvenir menu cards, the work of the bride, which was found by the plate of each guest. The bride is a lady of many and varied accomplishments. She is a graduate of Mitchell High School and of the Dakota Wesleyan University. She has had the successful experience as a school teacher. She is a musician of ability and presides at the organ at the Farewell Church. The groom is the eldest son of Mr. Thomas Sougstad, a prominent and successful farmer. He spent three years at the D.W.U. He is a young man of exemplary habits and by industry and thrift has a farm and home furnished by his bride. Both bride and groom are actively indentified with social and Church affairs of the neighborhood and are favorites with all the
young people. It is rare in life that a young couple start out in life with as bright prospects for comfort, happiness and success as do Mr. and Mrs. Sougstad."

**1910-1920 The Great War Years-her greatest years**

Anna settled into married life and the support of her family. At the time of their marriage, Emil's father, having been very successful, paid $4000 for a neighboring farm and gave it to them as a wedding gift. Their first son Milton was born in 1910. Anna writes "The birth happened so quickly. By the time Emil got back with the doctor, Milton was already born"

A second son Edgar was born in 1914 and Ruby was born in 1919 when Anna was 39. In 1912, Anna donated two acres from her homestead in Meade county to build a local church, and in 1914, Anna sold the homestead. With the sale of the homestead, they were able to purchase an additional 80 acres of adjacent land in Hanson County. Since Emil's father had passed away in 1911, they also were farming his 320 acres of land. They had a large farm for that era.

This was, for farmers, probably the best and most prosperous decade of farming in South Dakota. The weather was void of any significant droughts and the price for wheat was over $2 per bushel for years of 1917, 1918, and peaked at 2.16 per bushel in 1919. In contrast, the price of wheat was $2.55 in 2000, and to be on parity with CPI, wheat would have to be around $30 per bushel today to equate to current buying power. The war in Europe had created a huge demand for crops.
With this prosperity, the farmers flourished. Anna and Emil built a very large home and a complete set of new and modern farm buildings. Their new home was a large 4 bedroom house with large rooms, several porches and two fire places.

Anna writes numerous times in her dairy about how their life is a dream life. Since they had experienced many of hardships of prairie life, life during this decade was almost like a dream to them. Their hard work was amply and consistently rewarded, to a degree they had never experienced before. On a comparative basis, life had become almost easy. It seemed as if the earlier hardships were now only a memory.

There life was focused on the family and centered to a great degree around their church and community. They lead a disciplined life; had a balanced diet, avoided alcohol completely and took care of their health, both physically and mentally. Anna writes in her dairy many of the deep conversations she has with her young son Milton about old age, death and dying, and speculation about heaven. Clearly he is a favorite child.

On the flip side, the urban population, particularly those in the large areas, suffered due to the high cost of food. Wages had not kept up and high costs meant very difficult times for those in urban areas.

During this era the methods of farming began to shift more to new equipment and the mode of transportation shifted from horse and wagon to the automobile. They purchased their first automobile in 1913.

In some aspects, the role of women was changing. In 1918, South Dakota became one of the early states to allow women to vote. This was changing the role of women.
Anna worked hard to support the farm, but she also found time to do more paintings. These paintings became more complex, colorful and advanced.

It was like life was always improving and the experiences and prosperity were quite different from her earlier life. Mitchell grew to a prosperous city of over 8000, and with the automobile it was now easy for them to enjoy all the city offered. They were able to experience many of the cultural events that took place. Construction was started on the new and final Corn Palace Building which provided name entertainment during the Corn Palace festival. It was a time of great change and great prosperity. Anna and Emil worked very hard on their farm. They supported their community and their church. Quietly they were very generous to those less fortunate, a tradition my father carried on his entire life.

1920-1930 Good Times Continue

During this decade, farm prices dropped significantly from the high levels of the late 1910s to be at about half of what they had been. The farmers had adequate income, but not the levels of the previous decade. Costs were rising and farmers were taking on debt to invest in expansion and new farm equipment such as tractors and other machinery. The prosperity of the previous decade eliminated all of the fear of taking on debt to expand. It was very easy to borrow money, probably too easy. Emil and Anna were making these investments as well. They even provided their oldest son with a new car during his junior year in high school.
The nation, as a whole, however was doing much better than the previous decade. In June of 1924, the extremes of South Dakota weather impacted Emil and Anna. A tornado struck their farm, doing extensive damage to the farm house and completely destroying all of the modern farm buildings. The loss was huge, far beyond any insurance compensation, but they were not discouraged. They wrote of the loss, but also spoke of all of the blessings, the family was safe and they did not lose any of their farm animals.

In 1926, Anna and Emil, along with their two youngest children, made a trip to the Black Hills and as part of that journey, Anna returned to the homestead site in Meade County where she visited many old friends and took several pictures.

In 1929, Anna took her 75 year old mother to California to live with Anna's single brother.

The family lived well and they continued to be active in the Methodist church, where Anna was the organist and a Sunday School teacher. Anna continued her paintings.

**1930-1940 A crushing decade**

This decade on the great plains gave the farmers a quadruple whammy. As a result of the great depression, crop prices dropped to as low as 20% of their 1919 levels. This drop in prices was combined with the most severe drought of the century. Land prices fell dramatically.

Farmers struggled and without crops or prices there was little income. Bank failures meant many lost savings. Anna and Emil lost money in failed banks.
Anna and Emil lost their farm due to foreclosure to an insurance company, but were allowed to remain on the farm as tenants. All of the adult children were now living at home.

Anna's spirit was slow to break; she continued to show courage and independence. In 1935, she took 3 months to go to California to visit her mother. She wrote back about her love for South Dakota and her optimistic outlook for the future. There was still belief that times of prosperity would return, but such was not the case.

In 1938, Anna, at the age of 58, independent of her husband and children, abandoned her involvement in the Methodist church where she had been a pianist, organist and Sunday School teacher for over 40 years and joined a nontraditional religious organization. This had a big impact on the family as so many of the established family traditions were no longer part of her life. Her commitment to this new found religious belief was strong. This did not impact her love of her family nor her family's love for her. As always in her life, she was never afraid to follow her spirit.

In 1940, Anna developed a bleeding ulcer and was hospitalized with surgery. She died two days later at the age of 60. The family was devastated. Possibly she could have survived. In her typical determined way, she would face death with no fear rather than compromise what she believed.

6 weeks later, Emil died at the young age of 51. Many said he died of a broken heart, losing the woman he adored. While her death and the situation surrounding it was a very emotional event for the family, they all preferred to not dwell on that, but rather to
focus on the loving, caring, and talented mother she was. I believe they understood that
their mother was a complex, strong, loving, courageous and independent person and they
fully respected and made peace with her decision. I have spoken to many people who
knew her and everyone had the utmost respect and admiration for this lady.

Shortly after Emil's death, the family had to leave the farm. My father was able to
purchase 320 acres of land about 9 miles from the homestead.

Anna's Legacy

Since I was born several years after her death, I only know her through photos, her
paintings, her writings and her reputation. She was a very talented artist, musician and
with her courage and spirit, she was non conventional and without fear. She was relentless
in her pursuit of education, in her pursuit of adventure, in her pursuit of art, in her devotion
to her family. She had no fear or concern with any decision she made, including the
decision to marry a man 9 years her junior. In her life she experienced the greatest era of
prosperity (the Great War Years), and the worst era in great plains history (the Great Depression). I see some of her in my father, a talented violinist, and a kind and caring
gentleman. I see some of her sense of adventure, curious nature and loving spirit in my
siblings and my children and grandchildren. Clearly the pursuit of education carried on.
Nearly all of her grandchildren have a college education and several have advanced
degrees. The same is true of her great grandchildren. We have her paintings; many are
scattered amongst her grandchildren, and we plan to get them assembled together as a
part of her legacy.
The story is told that when my grandmother, Ida Nellie Gaines, was just a little girl, she scooped up her older sister Mary who had fallen headfirst into a cased up spring, saving her life. At age four, Ida begged to go to school with Mary and their brother Herman, after visiting several times. With family and teacher in agreement, Ida started school. She quickly learned to read and, while still quite young, she frequently won school “spell-downs.” Like others, though, she “sometimes got in on school fights during recess” that simply started with, “Let’s get mad at her,” or “Let’s get mad at those kids.”

With her family, Ida attended church services: church and Sunday School at the nearby Methodist Church, and often another Sunday School in the afternoon, followed by an evening service where they heard fervent Free Methodist preaching. In the week that followed, Ida and her sisters amused themselves by crafting “paper folks” who preached gospel sermons and

---

1 Ida Gaines McIntosh interviewed by Lucile McIntosh for biographical sketch, written February 15, 1929
copied the “carryings-on of the church people.”

Sometimes Arvilla discarded the paper families, only to find that Ida and her sisters simply made new ones!

This kind of spunk served Ida well in her youth, when her parents decided in 1900 to leave their farm home near Maquoketa, Iowa, to migrate west to the new State of South Dakota. By selling their land at a good profit, they could take part in something big and new.

Many people from the east were land hungry, and felt their hopes for a better future lay in “the bigger picture, the grander West.”

The family boarded a relatively fast and comfortable train to travel across the ambling Iowa prairie into Dakota.

Now at sixteen, Ida wondered what her future held as the train pulled away from the Maquoketa station. Staying behind were grandparents, aunts and uncles, cousins and friends—people she had known all her life. When would she see them again? Especially, her friend Emory “E.Y.” Roland, whose attentions she had just begun to enjoy?

New adventures lay ahead, too. Maybe she could teach school, marry a young homesteader, or “prove up” a claim herself! What would she find on this new pathway as she moved into womanhood?

2 Ibid.
3 Wayne Fanebust, presenter/author, The Nobles Road, Dakota Conference 2010, Augustana College, Sioux Falls, SD
Ida had lots of company with whom to share her thoughts. Sister Mary hoped for a homestead someday with her new husband, Fred Cropsey, in the “West River” country, that Dakota land west of the Missouri River.4 Some said that Mary “would follow that Fred Cropsey anywhere.”5 Herman, at nineteen, not much interested in farming, had heard that the banks in Mitchell were looking for trustworthy employees. Lovely Ella, now a young lady at fourteen years, and spunky Nora, at age twelve, could talk up a storm wherever they were. All felt safe in the company of their strong parents, Andrew and Arvilla, who had faced many challenges on the Iowa prairies. It was hardest for them to leave behind elderly parents and the little graves of infant twin sons, Fred and Frank.

Upon arrival in South Dakota, the Gaines family started farming near the village of Mt. Vernon, twelve miles west of Mitchell. The next summer, two days a week, Herman and Ida peddled their bicycles into Mitchell to attend Dakota University (later named Dakota Wesleyan University), founded a few years earlier by Methodist settlers.6

Soon the family moved to a modest home in the fast-growing city of Mitchell.

---

4 Thompson, Harry F., ed., Herbert Hoover and John E. Miller, contributors, A New South Dakota History, published 2005 by The Center for Western Studies, Augustana College, Sioux Falls, SD
5 Juanita Warfel, phone interview with Carol J. Swanson, c. 2000
At Eliason Photography there, the five siblings lined up to have their picture taken.

In July of 1901, Ida took two weeks of teacher training, receiving a “Certificate of Attendance and Promotion.” In 1902, she earned yet another certificate, signed by Supt. O. W. Coursey, and secured a teaching job in the rural community of Emsley, for the fall and winter months.

Ida received her room and board with a German family in Emsley. On the first night, her hostess took Ida upstairs by the light of a kerosene lamp. In the lamplight, Ida noticed the feather bed...two mattresses...with no bedding! Suddenly the lady left, taking with her the only lamp, leaving Ida completely in the dark! There was nothing to do but slide in between the mattresses and try to sleep!  

Ida’s friend Emory from Maquoketa, congratulated her on her new job.

---

7 Original certificate 1901, Davison County Teachers’ Institute, Mitchell, SD
8 Ida McIntosh to Lucile McIntosh, 1929
“Dearest Ida of the Wild West,

“Again I take the pleasure of writing you a few lines although it may be a
little soon. ...We have been awfull busy...we got our hay up Tuesday and my
vacation has been one of toil instead of rest...I am glad you have got the
school you wanted and 30.00 a month is nice. But a good little Girl deserves
a good little job...”

Ida had already received several letters from her friend Emory in the summer of 1902.

“Dear Friend....If you think Henry won’t care, I
will write you a few lines and if he don’t like it
just put it in the stove....Your friend, E.Y.”

One described a trip to Michigan by way of Chicago on the train:

“....We had a most beautiful run around the
southern end of Lake Michigan. This is the first time
I have ever been permitted to see so mutch watter
that I couldn’t see across it....it is fine for one who
has never seen the lake to take a run along it over
the ‘Michigan Central.’ It looks as if the sky came
down into the water...Please don’t forget to write
soone. Your Friend, E.Y.”

You can see the significance of the handwritten letter as a way of communicating in
the early 1900s. The penmanship is remarkable! For most people, it was not that easy to
travel even a few miles to see someone. What a difference a good road and a fast car might
have made to Henry “Hank,” another suitor who wrote to Ida from Mt. Vernon.

9 Excerpt of Emory R. letter to Ida Gaines, August 8, 1902
10 Letter excerpt, Emory R. to Ida Gaines, June 8, 1902
11 Letter excerpt, Emory R. to Ida Gaines, July 2, 1902
“Dear old girl. I thought I would scribble you a few lines...I intended to come to Mitchell last night but I was so busy harvesting and couldn’t spare the time. This is Monday & I am home taking a rest. I am working for Will and Norman Welch through harvest...getting $2.25 a day...I am going to commence threshing about a week from tomorrow. Oh I wish I could see you today Ida but I can’t reach you. I will try to be in next sunday if I can......I think of you every day Ida. I dream of you at night...I went to a dance a week ago......and had an awful good time......wish you could have been there too. Yours as ever, Henry B.”

Ida’s brother-in-law, Fred Cropsey, worked for Argo and Sweeney, a real estate company that bought land relinquishments from homesteaders who had tried to make it work... out on the Dakota plains. Lots of young men trekked west to work for the land companies. One of them was Charles Cyrus McIntosh, who also found a job with Argo and Sweeney. Charlie had gone west by himself when quite young, leaving his parents and four brothers back on the family farms near Dodgeville, Wisconsin. He did not want to be counted among those who were “born, married, and died in one county.” Through Charlie’s work he got to know Fred Cropsey. We believe it was Fred who introduced his sister-in-law Ida to Charlie McIntosh at a barn dance. Charlie and Ida grew to know one another quite well in the months that followed. But letters kept coming to Ida from Emory... this one from the Advance Hotel in Maquoketa, written on November 14, 1902.

12 Letter excerpt, Henry B. to Ida Gaines, August 3, 1902
13 Lucile M. Turner to Carol Jean Swanson, family account
14 Ibid.
“Dearest Ida,
Your letter at hand and I will try and answer today....I got sick on the road and had to come home... I had a little touch of the pneumonia... I am glad you got my picture....”

And a month later Emory wrote from Montezuma, Iowa...

“Dear Friend Ida,
I wrote you a long time ago, but have never had any reply. Thought perhaps you failed to get it ...We have a lot of snow here and are using a sleigh every day. What is the reason you didn’t write to me? Is your other fellow like Hank? Don’t he want you to write to me anymore? ...”

In 1903, Charlie “Mac” wrote letters to Ida, too. On April 2...

“Dear Little Girl....
......Will see what I can do in writing. I haven’t any news... had a dream last night, and that I had started smoking again, and I felt awful bad. Woke up this morning and found out it was a dream, so then I was alright. Will tell you what Ed said when I see you....Well, I will tell you some of it now. He said if we got hooked up this fail, he would make us a present of 20 bushels of potatoes, and he will have lots of onions. You can have the onions and I will eat the potatoes. Won’t that be nice? Guess we won’t starve for awhile anyway. Well, Little Girl, I don’t know of any more to write... ......will see you Saturday night. How is Ella and Nora? Suppose you girls are having a big time. Bye, bye, Little Girl....
...from your Loving Friend, ‘Little Mac.’ ”

15 Letter excerpt from Emory R. to Ida Gaines, November 14, 1902
16 Letter excerpt from Emory R. to Ida Gaines, December 14, 1902
17 Letter excerpt from Charlie McIntosh to Ida Gaines, April 2, 1903
By the end of the year Charlie gave Ida an engagement watch. It was all over for Emory, who acknowledged his loss from the Pierce Hotel in Yankton in May of 1903.

“Dearest Friend Ida,
I suppose I am wrong in writing to you and never expect to get a reply. If I had not been so slow last spring I could have had a better chance, couldn’t I. But I didn’t want to be so fast with you. You are a nice bright honest little Girl and one that any man could and should be proud of. I have often thought I would like to be more than a friend to you...
Your friend Emory.”

While Charlie and Ida made plans to marry, more Sioux lands opened up for settlement west of the Missouri River. In 1905 Charlie and Fred got wind that the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul railroad line was finally making firm plans to come across the Missouri River from Chamberlain. This idea attracted even more landseekers.

Fred and Mary, Herman, Ida, and Charlie decided that now was the time to get in on the action. They made the 140-mile trip from Mitchell to Lyman County the first time by stagecoach, the next time in “just a rattle-trap buggy,” reaching land north of Presho, which was “merely a hitching post... two stores and a post office.” In filing a claim, the idea was to buy government land at $1.25 an acre, fence in an area, cultivate a crop, and stay on the
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18 Letter excerpt from Emory R. to Ida Gaines, May 10, 1903
19 Ida Gaines’ April 5, 1905 claim file, original document, U. S. Department of the Interior
20 Ida Gaines McIntosh Matson interviewed by daughter Lucile M. Turner, 1943
land for at least fourteen months. If you toughed it out five years, and “proved up” the claim by showing evidence of settlement and cultivation, your land would be free.\textsuperscript{21}

Ida had just turned twenty-one when on April 5, 1905, she filed for 160 acres in Grouse Creek Township, and became what was known as a “girl homesteader.”\textsuperscript{22} Herman chose land right across the road from his sister Ida. Fred and Mary Cropsey settled a mile and a quarter southeast. And Charlie McIntosh staked his own claim just a mile and a quarter away from Ida’s place. Her South Dakota journey took a new turn.

One of the first things to do was build a house on each person’s claim. Ida’s was typical of 1900s Dakota homestead design. An improvement over the old sod shanties, she later described it as “a large structure” at ten by twelve feet, sporting a gabled roof and two windows, “papered on the inside with newspaper and on the outside with shiplap...a very presentable habitat.”\textsuperscript{23}

Herman’s crop of corn brought in fifty bushels per acre that first year, and he planted a garden in the firebreak. He also managed to craft a handmade quilt during the fourteen months he stayed on his claim.

The Grouse Creek school hosted community church services. Neighbors practiced western hospitality. It was “very common to go visiting, taking along a jar of buckwheat

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{23} Lucile M. Turner to Floyd G. McIntosh, “Dear Brother in Blue” letter, September 7, 1943
“Dominoes ranked high” among the family’s amusements, and community celebrations included the Lyman County Fair and an “old settlers’ picnic.”

Charlie carried an address book in his pocket, with instructions...

“in case of sickness or accident notify Miss Ida Gaines, Presho, Lyman Co, So Dak and James McIntosh, Dodgeville, Iowa Co, Wis”

and under the letter I.....he placed a lock of Ida’s hair.

Charlie’s 1907 Presho Bank ledger lists by name the horses he sold: Ally, Nancy, Soo, Dock...50, 75, or 100 dollars. Water for the animals was difficult in winter. Charlie had to “cut large blocks of snow he melted in the house to give to the stock.” They all contended with exposure to cold, carrying water, dealing with “so much gumbo” and “everything that goes with the life of the pioneer.”

They watched the town of Presho “build up” when the railroad finally got there. Town lots sold fast, and hotels sprang up overnight. It was said that one man “died for joy the day the railroad came through.”

---

24 Turner to F. McIntosh, “Dear Brother in Blue”
25 Leather address book owned by Charlie McIntosh, c. 1903
26 Presho, South Dakota, bank book owned by Charlie McIntosh, c. 1907
27 Turner to McIntosh, “Dear Brother in Blue”
28 McIntosh Matson to Turner, 1943
29 Turner to McIntosh, “Dear Brother in Blue”
In 1906, Andrew Gaines was in on the real estate business, too, partnering with Mr. John Tracy to form the South Dakota Land Company. Their large 1907 flyer invited folks to “own their own homes,” touting “nearly four thousand miles of completed railroads” in the state. An impressive list of South Dakota crops began with 30,292,818 bushels of wheat reported, worth over 24 million dollars.\(^\text{30}\)

When their business started, a large crowd surrounded by horses and buggies gathered in front of Mitchell’s famed Corn Palace, to send landseekers on their way to the West River region. In 1909, A.W. Gaines traveled to Peotone, Illinois, to accompany another group of landseekers to South Dakota, this time by automobile.\(^\text{31}\)

\(^{30}\) South Dakota Land Company 1907 flyer, Andrew W. Gaines collection

\(^{31}\) 1906 photograph depicts scene, Andrew W. Gaines collection
Andrew’s business prospered, and soon he and Arvilla bought what they called “the Big House”\(^{32}\) at 700 East Fifth St. The grand home became a place of hospitality and refuge for the Gaines family, their relatives and friends, and even hoboes, as they were called, who found the pathway to its welcoming doorstep.

On June 25, 1908, Charlie and Ida were married in Mitchell at this lovely place. Soon after, they returned to Lyman County, and moved the better of their two shanties to the claim where they would now share a home. Charlie’s brothers, Rene, Claude, Harry, and Ivanhoe, came to visit at different times. Some of the boys gave serious thought to leaving their Wisconsin farms to join Charlie out west.\(^{33}\) Brother Rene actually worked with a threshing crew near

\(^{32}\) Allen Charles Turner to Carol Jean Turner Swanson, family account

\(^{33}\) Marie McIntosh Rowe interviewed by Carol J. Swanson, c. August 2000 and various letters written to Charlie and Ida by his mother, Narcissa Floyd McIntosh
Mitchell for 2 ¾ days. On the train back to Wisconsin, he realized he left his threshing money at the hotel, and sent word to Charlie to see if “there was any money left there for Rene Mc.” A friend later told Charlie that Rene “would of stayed but the work was harder than he was in the habit of doing.”

In 1909 Charlie and Ida looked forward to the birth of their first child. With the baby due in mid-September, Ida spent some weeks leading up to it at her parents’ home in Mitchell. Closer to the time, Charlie arranged for care of the homestead, so he could be with Ida for the birth. The baby came a bit early, but things did not go as hoped. Sadly, Boy Child McIntosh, born Sept. 9, 1909, did not survive the day. The realities of a harsh life in the developing plains had hit hard, and they decided to move into Mitchell sometime during the next year.

In November 1910, Ida returned to her parents’ home, awaiting another baby due in early December. Charlie worked hard to close things up at the homestead, this time moving goods and animals in preparation for a move to Mitchell. On December 1, he wrote to Ida of his plan to “catch the morning passenger” before the baby’s arrival.

Then, on December 9, 1910, Charlie and Ida were comforted with the birth of their beautiful, healthy baby girl. They named her Lucile Marjorie McIntosh. Soon after, they

34 Letter excerpt from friend Charles Mullin to Charlie McIntosh, December 20, 1908
35 Ibid.
36 Letter from Ida Gaines McIntosh to Charlie McIntosh, August 24, 1909
37 Courthouse record of “Boy Child McIntosh,” Davison County Courthouse, Mitchell, SD and written in Ida Gaines’ Bible, given to her by her parents in 1907
38 Letter from Charlie McIntosh to Ida G. McIntosh, December 1, 1910
moved to a little house at 108 North Rowley St. in Mitchell. In February of 1912 they were further blessed with a bouncing baby boy, Floyd Gaines McIntosh.

They loved these children, who from infancy heard the sweet sounds of Ida’s hymn singing and their father’s harmonica and violin. As they grew older, Charlie took the young ones to see movies in downtown Mitchell and polished their little shoes on Saturday night for Sunday School the next morning. They called him... “Papa.”

By now, Charlie made his living by farming and dealing in hay, hogs and horses. A picture postcard of Charlie with a threshing crew, suggests pride in a bountiful harvest after earlier years of extreme drought in South Dakota.

Ida’s brother Herman now worked at the Western National Bank in Mitchell as an assistant cashier. There he met Miss Lora Bernice Closson, a stenographer, and on September 2, 1914, he and Lora were married at the home of her sister.

In the broader picture during 1914 - 100 years ago now - the Panama Canal officially opened. An astounding feat of modern engineering, it cut to a fraction the distance for sea-going vessels to travel between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Conflicts in Europe that

---

39 Lucile M. Turner to Carol Jean Swanson, family account
40 “Creating the Canal,” pbs.org/wbgh/americanexperience/features/timeline/panama
year increased in 1915 and ’16, leading to the Great War overseas, impacting the United States.\(^{41}\)

Despite progress or failure in the world around her, however, Ida’s own journey took a serious turn in the late summer of 1916. After a very successful harvest season, her husband Charlie became very ill. Visits from Dr. Bobb brought the sobering diagnosis: a brain tumor. Little treatment was available at the time for this kind of cancer, though the doctors tried what they could. Ida and her family lovingly cared for him, but on September 9, 1916, at age 38, after 8 years of marriage, Charles Cyrus McIntosh passed away.\(^{42}\)

Imagine what this must have been like for Ida. These two “were sweethearts” and “always loved to be together.”\(^{43}\) They had such respect for one another. Now, at 32, Ida was left with two young children...Lucile, almost 6, and Floyd, only 4 years old.

“Jesus, Savior, pilot me.”\(^{44}\)

Charlie’s father, and the brothers who had visited before, took the train from Wisconsin to attend the funeral. They stayed with the Gaines family at “the Big House” for several days.

It didn’t take long for Andrew and Arvilla to invite their daughter Ida to bring Lucile and Floyd to live with them. She readily accepted, and took in sewing to help support herself and the children. She found solace in the close company of her parents and in the fellowship of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Each day Ida and the children joined Andrew

\(^{41}\) Jennifer Rosenberg, World War 1 Timeline, history1900s.about.com/od/1910s
\(^{42}\) Turner to Swanson, family account
\(^{43}\) Gaines to McIntosh, 1929
\(^{44}\) Edward Hopper, 1818-1888, The Lutheran Hymnal, #649 at Lutheran-hymnal.com/lyrics
and Arvilla, along with guests of the household, in “the morning worship with a long prayer and a long scripture to put them out on their day’s journey.”

In April of 1917, the United States formally entered The Great War. And on September 6, 1917, another sadness came to the Gaines home when Ida’s younger sister Nora, at age 29, died after a long and debilitating illness. Then in May of 1919, Herman’s lovely wife Lora died in childbirth, leaving him and their newborn baby girl. So, during the Great War and its aftermath, Ida lost her husband, her sister, and her sister-in-law.

During each time of sorrow, the whole family drew close to one another... and to God. Despite the deep sadness, Lucile and Floyd brought smiles to their hearts, and the adults enriched these young lives with their love, guidance...and experiences.

Living at “the Big House” included lots of visiting with friends and relatives. Cousins played together. They enjoyed family picnics, popcorn after Sunday night church, fishing, and helping Grandpa Gaines with his garden produce. In Grandma’s kitchen, they made candy...taffy, fudge, peanut brittle, divinity. During these times, Ida often reminded her children of their father’s love for them.

---

45 Lucile M. Turner, devotional given at Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, KY, 1979
46 Rosenberg, World War I Timeline
At the invitation of a friend, she started going to the little Free Methodist church in town. Each summer they gathered with the Methodists and other denominations, for the Riverside Holiness Camp Meeting. Lucile and Floyd heard many hymns and much preaching as they grew into adulthood.

Through these associations, Ida met a widower, Rev. Anton P. Matson, a Free Methodist minister. Anton and Ida married in 1933, and enjoyed their life together. She embraced the activities involved in being a minister’s wife, a significant chapter in what she later described as her “long and exciting life.”\(^{47}\)

When Anton passed away in 1937, Ida’s brother Herman helped her deal with stock certificates that Rev. Matson had purchased in 1917 and 1918, the War Years. Herman wrote seventeen letters to various Secretaries of State, asking for help in locating the companies’ headquarters. Their timely replies were polite.

---

\(^{47}\) Ida Gaines McIntosh Matson conversation with daughter Lucile, 1943
The Gas Products Company stated, “We have no way of knowing the present condition of this company.” The War Horse Copper Mining Company was pronounced “legally dead.” Liberty Oil and Gas “filed its last return in 1919 and its charter was suspended... for nonpayment of the franchise tax.” Some of the letters were returned, leaving the envelopes to explain. The Cuban-American Petroleum Company was, “not in City Directory.” The Amalgamated Oil Company letter was “returned to writer unclaimed.” The Uncle Sam Oil Company had “moved...left no address – Out of Business.”

None of the seventeen stock certificates held any monetary value.

While surely a disappointment, this news made no difference to Ida. She had made investments of an eternal nature... her faith in God, her family, especially her children, Lucile and Floyd. She had once said to them, “I would always rather you would be good than great, but have

---

48 Original stock certificates and returned letters, to Herman Gaines in 1937.
wanted a little of the greatness, too. I would that you would leave the world a better place for your having been in it.”

That handsome boy, Floyd served in the Navy Seabees in World War II, married Irene Eggebraaten, a lovely Norwegian girl, and later became a successful candy maker in Marysville, California. Together they operated The Candy Box, a candy and gift shop, bringing a little bit of happiness to many, many people.

And that pretty little girl, Lucile, with the bow in her hair, became an effective and beloved public school teacher in South Dakota and Kentucky. She married a minister, George Allen Turner, who first saw her while she led the singing at the Mitchell Free Methodist Church. Best of all, she is the wonderful mother that Charlie and Ida gave to me and to my brother Allen.

Figure 17 Irene Eggebraaten McIntosh

Figure 18 Floyd Gaines McIntosh

Figure 19 George and Lucile M. Turner
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49 Ida McIntosh to Lucile McIntosh, 1929.
Thank you, dearest Ida of the Wild West......

Figure 20 Ida Nellie Gaines McIntosh Matson, c. 1946
Photo credits for Dearest Ida of the Wild West
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Settlement of the Dakotas:
Indian Wars, Politics, Drought and Governor Mellette’s Lonely Mission
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Indian/White Relations

In 1492, explorer Christopher Columbus sailed his three tiny ships across the Atlantic Ocean and found the American continents. He initially landed on an island in the Bahamas. Believing he had reached the East Indies, he called the native people who greeted him Indians, a name that is still used for the indigenous people of the Americas. Historically, indigenous Americans have preferred to be called by their own tribal names, such as Dine and Lakota, rather than those given them by outsiders, such as Navajo or Sioux.

In south, central, and North America, Indian population was estimated to be somewhere around 60 to 70 million. Five to fifteen million of those were believed to have populated the current countries of Canada and the United States. Over the next three centuries, those Atlantic winds brought hundreds more ships carrying thousands more Europeans. During that same time period, the Indian population declined by 90% before it would start to increase again. Not all of the Indians who died were killed in war or were massacred by Europeans. But small pox, measles, and other diseases brought by the Europeans did kill a large number of Indians. These foreign diseases were new to the Indian population, so their bodies had no immunity when they were exposed to them.

There would be many other profound changes to the American Indian way of life. The cultural differences between the white and Indian race is so deeply imbedded, that a
common social order between them is difficult and requires exceptional effort and skilled communication to maintain the peace. Although it wasn’t evident at first, history shows that a strained Indian/White relationship runs like a bolt of bright thread through the historical cloth of both Americas, our nation and state.

As time passed, the constant flow of arriving western European settlers seemed to be endless. The Indians were aware that one day the non-Indian population would outnumber them. The European/American Indian relationship was characterized by mutual suspicion and distrust. As they became acquainted, relationships became further complicated by misunderstanding and unpredictability. The wide spectrum of relationships ranged from hostile to tolerable and even amicable, depending on the geographic location, Indian tribe and European group. But generally speaking, managing peace was a fragile and delicate issue.

**Tribes Were Different, But Shared Basic Philosophy**

There were many different tribes scattered across our continent. There was a great diversity of social life and culture among the many Indian peoples. Most of the tribes were independent in establishing their own rituals, skills, and ideas. Consequently, they did not all live in harmony with each other either. But they did share a basic philosophical belief: that many spirits, *good and bad* make up the spiritual world. Many tribes even believed one Great Spirit created the universe, and the earth was made to be self-sufficient and able to take perpetual care of itself and all living beings on it.
The earth's cast and varied geographical terrain of mountains, valleys, forests, deserts, and grassy plains provides an infinite variety of climates and works in harmony with the cycling four seasons. Lush areas of forest and vegetation provided edible plants, fuel, and shelter. There was a vast variety of animals to hunt and huge flocks of birds darkened the skies. Lakes, rivers, and streams provided water for drinking, and stocked with unlimited numbers and varieties of fish. Anywhere Indians were found they were living in harmony with nature, and were creative and inventive with the resources around them. They took from the earth only what they needed to survive.

Indians Teach Settlers to Survive

Early colonists found living in this new environment could be cruel and menacing. On many occasions, their survival relied on the many skills taught to them by the Indians. Seldom had the French, Dutch, or English people known such heat as the American summer. Nor had they experienced such long, snowy, bitter, cold winters that covered much of this continent. The wilderness stretched endlessly to the west and north. In fact, the regions spreading the furthest to the north were nearly always in the grips of winter.

The harsh winter season did, however, have its opportunities. Millions of fur-bearing animals made their homes in the frigid wilderness. As autumn days grew shorter, the winter coat of the fur-bearers thickened and deepened until its texture was glossy, soft to the touch, and beautiful to the eye.

Adventurous individuals among the early settlers knew a great deal of money could be made from the peltries living in the forests and streams. European royalty were always
craving for furs. They would pay handsomely for robes made of ermine fur (a white-furred weasel with a black tail), and fur of fox or mink for the garments of great-ladies, and fur of beaver for the hats of gentlemen.

European entrepreneurs began hauling huge loads of traps and trade goods out into the dim uncharted wilderness to entice the Indians into trading for the rich pelts. The fur trapping and trading industry provided a common interest that benefitted both whites and Indians. Fur companies from England, France and new world colonists rigorously competed with each other over controlling the fur-rich territories. They persuaded many Indian tribes to fight with each other on behalf of one country or the other and to trade exclusively with them.

**Fur Traders Map the Way**

As the fur traders wandered the continent, they proved themselves to be competent explorers. They drew maps illustrating the surfaces of the earth and kept diaries relating stories of their adventures. Their written word described images of Indian people, discoveries and experiences. As they drew maps and gathered volumes of notes, they also claimed the land for the European country that was sponsoring them at the time. (*The Indians did not understand how the fur traders could claim land ownership.*) When white settlers set out to open and settle the west, they completely depended on the information provided by those first fur-trading explorers.

It took money, wits, and a love for adventure to succeed at the fur trade. Businessmen at desks in St. Louis supplies money and ideas. General labor employees at the
fur forts and trading posts worked cutting hay, gathering wood, growing gardens, raising animals for food, dealing for furs and hides, and any other daily needs of the fur forts. Administrative employees managed the labor work force and business operations by ordered goods, shipped hides and furs, keeping records, and always played the public relations game with the Indians and trappers.

Upon hearing reports of the animal life in Dakota and beyond, St. Louis businessmen eagerly extended the fur trade. The Missouri River was their link with the buffalo of the plains and with the beaver, fox, and mink on the rivers and in the mountains further west. Soon, Dakota fur forts were opening a brisk fur trade. Trappers caught the small animals, Indian men hunted buffalo and Indian women tanned the hides to trade for blankets, knives, kettles, and beads. For several years, everyone profited as the fur industry thrived.

**Decline of the Fur Trade**

After the colonists won their independence, defeating the British in the Revolutionary War, they established a democratic government. In 1803, the U.S. Government made the famous Louisiana Land Purchase from France. By 1806, the Corp of Discovery, led by Lewis and Clark, had completed their expedition of the huge land mass. Their wondrous stories of their expedition excited the whole population of this young country.

By 1830, European fashion tastes began to change, causing a sharp decline in the lucrative fur trade. The strong business ties created by the fur industry weakened and so did the Indian/white relationship. White/European immigrants were focusing their attention on
agriculture. They were anxious to start expanding into the west. That is when the real rub started between the whites and Indians.

Indian Wars

It was the white philosophy of *Manifest Destiny*,“God’s will for man to open and settle the western frontier”, that was in sharp contrast to the Indian way of life. The idea of private land ownership and use of the land were the two dividing issues at the core of the “Indian wars”. The Indians believed in taking from the earth only what they needed to survive. Earth should be left alone, unchanged or altered. Only the invisible hand of the Great Spirit should change the earth.

The Whites on the other hand, believed the Indians were not using the land to its full potential. It was God’s will that the land be used to improve the human condition. Forests needed to be cut down, clearing the land for raising crops, livestock, and providing food for building material. Private land ownership was the only orderly way to establish farms, ranches, communities, and towns. Gold, silver, coal, marble, and any other desirable materials found in the earth needed to be mined and processed. Their uses would lead to new scientific discoveries, ideas, and inventions. The wilderness needed to be tamed, developed, and settled. The process of civilizing the earth needed to be completed.

The Indians believed the earth was already complete just as the Great Spirit had created it. Planting and reaping of crops, mining, and changing the terrain of the land was an insult to mother earth, and they were absolutely appalled and livid over what the railroad did to the environment! Indians had lived on the land for thousands of years before
the white man even knew it was here. They were puzzled by the white man’s concept of land ownership. The land was here before man and would still be here after every man was gone. The Indians asked the white man if he could also own an ocean wave, or a cloud in the sky. The Indians strongly disagreed that anyone can own the land.

Increasing conflicts escalated into the “Indian Wars”. Those wars lasted fifty years, from 1840 to 1890. History books tell many stories of bitter and hard fought skirmishes that resulted in atrocities suffered on both sides. Wave after wave of white settlers moved across the continent, overtaking the Indians. The Indians resisted as best they could, but they were outnumbered and lacked the firepower of the whites. Many Indian tribes fought fiercely, but they eventually retreated further west or surrendered and were relocated on reservations to live. Initially the reservations were intended to move the Indians out of the way, while at the same time providing a place where they could slowly adjust to the large white society that was overtaking them.

The Great American Desert

When the settlers had pushed their way to the Great Plains, they found no reason to even try to settle this huge vast area of prairie. The land was barren, sterile, parched, and dried up for eight months of the year. Annual rainfall did not even supply sufficient moisture for timber to grow. Immigrants began calling this area the “Great American Desert”. This unproductive land was regarded as being unfit for settlement. The aquifers lay undiscovered and digging artesian wells into the prairie had not yet begun. For thousands of years, only buffalo and antelope swarmed over the plains, feeding on the tough prairie
grasses. Only the rugged, shaggy grasslands survived the long dry seasons by existing in a dormant condition.

**Sioux Tribes Control Northern Plains**

Sioux Indians once lived in the heavily wooded areas of northwestern Wisconsin and eastern Minnesota. They were driven out onto the prairies by the Ojibwa Indians (*Chippewa*), enemy of the Sioux. The Ojibwa were first to trade with the white man for guns, giving them a distinct advantage over the Sioux.  

Adjusting to living on the prairie caused dramatic changes to the Sioux lifestyle. They had to adapt from hunting and gathering food and living in lodges in long-term villages in the forests, to living a nomadic existence on the prairies. They learned to become totally dependent on the plentiful, but ever-roaming buffalo. To meet the needs of their new environment, they adapted the teepee (*a conical tent*) by replacing woodland materials covering the teepee poles with buffalo hides.

The Sioux were a tough, determined people, given to be warlike towards whites and most other Indian tribes. Discovered that the Arikara Indians living along the Missouri River had horses, the Sioux raided their village. Many of the Arikara were killed and the surviving fled north towards Canada. Gaining horses greatly improved the life of the Sioux. Acquiring guns and horses enabled them to become very proficient horsemen, warriors, and Buffalo hunters. They controlled the upper Great Plains and were protective of their nomadic lifestyle. Most white immigrants did not relish the idea of surviving the harsh, punishing
desert-like environment or the likelihood of encountering the hostile Sioux Indians. So, they avoided traveling through the Northern Great Plains on their journey west.

**Land of the Dakota**

Eventually the Federal government did gain control over the various Sioux tribes. The *Yankton* and *Sisseton* on the eastern side of the Missouri were less hostile and war-like than the *Hunkpapa* and *Teton* on the western side of the Missouri River. Since the Sioux had been existing on the Northern Great Plains, it made sense to establish their reservations here, why bother to relocate them? As more and more Sioux were overtaken, they were forced to settle on these reservation lands. This area became known as Land of the Dakota.

Over an extended period of time the federal government allocated over 23 million acres as reservation land to be lived on and owned by the Indians. The government did not realize the number of problems all of this authorized reservation land would later cause for settling and homesteading North and South Dakota.

Peace treaties promised to provide reservation Indians with land, food, clothing, medical care, and education. It was payment for the land that the Sioux had given up. They could no longer hunt buffalo, so the days of living a nomadic lifestyle were over. Instead, the government advised them to take up farming and send their children to school.

Military forts were established to keep the Indians in line, on the reservations and protect the federal employees who worked on the reservations. The Missouri River ran up through the middle of the Northern Plains area, which served very well as the main thoroughfare for river boat traffic delivering supplies to the forts and reservations.
Territorial Days

On March 2, 1861, President James Buchanan signed the Organic Act creating Dakota Territory. This gave the federal government control to politically organize the territory and manage the Indians. With the prosperous fur trading days over, the only economic base for the new territory was maintaining and servicing the Indian reservations.

Huge New Era of Growth

However, huge changes were on the horizon for Dakota Territory. The Black Hills gold rush of 1876, followed by the Dakota land rush two years later in 1878, ushered in a huge new era of growth. The population grew from 5,000 in 1861 to 14,181 by 1870. During the 1870’s it advanced by 12,000 or more per year and by 1880 the official population was 135,177. But, between 1880 and 1885 it grew to an incredible 640,823.7

In the summer of 1874, Lt. Colonel George Custer led a scientific expedition into the Black Hills. When Custer announced the discovery of gold, gold seekers began flocking into the Black Hills, still Indian reservation land. The Federal government attempted to keep the gold seekers out of the Black Hills until an agreement could be reached with the Sioux. However, in 1875, the Indians refused to cede any more of their land, so the government made no further attempts to keep the gold seekers out.

The gold rush attracted mostly men seeking quick riches: miners, adventurers, and entrepreneurs. They were soon followed by the parasites of society: matrons, madams, prostitutes, claim jumpers, bums, and bunco criminals. In general, the gold rush brought
more lawlessness than did the land rush. Most of the gold seekers planned to get into the Black Hills, get rich, and get out of the Sioux reservation land as soon as possible.

However, it was the land rush that made the greatest impact to the territory. During the 1870’s and early 1880’s, the weather patterns had completely changed in Dakota Territory. Heavy winter snow melts caused flooding. Constant spring and summer rains kept the prairies lush and green. The Northern Great Plains had been transformed into a fully favorable agricultural environment.

The spectacular growth in population between 1880 and 1885 was primarily due to the astonishing success of the “bonanza farms” located in Red River valley of northeastern Dakota Territory. The immense agricultural prosperity then spread into southeastern Dakota Territory, and to the Missouri River.

Meanwhile, cattle and sheep ranching were expanding in western Dakota Territory. The world had never witnessed such agricultural success, and it received global publicity! Collectively, these agricultural components created a huge demand for farm equipment, supplies, and transportation. The railroad also saw the opportunities and quickly laid tracks into Bismarck in northern Dakota Territory. Thirty-six railcars a day were loaded with a variety of grains and shipped to Duluth and Minneapolis.

Eastern syndicates owned many of the bonanza farms and hired managers to direct the mammoth operations. They required a small army of men and fleets of the most efficient farm machinery. The Red River region had 323 farms exceeding the 1000 acres and
1363 farms exceeding 500 acres. The Red River Valley became known as the “Bread Basket to the World.”

Soon there were more banks within the borders of Dakota Territory (299), than the combined total number of banks in eight surrounding states! The territory was attracting millions of dollars from eastern and foreign investors. As population increased so did interest rates, soaring as high as 20%. Dakota had become an investor’s paradise.⁹

Ambitious town site promoters, developers, stage coach services, and railroad companies promoted aggressively. They discovered they could buy journalists and began publishing magazines and brochures in English, German, and Norwegian, luring Easterners to the Territory. They described beautiful regions, where millions of buffalo and antelope roamed for centuries, fertilizing the land with nutrients. The prairies were being plowed and planted for the very first time, yielding fabulous crops. Publications exaggerated that summer lingered into November and by February it was already spring! They proclaimed, as if it had been promised by the Almighty Himself, that the plains and its climate had been changed forever! Homesteading became Dakota Territory’s number one industry. But the oversized promises gave settlers excessively high expectations.

Repossessing Reservation Land

It did not take long for the obvious problem to present itself—the Indian reservations. The agricultural success and the gold rush created such a high demand for more land that soon only reservation land remained. Nearly half of the land within the borders of the area we now know as South Dakota (over 23 million acres) was under the
possession of the Sioux. Therefore, the land was largely inaccessible to the white population for either: agricultural exploitation, gold mining, or transportation systems. Developers firmly believed the only way to keep the lucrative economic conditions moving and growing was to move the Indians out of the way, again.

As the federal government continued to renegotiate the size of the reservation lands, tension continued to increase between the Indians and the whites. The Indians were losing the wars and had very little leverage at dealing with the government. Reluctantly, they agreed to reduce the size of the reservations. The Indians were persuaded to begin ceding parts of their reservation land west of the Missouri River.

Congress wrote a new treaty with laws that broke up the Great Sioux Reservation. The treaty required: at least three-quarters of the adult male Indians had to sign papers agreeing to sell the rest of their lands. Land was then re-allocated to the Indians and provided for each adult male to receive 160 acres; the same size as a homestead claim for white settlers. This was called the Sioux Agreement of 1889. By 1890, much of the reservation land was opened for white settlement. Gold seekers and homesteaders alike, swarmed to essay and land offices to file claims.

Territorial William Howard Copes with Institutional Shortages

By 1878, two pressing issues had been drawn to the attention of Territorial Governor William Howard. Dakota Territory’s number of mentally troubled population was increasing and there were no facilities to care for them. A similar problem had arisen with confining criminals. The states of Minnesota and Michigan had been contracted with to
provide the needed services respectively, but due to overcrowding, Minnesota could no
longer house Dakota’s mentally ill at the sanitarium in St. Peter and Michigan could no
longer house Dakota’s prison population at the prison in Detroit.

Mental health problems were first noticed in the Black Hills. Disappointment and
failure caused many gold prospectors to develop mental problems and substance abuse.
Although many prospectors finally left the Hills, there were those who stayed. Those miners
who stayed, reasoned that the gold found in the streams had to have come from
somewhere within the mountains. Most remaining miners hired on with subsurface mining
companies and began hard rock mining. Underground drilling for the hard rock ores was
difficult and dangerous work. Although a lot more gold and silver was found, mental health
problems continued to increase. As mental and emotional problems increased in the Black
Hills, it began spreading east, increasing as the land rush escalated and the weather
patterns slowly began to revert back to draught and hardship.

Governor Howard was able to get a short extension of time while he looked around
for another location. He found two large unoccupied wood framed buildings in Yankton.
These buildings had been constructed a few years earlier to accommodate arriving
immigrants. The Governor had the buildings taken apart, and transported two miles north
of town. There, they were reassembled and served as housing for the mentally ill. The
hospital opened to receive patients on April 11, 1879. But within two years, the rapidly
increasing patient count was causing significant overcrowding. The Territorial Legislature
issued $40,000 of additional territorial bonds for the purpose of constructing an adequate
facility.\textsuperscript{11} This established Yankton as the mental health center for South Dakota and remains as such today.

There was a similar notice received from the Michigan State government. Dakota Territory prison inmates were being housed in the prison in Detroit. The state of Michigan could no longer provide confinement due to over-crowding. A prison was completed in Sioux Falls in 1882 and selected convicts provided the labor.

\textbf{Gold Rush and Land Rush Settlers Were Different}

The land boom also attracted some undesirables, but for the most part, these settlers were different than their gold rush counterparts. Homesteading generally attracted young men, their wives, families, and many foreigners.

The foreign settlers were politically naïve, but socially compliant. Homesteaders had to adjust to living in a society of geographic isolation. Many towns were established by nationalities or ethnic groups. These pioneers planned to build a future by creating new towns in a region previously thought to be too harsh for human habitation. Some were seeking freedom, land of their own, and opportunity they couldn’t find in the East or in Europe. Others were looking for a place to change themselves, become someone else, or just to start over.\textsuperscript{12}

Homesteaders were often referred to as honyockers, squatters, nesters, sodbusters, and dry farmers. Collectively, they differed in race, nationality, creed, politics, and language. But they possessed a strong common interest; to take part in the dispersion of the public domain land offered through homesteading.
On May 20, 1862, revisions to the initial Homestead Bill of September 4, 1841 went into effect. These revisions had rewarding aspects added that favored Civil War soldiers and sailors for their service. It provided that “any person who is the head of a family or who has arrived at the age of twenty-one years, and is a citizen of the United States, or who shall have filed his declaration of intention to become such,” and who has, “never borne arms against the United States Government or given aid and comfort to its enemies,” was entitled to one hundred and sixty acres of land in certain areas or eighty acres if taken in more favorable locations, such as within a railroad grant.

A fee of eighteen dollars was charged for each one hundred and sixty acres. Fourteen dollars was paid on making application and the balance was due when “final proof” was made. From the date of first application, usually called the filing date, six months was allowed for the homesteader to be on the land and begin making improvements. They were further required to make it their permanent residence for a period of five years from the date of those first papers. Any time after that date, the settler could take out their final papers, provided, however, that they did it within seven and one-half years after filing. This final process consisted of giving evidence that the conditions had been fulfilled. If the evidence was satisfactory, a patent was granted on the testimony of two witnesses. This last formality was called “proving up”.

Surprisingly, a large number of homesteaders were women. Many were young, single women, widowed, divorced, or had been deserted by their husbands. On the whole, women were without training or experience and lacked physical strength needed to take on
the severe living conditions. Even strong men had great difficulty in surviving the Great Plains. Most of the women were sensitive, delicate, cultured women unused to the harsh work involved in succeeding at homesteading. A larger number of women suffered from mental illness than did men.

Nevertheless, many of the women were a plucky lot with true grit. They took life as it came and usually in an uncomplaining manner. Their letters, diaries, and reminiscences have revealed a lot of information about their activities, hardships, reward, values, and attitudes. One of the most frequently mentioned hardships of pioneering which the early women settlers confided to their friends “back home,” was of loneliness and the absence of cultural opportunities.

However, women did bring a very important factor into the homesteaders’ lives. They instigated many forms of social life, such as visiting with neighbors, church socials, picnics, and impromptu parties. Although these informal gatherings may have been modified to meet frontier conditions, they did not lack the politeness and manners that the women demanded. The women were largely responsible for establishing and molding a standard of social life that is deeply rooted in our history.

Statehood

After twenty-eight years of Territorial status, the fight for statehood was finally within reach. For nearly a decade, Democrat-controlled congresses had successfully blocked statehood for South Dakota, defeating 41 statehood bills and rejecting two petitions for the same. In 1889, Benjamin Harrison won the presidential election defeating President Grover
Cleveland. In addition, the Republicans rode Harrison’s political coattails to other congressional election victories, gaining control of the Senate and House of Representatives. Statehood was now inevitable. On February 22, 1889, Washington’s birthday and ten days before his term ended, President Grover Cleveland accepted the inevitable and signed the Enabling Act (also called the Omnibus Bill) authorizing the creation of state constitutions from North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington.

On March 4, 1889, seven days after his inauguration, President Benjamin Harrison appointed Arthur Mellette as the tenth and final governor of Dakota Territory. At 2:48 p.m. on Friday, March 22, 1889, Mellette was sworn in and officially took office.

President Harrison immediately instructed Mellette to get North Dakota ready for statehood. Mellette focused on those instructions which entailed overseeing: the establishment of state institutions, state elections, writing the state constitution and laws (mostly adapted from the South Dakota constitution) and a final State of the Territory report to the Secretary of the Interior. When that was accomplished, the Territory could be divided into two states. Washington, Montana, North and South Dakota, were admitted to the Union on November 2, 1889. By then, Mellette had been elected as South Dakota’s first governor. He served two terms. Republican John Miller was elected as first Governor of North Dakota.

The Road of Statehood Was Harder Than Road to Statehood

As the first Governor of South Dakota, Arthur Calvin Mellette was confronted with the difficulties of a new and fledging state government. He was burdened with a lack of
resources and hindered by an unusual variety of adversity and political problems. Even so, he met crisis after crisis in a manner which was commendable. Honesty and integrity drove his steadfast determination to do the best that could be done with the resources at hand. In 1910, South Dakota’s first state historian, Doane Robinson, stated: The way was uncharted and he displayed a patience and wisdom which will always distinguish and commend his memory.”

The road to statehood had been a long hard journey for the settlers of Dakota Territory and finally achieving that end was joyously celebrated. However, the jubilant residents of North and South Dakota would soon discover the road of statehood would be even tougher than the road to statehood!

A severe drought had begun in the summer of 1889. Those wonderfully wet years had come to an abrupt end. Failing crops caused famers to default on mortgaged homesteads. Cash flow was hardly a trickle throughout the upper Great Plains. Banks began failing. Destitute homesteaders were in a panic, many near starvation. Mental illness on the prairie spiked dramatically!

**Governor Mellette’s Lonely Mission**

Governor Mellette made trips into the countryside in his horse-drawn buggy to see how the homesteaders were getting along. Day after day, the burning sun beat mercilessly down on the dry and parched land. Hot southwest winds swept and scorched the prairies. From horizon to horizon, the withered, dried prairie grass appeared to be seared brown. The brittle grass crunched and broke when walked upon. The creeks and wells went dry and
gardens withered. Farms were completely engulfed by the severe drought. The Governor witnessed many families barely existing.

Thirst became an obsession for all living things. Cattle broke out of pastures and went bawling over the plains; horses ran wildly in search of water. Most livestock deteriorated to mere skin and bones as they leaned against fences or lay dead. Their manes, tails, and hooves had dropped off! With each passing day, Governor Mellette saw more and more dead livestock strewn over the drought-stricken prairie.

The Governor was alarmed at the number of times that he found a wife and youngsters trapped on a dry claim, while her husband was away hunting for work at the railroad camps, or anywhere!\(^{18}\) The Governor was heart-broken when discovering children caring for each other. Mothers sat despondent, rocking in a chair or lying in bed staring into space. Unable to function, their minds tormented by the cruel reality of shattered dreams and a broken spirit. Hot wind, scorching sun and endless hours of back-breaking work had robbed these courageous women of their youth and beauty. Many husbands never returned to their families and their fates were never known. \textit{On a percentage basis more women proved up claims than men did.}

Saddest of all was when Mellette encountered the mothers fighting back tears, their bodies shaking with grief as they tended to the graves of their children. Frequently, there was no minister to speak words of comfort to the bereaved. Mothers found it almost impossible to tear themselves away from the graves and leave their children alone beneath
the bleak prairie. The Governor did everything he could to alleviate their misery. He sought local help from neighbors, churches, relatives, or any other resources available.

On the other hand, there were many strong homesteader women who fought on courageously. Armed with home-making tools of merely a broom, flat-iron, and washboard, they tended to their rude cabins, shack, or soddy, accepting sacrifice as a duty. The children pitched in too. They hoed, pulled weeds, and picked potato bugs until their arms and faces were burned cherry red. The sound of rattlesnakes became as familiar as the song of a bird. The hot dry weather seemed to make the snakes bigger and thicker and more aggressive. Families battled the elements, fighting the draught, starvation, thirst, sickness, and any other calamity that threatened them.

The greatest terror, especially during the drought, was Prairie fire. A prairie fire was a grand and startling spectacle. As with forest fires, prairie fires create their own wind storms. The fire often moved faster than a horse could run. The larger, hotter hires produce “fire devils” which have the appearance of small tornados of fire, dancing, bobbing, and swaying, moving quickly up and down the front line of the approaching fire. They are fascinating, but horrifying to see, especially when directly coming at you!

Everyone was expected to carry matches when away from home, even children. All ages were knowledgeable about starting a back-fire. The speed of the prairie fires were driven across the plains by their own high winds, killing settlers, destroying homes, barns, feed, winter range, stacks of hay, stock, and even devastating entire settlements.
Governor Mellette heard many stories from the homesteaders. Some were horrific stories, while others had miraculous endings. Some settlers survived by climbing into wells, others were protected by climbing into dugouts or sitting on plowed ground. Nothing could be accomplished by fighting the fire head on. The most effective means was to attack the fire from the sides by dragging or beating blankets, animal skins, or cloth sacks at the flames.\(^\text{19}\)

Defeated, many families loaded up their wagons, if they had horses to pull them, and left for back East. With them, went their horror stories that were sure to retard the growth of the state.

Governor Mellette mustered up what statewide relief he could. He appealed to citizens all over the state, including the larger communities for assistance. Unfortunately, most of the merchants already held long lists of farm creditors who would never be able to settle their debts. Many merchants were little better off than the farmers. Everyone had a severe cash flow problem and the donations Mellette gathered were meager.\(^\text{20}\)

The wheat farmers in the central and northern counties of the state seemed to have been hit the hardest by the draught. Clark, Faulk, and Miner counties had at least 600 destitute families. Mellette was unable to raise taxes in excess of the state constitutional limit. The situation seemed hopeless!

He appealed to all South Dakotans to provide coal, clothing, food, shoes, and cash for those farmers trying to hold on. He challenged churches, organizations, private individuals, and the Farmer’s Alliance to meet a goal of $100,000, but only $39,637 was
raised. Mellette used $3,600 of his own funds (more than his annual salary as governor) to administer what was collected for the suffering farmers and ranchers.

**U.S. Senator Pettigrew Leads Group of Realtors in Attacking Mellette**

As a last desperate effort, Mellette left South Dakota traveling to Chicago and other eastern and mid-western cities seeking help. Using honesty and hard facts, he revealed the hardships, relating stories that he had seen firsthand. He used several thousand dollars of his own money to pay expenses. He promised faithfully that all money collected would go directly to help the needy. Not one penny would be used to administer the funds. He made a list of each contributor and where the money was to go. The response was generous and a great many of the suffering homesteaders were helped and able to make it through the drought.

Governor Mellette’s most severe critic of the manner in which he handled the situation was U.S. Senator Richard Pettigrew. Many others in the real estate business joined Pettigrew in the bitter criticism. They took out large ads in the Eastern newspapers denouncing Mellette as a liar. They discredited him by flatly stating, “South Dakota was not suffering hard times. Newly arriving settlers were continuing to do very well!”

Mellette was disappointed at those who had turned on him. Many had been friends! After all, Mellette was in the real estate business too! His efforts did cost him politically as well as financially, but he never regretted saving many lives or helping settlers through the draught, or stemming the tide of mental stress that had been sweeping the state.
Indians Desperately Turn to Ghost Dance

The conditions were even worse for the Indians. They were expected to learn the methods of agriculture while being subsidized on handouts authorized by Congress. If the white homesteaders were having disastrous results with farming, the plight of the inexperienced Indian farmers was worse! For the most part, the Indians were not fond of farming anyway. The government rations given to the Indians were barely enough during the good years when they could be supplemented by gardening, hunting, and gathering. Many Indians had farmed the fertile creek bottoms, but now even the creeks had dried up and those meager crops had withered and died. The wild game had disappeared. Every living thing was desperate. All edible plants vanished during the drought. Forty-five Indians a month died on the Pine Ridge Reservation alone. Disease and starvation swept through their villages.

In desperation, many Indians turned to the Ghost Dance religion for hope. The west river residents feared an Indian uprising. The Indian Reservations were under the authority of the federal government, not the state government. A worried South Dakota state legislature was in a quandary as to how the Federal government might react to these problems. The Indians had no Arthur Mellette to plead their case.21
When Columbus first landed in the new world, he thought he landed in the East Indies. He had in fact landed on an island in the Bahamas. He named the island San Salvador (it is now called Watling Island). America’s beginnings involved a fascinating set of interactions among many groups: Indians, who had been on the continent for many centuries, the Spanish, who moved mainly north from Mexico after conquering much of Latin America, the French who had settled along the St. Lawrence and Mississippi River Valley’s, and the English, who moved west after landing on the Atlantic Coast. “The Making of America” by Robert D. Johnston, PhD., copyright 2002, National Geographic Society, 1145 17th St NW, Washington D.C.

The American wilderness held a wealth of fur-bearing animals referred to as “Winter Gold”: Sable, mink, ermine, beaver, artic, red and silver fox, otter, sea otter, marten, muskrat, skunk, raccoon. Other hides of value, even though their hairy coats were worthless, were bear and buffalo.

In 1803, the U.S. made an offer to Napoleon Bonaparte of France to purchase a small portion of Louisiana and a coastal section of Florida Territories, which France had recently taken from Spain. Napoleon shocked the U.S. envoy with a counteroffer to sell the entire Louisiana Territory, a massive 888,000 square mile expanse that would almost double the size of the U.S. Immersed in European affairs, Napoleon saw little reason to keep the territory and preferred to sell it rather than allow Great Britain to gain control over it. President Jefferson made the purchase for $15 million. It encompassed most of the watershed of the massive Mississippi River and included what would become Arkansas, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, as well as parts of Colorado, Kansas, Minnesota, Montana, Oklahoma, and Wyoming. “Living History America”, edited by Erik Bruun and Jay Crosby, Published by Tess Press, 151 W 19th St, NY 10011

Manifest Destiny—most whites believed it was God’s plan for the United States to expand from sea to sea. People had a sacred duty to yoke up oxen and take their families in covered wagons west on the Oregon Trail.

Examples of Indian ingenuity are well illustrated in their use of the buffalo. Every part of the buffalo was used in some way: internal organs, hide, muscles, brain, hoof and feet, meat, tail, skin of the hind leg, skull, tongue, beard, horns, bones, all four chambers of the stomach, hair, paunch, even the scrotum. The list of tools, shelter, utensils, and clothing items made from the buffalo was amazing. The woodland Indians were equally inventive with what they found in the forest. From wooden lodges to weaponry, tools, and skills they developed made them problem solvers and inventors. Their ability to make pottery was not only useful, but became an art form.

The earliest recorded meetings between the Sioux and the whites comes from the Jesuit Relation of 1640, where positive documentation is made of the Winnebago, Assiniboin, and Dakota; just eighteen years later, the same missionaries had recorded the existence of a number of Dakota villages in the vicinity of Green Bay in present day Wisconsin and further in the forested regions of southern Minnesota. These people were referred to by the Chippewa as Nadowe-is-iw, signifying ‘adder’ or ‘snake’. This Chippewa word was later corrupted by the French to Nadowessioux, which in turn was abbreviated to ‘Sioux’ by English traders. The Sioux, however, referred to themselves as ‘the Otchentri Chakowin or Seven Council Fires’. These Sioux, who had inhabited the woodlands for many generations, at this time lived in birch back covered houses, used the canoe and dog for transportation, and were divided into many groups, in perhaps up to thirty villages. They lived by hunting, fishing, and ate wild rice.

Three reservations occupied prime farm ground east of the Missouri River. The Santee Sioux had a wedge-shaped reservation of one million acres in the fertile northeast corner of the state. The Yankton Sioux held 420,000 acres of the richest land in the southeast. The Crow Creek Reservation was located right in the middle of the state.

It was, however, the Great Sioux Reservation, occupied by the seven bands of the Lakota (Teton), that most obstructed state progress. The reservation sprawled from the Missouri River west to the 103 meridian, a span of over 100 miles, and ran north from the Nebraska border to the Cannonball River in North Dakota. It severed the state in two. Only a single, narrow wagon road The Fort Pierre to Deadwood Trail connected the Black Hills, with its rich ore deposits and vast timber reserves to the more heavily populated and promoted eastern part of the state.

Germans colonized near Sioux Falls, Bohemians in Yankton and Bon Homme counties, and Russian-Germans in Turner and Hutchinson counties. The Emigration Society of Peoria, Illinois favored the Brule City area below Chamberlain. Two hundred members of a Mennonite sect from Indiana inspected Dakota and then decided to make it their home. Swiss-Germans added to Yankton county’s growth population. Danes selected sites around Swan Lake in Turner County. Ohio home seekers selected in the Jim River Valley. An army and navy colony put Rockport, Hansen County on the map. A Jewish settlement was attempted near Mitchell. And so it went, spreading over the East River area with feverish enthusiasm. These settlers were of various nationalities. They had different religions, old country customs and languages. “Dakota Panorama”, ‘This Was Homesteading in Dakota’, by Joe Koller, Pp 227, Edited by J. Leonard Jennewein and Jane Boorman, copyright 1961 by the Dakota Territorial Centennial Commission.

The claimant was required by this law to erect a dwelling on the claim, make proof of his settlement to the register and receiver at the land office for which that official received fifty cents from each claimant. The latter, in accord with the specifications laid down, was required to swear that: (1) They had never preempted before. (2) They did not own 320 acres in any other state or territory. (3) They had not settled on the land for the purpose of selling it. (4) They had made no agreement or contract with anyone, directly or indirectly, to turn the land over to anyone else. The intent of these last two was to guarantee that they were a bonafide settler. The register and receiver made such regulations as deemed necessary to safeguard against fraud. ON taking the proper oath and making proof, the settler was allowed to purchase the claim at the minimum appraised price. This was in most places $1.25 per acre. Persons swearing falsely were guilty of perjury according to the law, and the perjurer was penalized by the loss of both land and money. United States Public Statutes at Large, 27th Congress, 1841, Vol. V, pp. 453-458. This act became law September 4, 1841. The Homestead Act had rewarding aspects to the Union soldier and sailor for their service in the Civil War.

Later registration made certain exceptions in the case of soldiers but only minor changes in policy. One such change allowed war veterans to apply their service time in the army to the residence time required for proving up on homestead. Another amendment allowed an ex-soldier of the Civil War who had served nine months to take one hundred and sixty acres of land within the limits of a railroad grant whereas all other could take only eighty acres.
The first attempts at agriculture were crude. A settler without ox or horse took a spade and mellowed the prairie sod sufficiently to plant potatoes. Breaking the tough sod of the virgin prairie was a difficult and trying task. It took more power than the average pioneer commanded. The ordinary settler owned only one yoke of oxen; in order to break the sturdy turf, it took a large plow with several yoke of oxen. It was necessary then wither to hire the work done by an older settler or join forces with a neighbor and break a patch on each claim. The ordinary breaking plow turned a strip of sod twenty to thirty-three inches wide and was drawn by six yoke of oxen or more. The settler who guided the plow had a most difficult time holding it in the ground. Sometimes a second person sat on the beam to help keep the plow in the ground and to drive. It was often possible for a settler to give day labor to an older settler in exchange for breaking.


This method for fighting prairie fires was considered so effective that cases were known where some of the fighters stopped to slaughter an animal, strip the hide from the carcass, tie a rope each side of the green skin, and drag it over the side fires putting them out as fast as the men could ride.


“To Have This Land”, by Philip S. Hall, University of South Dakota Press, Vermillion, SD. 1991 Pp. 11.
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I HAD A BIRD NAMED ENZA
(The Spanish Flu in the Dakotas, 1918)

Charles T. Wise

THE BEGINNINGS

In early fall 1918 in South Dakota and its surrounding states, a feeling of optimism prevailed. The “dough boys” from the United States had the “Huns” on the run in Europe, and it appeared that peace was about to break out. The prices of corn and wheat were up. Almost anyone wanting a job could find one. Science had the ability to solve all our ills, and utopia seemed near at hand.

In 1918 the population of Sioux Falls was 20,929. The 1920 census put the population of South Dakota as 636,547. In Sioux Falls, 1918 marked the establishment of Augustana College and Normal School and the building of the Coliseum Theater. The Catholic Diocese completed the building of the St. Joseph Cathedral. The people of South Dakota went to movies, attended ball games, picnics, and church. They attended roller skating rinks, amusement parks, dance halls, pool halls, and saloons. Automobiles, trucks, and tractors were becoming more and more prevalent. South Dakotans had more money and more leisure time than any prior generation, and they flocked to these activities in growing numbers. At the time, Peter Norbeck was governor of the state. WNAX radio station in Yankton would not begin operation until 1922.
However, a specter none were expecting loomed on the horizon; a specter that would ultimately claim up to an estimated 50 million lives; a specter that became known as the Spanish Influenza Pandemic of 1918. In the United States alone the pandemic killed more than South Dakota’s entire population at that time.

In early 1918, a farmer in Haskell County in southwestern Kansas spent an entire day working and cleaning the inside of his chicken coop. The coop was very dusty and closed in with poor ventilation. It was a very tortuous, smelly job, and he was glad when he had finished the job.

Several days later he noticed that he had a bit of a sore throat, an occasional cough or sneeze, and felt somewhat out of sorts. After a few days and feeling better, he gave it no further thought. His wife and son, however, also began sneezing and began to run low-grade fevers. His son did not feel bad enough to stay home from school. Therefore, he went to school where he came into contact with many fellow students and adults. In time some of them also began having cold-like symptoms. They probably thought it nothing other than a typical cold.

A few of these people, however, began developing more severe symptoms: fever, severe headaches, joint pain, congestion, deep nonproductive coughing. Ultimately, some began dying.⁴

Dr. Loring Miner, who lived in Haskell County, began seeing patients exhibiting these symptoms, and he became alarmed. He noted in late January, early February in Public Health Reports, “...the strongest, the healthiest, the most robust people in the county were
being struck down as suddenly as if they had been shot.” He warned of a “severe type influenza.” It was the only reference to influenza anywhere in the world at that time.\(^5\)

On the morning of March 11 at Fort Funston in north central Kansas on the Fort Riley Military Reservation, Private Albert Gitchel, whose job was to serve food in the mess hall, reported to the infirmary with a high fever and chills. By midday Fort Funston had 107 cases of the flu, a total of 522 within a week, and total of 1127 by April. Forty-six of those afflicted died.\(^6\)

Fort Funston became home for many freshly drafted and enlisted young men, many of them surely from Kansas and Haskell County. From there they were dispatched to other military encampments throughout the United States and then onward to Europe. They took the flu with them.\(^7\)

Regardless of where the pandemic started, all too soon it became ingrained throughout Europe and then the rest of the world, including the United States. The influenza would eventually infect up to 20% of the world population.\(^8\) According to John M. Barry, “One cannot know with certainty; but if the upper estimated death toll is true, 8 – 10% of all young adults then living may have been killed by the virus.”\(^9\)

The Spanish flu got its name, not because it started there, but because Spain during World War I was a neutral country. Censorship did not constrain Spain’s newspapers like the other countries that were involved. A lot was written about the influenza in Spain particularly after King Alphonso XIII became ill. Consequently, the media referred to it as “The Spanish Flu.”
A UNIQUE DISEASE

What made this pandemic particularly unique? If nothing else, sheer numbers alone tell the story. According to Molly Billings, “The influenza pandemic of 1918-1919 killed more people than the Great War, known today as World War I, at somewhere between 20 and 40 million people (Many sources say up to 50 million, author’s note). It has been cited as the most devastating epidemic in recorded history. More people died in a single year than in four years of the Black Death Bubonic Plague from 1347-1351. It was so severe that the average life span in the United States was depressed by 10 years. It is estimated that 675,000 Americans died in 1918, 10 times as many as in the world war. Of the U.S. soldiers to die in Europe, half of them fell to influenza rather than to the enemy.” Each side blamed the other for utilizing germ warfare.10

Another unique feature of the 1918 influenza is that it did not kill primarily the very young and the very old as other flu epidemics have done before and since. This epidemic took aim at those just entering the prime of their lives. Influenza and pneumonia death rates for those 15-34 were greater than 20 times higher than in previous years. Overall nearly half of the influenza related deaths in the 1918 pandemic were in young adults 20-40 years of age, a unique phenomenon that pandemic year. If one charts the deaths in a normal influenza outbreak, it would look like the letter “U.” In 1918, however, the chart would look like a “W.” The middle peak of the W was caused by the increased mortality of those aged 15 to 40.
The difference between the influenza mortality age-distributions of the 1918 epidemic and normal epidemics – deaths per 100,000 persons in each age group, United States, for the interpandemic years 1911–1917 (dashed line) and the pandemic year 1918 (solid line)\(^\text{11}\)

Pregnant women were in the group that was most likely to die. This left an unknown but enormous number of children who lost their mothers. (Barry, p. 240) Also of course an unknown number of unborn babies were lost.

Most normal influenza presents itself with sore throats, coughs, fevers, congestion and recovery in three to five days. This pandemic did not limit itself to that. One of the most vivid descriptions of the disease is given by James F. Armstrong:

The 1918 influenza was not the flu Americans were familiar with. It was a horror that turned victims bluish-black then drowned them with their own body fluids. The death toll was highest in the ages 15 to 40, those in the peak of health. The victims would be fine one minute and the next incapacitated, fever-racked, and delirious. Temperatures rose to 104-106 degrees, skin turned blue, purple, or deep brown from lack of oxygen. Massive
pneumonia attacked the lungs, filling them with fluid; blood gushed from the nose. Death was quick, savage, and terrifying.$^{12}$

Morens and Fauci add, “Explaining the extraordinary excess influenza mortality in persons 20 – 40 years of age in 1918 is perhaps the most important unsolved mystery of the pandemic.”$^{13}$

**WHY SO DEADLY?**

There were several extenuating circumstances that set up this perfect storm and made this pandemic particularly deadly.

For one thing the influenza virus mutated and became very lethal. The influenza virus is a microscopic parasitic organism with a ribonucleic acid (RNA) core. RNA lends itself to mutation and is constantly changing. This is why one influenza vaccination will not last for any period of time and can explain what happened to the virus in Kansas. Later it probably mutated back again into a more normal, less deadly form; this could explain why the pandemic did not last for any extended period of time.

The war was perhaps the greatest contributor to the spread of the disease with the close, unsanitary conditions of trench warfare, the closeness of the living conditions in the encampments, and the transportation of troops to all parts of the world. The troopships alone were described as cesspools of contagion. If there had been no war, it is possible that it would have been contained in Kansas and died out there on its own accord.

Also related to the war, there developed a shortage of doctors in the United States. The youngest and the best doctors were in the military and in Europe. The main source of
doctors at home was older doctors, those over 45 and trained in the old style of medicine and who knew little of microbes and emerging diseases. In fact, due to this shortage many second and third year medical students were called upon to help.

Doctors were needed for the confirmation of the disease and prescription, but nurses were even more in demand as they were needed to administer the care to the patients. Their training probably exceeded that of many – if not most- doctors trained before 1910. (Barry, p.142) At home there was a great shortage of them. They were literally being kidnapped. It was impossible to get a doctor and possibly more impossible to get a nurse. (Barry, p 276-277)

Also contributing to the lethality of this pandemic was the general lack of knowledge in dealing with viral disease. There were no electron microscopes; no viral vaccinations. There was very little known of microbes and cause of disease. Palliative care, care given for comforting not cure, was the most that could be offered. At the time very little was known about what could be done for the victims of the influenza. The medical community had only just recently realized that diseases were carried by microbes. Virology was in its infancy.

Some remedies were offered. These included hot lemonade with honey and goose grease to relieve congestion. Vick’s Vapo Rub became a popular seller. (In just one year due to the pandemic, its sales rose from $900,000 to 2.9 million.\textsuperscript{14} ) Kerosene placed on sugar cubes was even tried to relieve the congestion and coughing. (See below)
We may now have at least a partial answer as to why it was so deadly for the 15 to 40 age group. A person’s immune system is usually strongest in this age group. In this case, however, their immune system may actually have over-reacted in what is called a “cytokine storm” whereupon the body overreacts and sends an overly large amount of antibody serum to the infected areas, the lungs in this case, causing the victims to quite literally drown in their own body fluids. It also weakened the lungs to the extent that pneumonia was more easily able to invade the body.

THE DAKOTAS AND THE FLU

South Dakota and its surrounding states were not isolated from the epidemic. The first confirmed case in South Dakota was on September 23, 1918. As in the other neighboring states, the influenza arrived primarily by trains carrying troops home. If one were to follow the movement of the pandemic in the United States, it started in the port cities on the east coast and the ports in Louisiana and Texas. Then it followed the train lines into the interior of the country and onward to the west coast.

In early September 1918, Mrs. Arthur Nielson of Hot Springs, SD, heard that her brother had just returned from the fighting in Europe. He was jubilant as he stepped off the troopship in Boston, happy just to be alive, and he felt a sense of great relief just knowing he was safe. He looked forward to returning to his home in South Dakota. As he walked down the gang plank, he barely noticed the beginning of a sore throat which he felt only when he swallowed.
Since the beginning of 1918, many of his fellow troops had become ill. Many were hospitalized. An entire third of his troop ship had been quarantined for the sick soldiers returning home. But he had been one of the lucky ones and had not become ill. Now all he wanted was to get back home, to get a job, and to get on with his life.

By the time he checked into his hotel room, he really didn’t feel well at all. His throat felt quite sore. He could tell that he had a fever, and he began to have a severe headache. He lay on his bed, not feeling well enough to get undressed. Then the coughing began. He coughed continuously and began to sweat profusely. His head felt like there was a wedge being driven between his eyes and brain. It vibrated every time he coughed. It hurt to even move his eyes. The coughing became so intense that a severe pain developed in his back and chest which made the coughing that much more unbearable.

He reported into his superiors and told them of his symptoms. They ordered him to report to the infirmary; and once there, they immediately put him in a makeshift hospital ward that had been set up in a gymnasium. The room had rows and rows of cots with sheeted walls set up on three sides of each cot. He really didn’t notice his surroundings as his cough had intensified to where it shook his entire body, and he began coughing up red, frothy foam. He had to keep coughing just to keep his lungs clear enough to breathe. In time his skin began to change color and developed a blue tinge; a bad sign indeed. When one of the attending nurses noticed his change of color, she attached a paper tag to one of his toes. This was the order of triage; there would now be no effort to cure him, but simply to keep him as comfortable as possible.
Relief finally came as he lost consciousness. It had been only three days since he had first noticed his sore throat. He had served his country well. He has the dubious distinction of being one of South Dakota’s first documented Spanish Flu victims.\textsuperscript{15}

But he certainly was not the last to die. In 1918, 1,847 succumbed to the disease in South Dakota. This raises to 2,391 if you add pneumonia to the total of which many died due to a weakened immune systems caused by the flu, or the flu was misdiagnosed as pneumonia. (Recent studies have found that the virus in 1918 weakened bronchial tubes and the immune system which allowed pneumonia to set in. Thus many diagnosed with pneumonia had been influenza victims first.) In 1918, 1919, and 1920, it ranked as the number one cause of death in the state of South Dakota. The hardest hit counties in South Dakota were Lawrence with 145 deaths, Brown with 118, Beadle with 98 and Minnehaha with 95. Only two counties in South Dakota had no deaths: Custer and Bennett.\textsuperscript{16}

In late September, as influenza swept across the country, newspapers in North Dakota asserted that “if the people of North Dakota exercise ordinary care they need not fear the ravages of this disease." On September 27th, the \textit{Fargo Forum} proudly boasted that the "Spanish Influenza Hasn't Hit Fargo." Within a week, the situation had changed. Fargo reported a hundred cases of influenza on October 4th. One day later, on October 5th, Jamestown reported 1,000 cases.\textsuperscript{17}

When the outbreak occurred in South Dakota, people reacted as best they could. Public health boards were given unprecedented powers. Schools closed as did churches, theaters, and other public gathering places. Cities imposed quarantines and passed special
public health laws forbidding the use of public drinking cups and towels. The Home Guard, today’s equivalent of the National Guard, patrolled the streets enforcing the new laws. No Aberdeen resident dare appear on the street, in a theater, a restaurant, a church, a business establishment, a school or any other public place without wearing an influenza mask. A number of violators were arrested and fined. 18

In Rapid City spitting in public places was prohibited, and funerals had to be held only in the open air. (Rapid City Daily Journal, 9 Oct, 1918) Huron postponed a peace celebration on November 11 because of the influenza. (Argus Leader, 11 Nov, 1918:7) People were advised to avoid shaking hands and to stay indoors and away from crowds. In Fargo trains were not allowed to stop if passengers had the flu. 19

In Sioux Falls on November 11, Dr. W. E. Moore, a leading Sioux Falls health physician and head of the Minnehaha County draft board, closed the fourth floor of Moe Hospital to only influenza patients. 20 In Aberdeen it was reported that the emergency hospital was filled to capacity (44), the regular hospital was also filled, and there were many patients in private homes. 21

Many stories point to what must have been unbearable grief for families and the individuals affected by the disease. The following are but a few reported in the Argus Leader [Sioux Falls]:

- “Egan Physician Gives Life for Others.” Although a victim of the flu himself, Dr. Patterson continued to give aid which caused a relapse and caused his own death. (3 Nov, 1918: 8)
• “Last Member of Stricken East Side Family Succumbs to Pneumonia and Diphtheria.” Mrs. L. L. Spencer died after ten days. A week earlier her two-year-old daughter died. Her father died the same day. (2 Dec, 1918: 23)

• “George Larson, Jr., age 17, Dies of Pneumonia.” Death entered the home of Mr. and Mrs. George Larson for the second time within a week. Torrey died a week earlier. (13 Dec, 1918: 9)

• “Mrs. Lewis Henie, age 29, Survived by Three Small Children.” Deceased had been ill but a few days. (19 Dec, 1918: 10)

Some other headlines in papers read: “Triple Funeral Held at Mount Vernon Recently,” “Seventh Double Funeral has been Held at Lead,” “Fourth Death in Murphy Home,” “Three Die in One Week in Sioux Falls Family,” “Fourth Lead Teacher Dies in ‘Flu Fight,” “Four Deaths in One Family at Faith,” “Brother Dies Soon After Sister’s Death,” “Five Funerals Held in Rapid City,” “Huron Losing in Flu Fight,” “Spanish Influenza Claims Seven People in One Day,” and “600 Cases of ‘Flu’ in Aberdeen.”

The influenza did not discriminate who it attacked. President Woodrow Wilson was a victim while he was in Europe negotiating the Treaty of Versailles. South Dakota’s governor Peter Norbeck became ill when he returned from a business trip to Wyoming. He was hospitalized in Lead for three days. Both were fortunate and recovered.

The first case of Spanish flu in North Dakota arrived on September 14 in New Rockford. On October 6, Fargo had 125 cases. Three days later 2,000 cases were reported. Doctors and nurses were not immune to the disease either. North Dakota lost three doctors and fourteen nurses. The official death toll for North Dakota was 1378, believed now by health officials to be greatly underreported.
At the age of 101 in 2007, Thelma Trom of Lisbon, ND, related in *The Bismarck Tribune* what she remembered of the 1918 epidemic. She said that two of her aunts, one of whom was pregnant, had succumbed to the disease. She also told how she would ride along with the local doctor as he made his rounds attending the sick. Her uncle was the local mortician. She would help him groom the bodies. She said that most did not receive funerals. She remembered the coffins stacking up in his garage where he usually parked his horse drawn hearse.²⁶

In another anecdote Vanessa Short Bull tells of how her grandmother, Sadie Afraid of His Horses- Janis, and her family in September of 1918 left the Pine Ridge, South Dakota, and traveled to Alliance, Nebraska, to pick potatoes to take back to Pine Ridge. At that time it was a five-day journey.

At the end of October, they had just finished when they heard word that they should start for home as “a real bad sickness was coming.”

Just as they were getting ready to break camp, middle-aged members of their family began getting ill. As they had heard that members of their family in South Dakota were also getting ill from the flu, they decided to start for home. When they got near Gering, Nebraska, a farmer told them that they could camp on his farm. One of the girls, Nancy, took charge. She told those ill to stay in their tents, and she would bring them food and medicine. Anyone who was sick got their own tent. She boiled a big bucket of “flat cedar tea,” which she took tent to tent to fill their individual cups. She made certain that there was no sharing of personal items like washbasins or utensils. Nancy “smudged” the tents
with sweet grass, so they could breathe better and to ward off evil spirits. To help relieve their coughing, she would mix kerosene and sugar and feed it to them. On November 11, 1918, Sadie’s brother, Paul, came running home yelling that the war had ended. Sadie said, “It was the best time because the war had ended, and the Red Cloud family had survived the bad sickness.” All survived

It is difficult to measure precisely the economic impact the pandemic had on the Dakotas. With the closing of public businesses such as theaters, dancehalls, etc., and people staying away from public gatherings, business had to have suffered a great deal. “Rumors that Influenza Had Reappeared Causes Losses to Local Mercantile Trade” was a story in the Argus Leader [Sioux Falls]. It stated, “Board of health officials in a Huronite newspaper tell people to stop worrying. People hearing the rumors have been staying away from movie houses.” Basic services such as mail delivery and garbage collections were hindered by the lack of healthy workers in some parts of the country. In some places entire families were ill, and there weren’t enough farm workers to harvest the crops.

THE GOVERNMENT’S STANCE

The government took a somewhat paradoxical stance on the pandemic. On the one hand it told people how to avoid the flu and told them what to do if they should get it. It passed laws forbidding public gatherings, and spitting on sidewalks. It closed churches, schools, movie theaters, etc.

At the same time the government downplayed it. It did not want to hurt the morale of the troops fighting the war. And perhaps more importantly in regard to the pandemic,
they did not want the public to panic. As John Barry states, “Over and over in hundreds of newspapers, day after day, repeated in one form or another, people read Rupert Blue’s (Surgeon General of the Public Health Service) reassurances, ‘There is no cause for alarm if precautions are observed.’” The Los Angeles public health director said, “If ordinary precautions are observed, there is no cause for alarm.” Forty-eight hours later he closed all places of public gathering, including schools, churches, and theaters. Chicago Public Health Commissioner, John Gill Robertson, stated in his final report on the epidemic, “Nothing was done to interfere with the morale of the community. It is our duty to keep the people from fear. Worry kills more than the epidemic.”

This was mirrored by Dr. W. E. Moore in Sioux Falls. On September 25, 1918, in the Argus Leader, he stated, “The public should quiet down and take care of themselves. There is no necessity for alarm, but anyone with a cold should take care of themselves.” On December 4, 1918, he stated that most cases reported by neighbors were “heavy colds,” not the flu. And on December 16, it was reported that he had attended a meeting in Chicago regarding influenza, and he stated, “Everyone is asked to keep a stiff upper lip, and the less talking about the influenza they do, the better.”

The mayor of Sioux Falls at the time, George W. Burnside kept the same timbre. “(In Sioux Falls) . . . there will be no closings if people will obey quarantine laws, and if physicians will see that quarantines are properly placed on houses where there is influenza.”

Apparently not all physicians agreed with the laws put in place. In Aberdeen, Dr. R. L. Murdy said that the regulation to have all citizens wear masks was “all nonsense” and
caused people to breathe the same air over and over. (Argus Leader, 26 Dec 1918: 9) Three doctors in Sioux Falls were arrested for alleged failure to report influenza cases. They may have been motivated by the hardship that quarantines caused both financially and psychologically.

WILL IT HAPPEN AGAIN?

Most sources vary in their answer to this question from “not likely” to “it is not a question of if, but when.”

Since 1918 many medical advances have evolved. Grand advances have been made in the treating of infectious diseases. Vaccines have been developed. Advances in epidemiology, the branch of medicine that deals with the study of the causes, distribution, and control of disease, have been made.

There are a number of organizations doing what they can to identify, prevent, cure, and sometimes eradicate disease. To name a few of these organizations, we have The World Health Organization (WHO) and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), which are able to alert us quickly of almost any outbreak of influenza in the world or any other new or deadly disease. Other agencies are also constantly working to detect, prevent, and cure any new or unknown disease. These include The United States Agency for International Development, The European Center for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC), and the World Organization for Animal Health. Because of the potential of bioterrorism, one can also include the United States Department of Homeland Security. The world today, hopefully, is a much safer place medically speaking than in 1918.
However, for all our advances made and all of our understanding of causes and cures of disease can we ever be sure a pandemic on the scale of the 1918 Spanish flu will not occur again? Probably not. Influenza, with its penchants for mutation, will probably never be eradicated. Today in an average year, worldwide there are at least three million cases of influenza with more than 250,000 fatalities. When will the next AIDS virus or unknown deadly virus make its appearance? When will our “miracle” drugs (antibiotics) become ineffective?

If such an occurrence does happen, what can/will be done about it? Donald Quammen tells us we need to improve the scientific basis to improve readiness. He states, “If we can’t predict a forthcoming influenza pandemic..., we can at least be vigilant; we can be well prepared and quick to respond; we can be ingenious and scientifically sophisticated in the form of our response.” Miles Ott (AB) continues by stating, “...Unlike in 1918, a pandemic vaccine will likely be available today, albeit four to six months after the pandemic starts. But similar to 1918, the challenge will be designing an orderly and ethical distribution of a scarce commodity (author’s emphasis). Further, experts in risk communications should assist in developing messages that are scientifically accurate, understandable, clear and useful. Finally, we need to take care and to note the local and national lessons from the past, so we do not have to repeat these vital lessons.”

**WHY FORGOTTEN?**

The pandemic killed 50 million worldwide, 675,000 in the United States, 1378 in North Dakota, and 2391 in South Dakota. How was it so soon forgotten? In most history
books it is merely added as a footnote or short anecdote at the end of the chapter on WWI, if it is mentioned at all.

There are several possible answers to this question. The primary means of communication at this time were the newspapers of the day, word-of-mouth, and personal observation; there was no radio or television. This was also the time of World War I. The Espionage Act of 1917 and the sedition act curtailed the freedom of speech in such a way as never seen before or since. A person or a newspaper could very easily be accused of violating the espionage or sedition act if they were to question any aspect of the government’s stance, action or inaction.

Newspapers did carry stories of the influenza; however, they rarely, if ever, were on the front page. But if one looks to the interior of the papers, one will find story after story of the flu’s presence. Thus people were conditioned to doing what the government told them without question. If the government were to say, “Keep a stiff upper lip; it is merely a bad cold; and the less talking about the flu, the better,” it would tend to trivialize the matter. The fact that newspapers of the day did not headline the pandemic contributed to the forgetfulness of the public.

It has also been suggested by Erin Miller that epidemics were common, and the Spanish flu may have been viewed as just another one with which one had to deal as best as one could. Recent epidemics at the time had included yellow fever, malaria, cholera, smallpox, and as recently as 1916, polio.\(^{39}\)
Another reason it was so soon forgotten was perhaps because young men and women were dying in Europe for freedom of the country. This was the type of death to be remembered, not dying at home from influenza.

There were large families, and it was not uncommon for members of a family to die. Perhaps people lived closer to death then, and it just didn’t seem that unusual.

Miller also suggests that because the Spanish flu came on so quickly and, although deadly, didn’t last long; it is quite possible that the losses of both the war and the flu blended into one in American psyche. Sadie Afraid of His Horses-Janis seems to confirm this when she says, “It was the best time because the war had ended and the family had survived the bad sickness.” You can see from this statement that Sadie blended the war and the sickness into the same thing. The American people were jubilant at the ending of the war. A person dying from influenza was seen as just another casualty. The war was over; we had won; and that was that.

WHY SHOULD WE REMEMBER?

Any incident that takes the lives of 50 million people, or kills in the United States the equivalent number of Americans as the entire state of South Dakota, needs to take its rightful place in history. It is certainly one of the world’s worst natural disasters. If for no other reason, we should remember in order to honor the doctors and nurses who gave their lives in attempting to care for those afflicted. We should remember those whose lives were taken and families that were forever changed. We should remember the grief they must have felt for the loss of their loved ones.
Perhaps the most compelling reason to study this disaster is, as said by George Santayana, “Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.” We may not be able to prevent another such epidemic of influenza or an epidemic of another unknown source, but we need to be forever vigilant to do what we can to prevent such an occurrence from happening again.

I had a little bird
Its name was Enza
I opened a window
And In-flu-enza41
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2014 is the centenary of WWI. Thus it is appropriate to remember men of the Great Plains and West who fought in that conflict. This article discusses my grandfather’s experiences in WWI. My grandfather, Emery Gordon Poling II, was born in Collins Ohio in 1887. He made his way later in life to Bowbells North Dakota and there worked in agricultural employment with various farmers. He was inducted into the United States Army on September 18, 1917 and was assimilated into the Federal Army as part of the 88th (4 leaf clover[1] and later blue devils) division.[2] The 88th division was made up of men from the Dakotas, Iowa, Minnesota, Illinois, Missouri and Nebraska—thus if any unit could have been called a “Great Plains” or “Western” division, it was surely the 88th. He was then assigned to the 338th Field Artillery, Battery A. He was later reassigned to the Headquarters Company of the 338th until his discharge.

First stop was Camp Dodge Iowa. Depending on when a man’s induction was, training at Camp Dodge lasted from weeks to months. My grandfather was stationed there for almost a year. He began his journey to France on August 12 1918 from Camp Dodge Iowa. His unit headed for Camp Mills New York. The train stopped several times at Marrion Iowa, where the men did physical drill for 30 minutes, then in Savannah Illinois where the Red Cross served them coffee (here my grandfather wrote YEA), sandwiches, ice cream and cigarettes. The train proceeded through Chicago, Port Huron Michigan, and later Niagara Falls, Wilkes Barr Pennsylvania, and eventually Jersey City on August 15 1918. There they
marched to a ferry and eventually ended up at Camp Miller. He noted that their bunks were steel cots with springs and they were only given one blanket for bedding. They were also issued new uniforms at Camp Miller.[3]

After a short night’s rest, they took a ferry to New York and boarded their ship, the Proz De Montis at 4 p.m. August 17 1918.[4]

The ship started for France on the following day, but after traveling only 5 or 6 miles from shore, the boiler “went on the blink” so they turned back and anchored in the harbor. Although they were not allowed to go ashore, my grandfather commandeered a life boat and went out for a row which he wrote was “great sport”. They could not start out again until August 26th. On the morning on September 7th his ship met the English convoy that would take them to England. He wrote that later in the day, one of the other ships had some sort of engine trouble and fell in behind the rest of the convoy. Then about 3:30pm that ship’s whistle sounded the signal for danger and all the ships followed with a general alarm. In a few minutes the ship that my grandfather’s ship had just passed was hit with a German torpedo about midships. Then a torpedo just missed my grandfather’s ship and he and the other soldiers were all ordered below then in a little bit they were ordered topside again and told to stand 2 feet from the ships rails. Two British destroyers and two airplanes began to hunt for the U-Boat. They later received a wireless telegram that the injured ship managed to pull into a port in Ireland and that no one had been injured.[5]

On the morning of September 8th his ship anchored in the Straits of Dover, where it was discovered they had anchored about 11 feet away from a mine. A tugboat pulled them
away from the mine and they debarked in Pilsbury England at 4:30 pm where they were read a greeting from the King. They took a train to Romney England and then hiked three miles to their encampment at Camp Woodley, where they were served a supper of bully beef, hardtack and tea.

On September 11 he noted that they took a hike to keep in trim—he also noted that this was supposed to be a rest camp! On September 12 they visited a very wealthy lord’s estate, which my grandfather wrote was just like a park. He also noted that the Kaiser had signed the guestbook.

His unit left for Southampton on September 13th and embarked for France. He arrived in Cherbourg 10am on September 14th 1918. They eventually were quartered in a small French town named Satallion where they were quartered in a French house. He noted that some the boys drank too much wine. My grandfather was a teetotaler—a trait he passed down to my mother and also myself. I believe it kept him out of a lot of trouble.

On September 22 he obtained a pass to Bordeaux where he purchased a picture postcard book which I believe is on display here with his uniform. Later back at camp he was assigned quarters and the men were assigned to special training schools. He went to gas school to learn all the ins and outs of chemical warfare. He was there for three weeks and passed the course. He was planning on visiting Paris but his regiment was ordered to the front.

He noted that the war was not so bad except he could not go anyplace as he came down with the flu and was ordered to the infirmary for 2 weeks where he also came down with bronchitis. He was released from the infirmary, but he got wet and came down with
bronchitis again. I believe he had a very close shave. In fact, according to divisional history information, there was an epidemic of influenza that swept through the division - between September 20th and the 28th there were 1,370 cases of the flu in one regiment of the 88th alone. The total numbers for the entire division were 6,815 cases of the flu and 1,041 cases of pneumonia from which there were 111 deaths[6].

When he finally recovered he again had orders to head for the front, when he wrote that the “great day arrived”. My grandfather always said that he was on his way to the frontlines when this information arrived. He could see the horizon lit up by the massive flashes of the Allied artillery barrage. This was November 11th 1918.

His next diary entry notes that they heard at 11 AM that the armistice had been signed. They celebrated with a stag dance in the mess hall which had a concrete floor and all the men had hob nail shoes.[7] Interestingly, my grandfather always maintained throughout his life that the war had been stopped too early. He believed that the Germans did not feel defeated and would once again at some future date, threaten world peace. He believed that the entire country should have been invaded and occupied—which of course is exactly what happened about 25 years later in WW II.

His regiment left for Bordeaux and a rest camp named Camp Guniscart on the 27th of November. He was given permission to ride in a car with several other enlisted men and another corporal. My grandfather was a also a corporal but the other corporal was put in charge of the little group by a lieutenant before they left for Bordeaux. They had dinner at the YMCA for 4 ½ francs. The other men wanted to stay and drink but as my grandfather
wrote, “not me.” He took a truck to their camp at 3:30pm. The other men were reported absent at roll call or retreat as my grandfather called it and a captain asked him where they were. He told the captain the last he had seen of them they were still in town drinking. The captain asked my grandfather if he had been in charge and he said no the other corporal was given command. The captain told him that he should have been in charge. The other men did not get back for two days and were still drunk when they got back to camp.

His unit stayed near Bordeaux where he noted that they kept up military routines of hiking and cleaning camp. He also noted that some of the soldiers were drunk every night. Often the men would try to find ways to go down to the docks where ships came in and where alcohol was easily available. My grandfather noted that he preferred to stay in barracks when they did this. He did finally go down to the docks after he was put in charge of some of the men—my guess is he was supposed to try and keep them sober. He noted that there was “such a lot of stuff of all kinds there”. [8]

All were eager to depart for the USA. He boarded the ship Pocohantas, which he wrote had been captured from the Germans and no doubt renamed. They set out for the USA on Christmas Day 1918. He also noted that they were served turkey for supper that day and that it was “quite good” even if it had been in storage too long. They arrived in Chesapeake Bay January 4th 1919 and debarked on January 5th. They arrived at Camp Stuart Virginia where their clothes and blankets were all deloused and they finally had a decent meal-steak, potatoes and gravy, white bread, apple sauce, corn bread and coffee with
sugar. \[9\] Later they were ordered to the YMCA where a doctor gave a lecture on venereal disease which undoubtedly some of the drinking men had acquired.

They left Virginia and arrived back at Camp Dodge on January 13\textsuperscript{th}. He noted that they were assigned the barracks about 2 blocks from where they were before they left for war. He was discharged on January 16\textsuperscript{th} 1919. He noted that he received 16 days pay upon discharge and 39 cents a mile back to their home. This mileage money was applied to their ticket if they bought it in camp. He entrained for North Dakota and arrived in Bowbells North Dakota on January 19\textsuperscript{th}. He wrote that only 2 of the original 35 men who left from there came back on the train from Camp Dodge. He later made his way back to Ohio to visit his mother and brothers.

Although there are no tales of daring do in my grandfather’s war diary, divisional history information makes it clear that the 88\textsuperscript{th} was instrumental in the Meuse-Argonne offensive which effectively ended WWI. The 88\textsuperscript{th} acted as a divisional reserve attached to the American IV Army Corps on the Meuse-Argonne front. The 88\textsuperscript{th} freed up several other divisions who were able to participate directly in the final offensives of the war. If the war had continued the 88\textsuperscript{th} was scheduled to participate in an offensive against German lines near Metz and Saarebruck. \[10\]

In conclusion my grandfather was always proud of his military service and later participated in a new organization for veterans called the American Legion. I am also very proud to have had a warrior in the family.
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