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Tried and True
Reviewing ~ Refining ~ Improving

Join us at MOMCC’s 40th anniversary conference at The Henry Ford (THF). MOMCC began in the afterglow of the Bicentennial and grew during the culture wars. Does MOMCC remain an organization relevant to its constituents? Help us set the course for the next decade. Workshop & selected sessions already proposed follow. After the Thursday workshops, attendees will gather for an evening in Eagle Tavern at Greenfield Village. Founding mothers and fathers will share their rationale for creating MOMCC, and newcomers will counter with what they can do for MOMCC. The more the merrier at this exploration of open air museums in the 21st century.

- Practical hints and how-tos of draft horse management & harness care in public venues
- Pick your cooking workshop: hearths, woodstoves, coal stoves
- Build-your-own workshop with THF collections in the Benson Ford Research Center
- Tour of Detroit churches and stained glass with relatives of architects and designers
- Tour Ford’s River Rouge plant; see a new industrial environment
- Saying what you mean in 60 words and 400 characters: Amazing Archives
- Public engagement with American textiles in the Midwest with THF’s Jeanine Head Miller
- Finding those nuggets to create vignettes with THF curator & events guru Jim Johnson
- Hints about going local with your own Innovation Nation shared by THF’s Saige Jedele
- Giving up the Helm: Multi-Generational Leadership with MI preservationist Mallory Bower
- George W. Carver in Iowa: New ways to teach Carver; Nature Studies & Museum Ed
- Visitor Studies – how to ask pertinent questions and what to do with your findings
- Creating meaningful programs around historic crops, foodways, crafts, and historical techniques? Share your story with MOMCC friends.

Session proposals should be submitted not later than August 1, 2018
Submit to Debra A. Reid, Curator, The Henry Ford, 20900 Oakwood Blvd, Dearborn, MI 48124
debrar@thehenryford.org  Phone (313) 982-6118

Call for proposals form can be found on the MOMCC website at www.momcc.org.
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2018 is the 40th anniversary of MOMCC. The first organizational committee was formed at the Midwest Museums Conference (MMC) in Indianapolis in September of 1978. The committee met again in November and two exchange programs were established. The first was an exchange of research information between sites, and the second was an interpreter exchange to take place the following summer. Sessions on open-air museums were also planned for presentation at the 1979 MMC conference in Des Moines.

The MMC conference in September of 1979 provided the setting for the organizational meeting of the new organization. At that meeting, by-laws were drafted and adopted, standing committees were formalized to include research, interpretation, curatorial, and crafts, and 28 people signed up as charter members. The founding principle was that a group of museums and museum professionals could benefit from active sharing, cooperation, and mutual support. This meant that MOMCC was not only for directors and administrators, but also for curators, researchers, interpreters, craftsmen, educators, restoration staff, and volunteers.

I attended that first meeting in Des Moines and signed up as a charter member. The open-air museums and living history fields were still fairly new and fresh invoking a sense of excitement and adventure that comes with new endeavors. I felt that same sense of adventure in my work at Lincoln Log Cabin as we delved into living history, first person, 1840s farming, period clothing, and Southern Upland dialect.

Every year, though, I looked forward to returning to my source of inspiration and information at the annual MOMCC and ALHFAM meetings. Many of the ideas I implemented at Lincoln Log Cabin came from these meetings and the open-air museums where they were held. Now, it’s been 40 years, and MOMCC and ALHFAM are still providing an opportunity for networking, exchanging information and ideas, setting standards of excellence, and still providing a source of inspiration and excitement for those of us who love living history and open-air museums. ❑
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CONGRATULATIONS to all for a great fall conference at Sauder Village. The sessions, accommodations, and camaraderie were excellent. We had great attendance, and the enthusiasm that has made this organization so vibrant and vital in the last 40 years was apparent in both first-time and repeat conference attendees.

Immediately after the conference we had our “wrap up” board meeting, my first “official” board meeting as newly-elected president. We welcomed two new members to the board: Jim Slining, as vice president, and Jim Johnson, as member-at-large. Both gentlemen bring knowledge and expertise that will be beneficial to both the board and the organization.

The board returned to Sauder Village in January for the mid-winter board meeting and retreat. Saturday was given over to the business of the organization and Sunday was set aside for a retreat. I want to thank the members of our board who came from as far away as Iowa and Wisconsin to participate in what evolved as a very thought-provoking and productive meeting/retreat time.

There was much discussion and work begun to resolve issues that have been long-standing. We welcome Andi Erbskorn, of Sylvania Historical Village, as the new webmaster. The organization is fiscally sound and viable; Deb Reid, our treasurer, and several other board members are seeking out opportunities that will both protect MOMCC assets and provide some growth to both Outreach and Endowment funds of the organization. These opportunities will be brought before the board for discussion and approval before any investing commitment is made. Members at large will be discussing the member awards, which will include Lifetime Achievement and Matelic Awards, in addition to new awards recognizing members for outstanding work in various fields of museum work. As always, the future conferences were discussed, and we are looking forward to the upcoming spring conference in Shakopee, Minnesota, and those scheduled through 2021. Thanks to Becky and Monique for all their hard work.

On Sunday morning, a retreat for the board was led by Kim Kiehl, who graciously donated her services to the organization. She introduced herself as an “outsider” not from the museum field, although she worked at the Smithsonian as CEO of the School of Exhibit Design, and currently works at the Ohio History Connection as the project director for the new State Museum of Ohio. Kim had previously surveyed the board to help prepare for the retreat. With Kim’s facilitation, the board looked at realities of the field and organization and put consideration into a review of membership data, small groups, moving forward as a 21st century organization, and developing the outline of a strategic plan. At the end of the retreat, Kim told the board she had come into the process as an outsider but had done research on MOMCC prior to the retreat and is now eager to join.

All of this is to say that the MOMCC board is working hard to keep the momentum going that you as members generate. Together, the board and membership will continue to make MOMCC a valuable resource for museums and historic sites in the Midwest region and all who are associated with the organization.

MOMCC’S 40TH ANNIVERSARY
“$40 FOR 40” CAMPAIGN

THE Fall 2018 conference marks the 40th anniversary of the Midwest Open Air Museums Coordinating Council. Conference hosts are planning a retrospective plus rousing conversation about future directions at a special Thursday evening banquet at The Henry Ford’s Eagle Tavern. Come join us for this once-in-a-lifetime event, and help celebrate what we’ve done and contemplate what we need to do to keep open air museums in the Midwest vibrant places of learning.

MOMCC has launched a $40 for 40 fundraising campaign. All proceeds go to support promotions of MOMCC that emphasize the regional organization’s unique assets and services to members. This includes special promotions for the 40th anniversary conference, support of extraordinary offerings during that conference, and a lasting legacy. All funds beyond those needed to support special 40th anniversary events will become part of the restricted endowment fund which supports services to members, including invited speakers for fall and spring conferences.

To support the cause, send your check (payable to MOMCC) to Debra A. Reid, MOMCC Treasurer, 22705 Nona St., Dearborn, MI 48124. Note: $40 for 40 in the memo line. Feeling generous; you can double or quadruple your donation. It all goes to a good cause!
Fellowships for MOMCC Regional Conferences cover conference registration in addition to funds for lodging at the conference site. The funding amount for lodging will be determined per conference by the MOMCC board.

Recipients are strongly encouraged to submit an article for consideration in the MOMCC magazine or to submit a session proposal for an upcoming MOMCC conference within six months of receiving the fellowship. Articles could include an account of their conference experience, a research paper, or a synopsis of a session that the fellow has presented at an MOMCC conference.

Eligible candidates must meet ALL of the following qualifications:

♦ You or your institution are a member of MOMCC.
♦ You have not received a fellowship to a MOMCC conference in the last two years.
♦ A cover letter stating: (limit of two pages)
  1. Your name and site affiliation;
  2. Your membership status (individual or institutional);
  3. Why you wish to attend the conference;
  4. An explanation of your financial need;
  5. How you intend to contribute to MOMCC;
  6. Past contributions to MOMCC, if applicable;
  7. If you are a first-time conference attendee (please specify).
  8. Attach a résumé with two (2) references (limit of two pages). Be sure to list any volunteer or recreational experience you have that relates to fields/activities served by MOMCC.

Failure to include any of the above information will disqualify an applicant.

Applications will be rated based on the following criteria:

1. Potential for future contribution to MOMCC;
2. Participation in living history, museum, or other work relating to MOMCC’s mission;
3. Rationale for attending the conference and participating in MOMCC;
4. Financial need;
5. Presentation of application.

All applications must be received by October 1, 2018
APPLICATIONS RECEIVED AFTER THIS DATE WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED.

Send Application to: MOMCC FELLOWSHIP COMMITTEE

c/o Mike Follin  mfollin@ohiohistory.org  or mail to:

Mike Follin, The Ohio History Connection, 800 East 17th Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43211

Please copy this form and provide all information via email/electronically, if possible. Regular mailed applications will be accepted also; please allow time for delivery and circulation among committee members.
PHENOLOGY means little to most Americans, and to most historical interpreters, it’s one of those “under the radar” aspects of 19th-century everyday life in America. Over the last 26 years appearing as Professor Phineas Fairhead, a fictitious Practical Phrenologist, at various historic events around the Midwest, I have found this to be too true. During that time, as more phrenological material on the internet and new publications emerged, I have come to believe that phrenology had a much greater impact on American popular culture than previously thought.

I believe that phrenology’s rise and subsequent success lie in its scientific plausibility, national yearnings for self-improvement, social reform, advertising, and the steam-powered printing press.

In the late 18th century, noted Austrian anatomist Dr. Franz Joseph Gall (1758-1828) examined the skulls and brains of condemned murderers as well as hundreds of asylum and prison inmates and determined that: 1) the brain is the center of thought, and 2) the brain is divided into different organs, also referred to as faculties or attitudes. These were empirical scientific observations, but, from here he veered off, unknown to him at the time, into the non-scientific realm by naming each organ and further pinning its location on the exterior of the skull. He called his new science “craniology.”

Gall was soon joined by Johan Gaspar Spurzheim (1776-1832), a German medical student, and by increasing their number of study subjects, sharpened their research, published their findings, and began to lecture to rapt audiences of physicians and fellow scientists throughout Austria, Germany, and France.

In 1809, Spurzheim broke with Gall and moved to England, where he promoted his own theory that a person’s brain was not trapped by its organization, as Gall continued to insist. Rather, Spurzheim argued, by using his or her brain’s organization, a person could, with effort, effect change. Spurzheim called his new theory Phrenology. England at the time was in the throes of its Industrial Revolution where society was rearranging and people were trying to find their place within it. Spurzheim published his findings of hope in the English scholarly and popular presses. This caught the attention of both the intelligentsia and working classes, and he began to lecture at academic forums, workingmen’s lyceums, and other public venues throughout the country.

During one of his tours, he met lawyer and skeptic George Combe (1788-1858) of Edinburgh, Scotland. Combe became convinced that not only was the brain malleable, but because it was also part of the body, it shared the same organic, physical, and moral forces of natural law as animals. This was dangerous thinking for the time, and like Spurzheim’s theories, challenged prevailing biblical teaching.

Combe also published and lectured on the idea that his combined phrenology/physiology ideas were the scientific avenue to health and social reform. In 1820 at the University of Edinburgh, he founded the Phrenological Society of
Edinburgh, which became the leading center for the study of phrenology in Britain. In 1828, he began publishing an English *Phrenological Journal*, which found broad appeal among physicians, lawyers, and other intellectuals. Other lesser phrenological societies were organized in several British cities to collect, compare, and discuss human and animal skulls -- some real, but most were plaster casts.

The theoretical educators in Britain and Europe came to accept that the science of phrenology provided the foundation on which their theories rested. Among those was the American Horace Mann (1796-1859), the future father of American education.

By the 1820s, phrenology, or “The Science of Man,” had already spread to America, by print and by Americans returning from Europe. One such returnee was Nicolas Biddle (1786-1844), president of the Second United States Bank and foe of President Andrew Jackson in the latter’s war against the bank. He founded the first Phrenological Society of America in Philadelphia in 1823.

As in Britain, other societies soon followed in cities along the American Eastern Seaboard, founded by those interested to discuss, examine, compare, and interpret their own skull collections, often referred to as Phrenological Cabinets.

During this time, America was also going through its own period of social upheaval. New immigrants were crowding into the eastern port cities. Settlers were scattering into the West, establishing plantations, farmsteads, small villages, and towns, where communication was slow, education sparse, and ignorance great. Social reform was in the air, and, as a result, the Second Great Awakening in the West and liberalization of the East’s established religions engendered a feeling by thinking Americans that their country was God’s chosen nation and with His help, they would usher in the Millennium. American society, indeed, was ripe for a visit from the leading purveyors of the “Science of Man.”

Upon arriving in New York City in 1832, he delayed his journey for a time to lecture there, where he met the painter John James Audubon. Audubon was carrying an invitation for Spurzheim to lecture at the Philadelphia Phrenological Society, but already obligated, Spurzheim continued to Boston, where he was received as hero. There, his lectures and demonstrations attracted mostly physicians, lawyers, and informed members of the public.

In great demand, he soon overtaxed himself, fell ill, and died. His funeral was held in the Old South Meeting House to an overflow crowd, and was said to be the most-attended funeral in Boston up to that time. It was there that phrenology was embraced by most of New England’s intellectual elite.

Upon Spurzheim’s death, the leadership of the phrenological movement fell upon George Combe, who by 1835 had published his famous *On the Constitution of Man*, a book that became an instant best seller in both Britain and America. It sold more than 200,000 copies, nearly equaling sales of the Bible. Not just a book on phrenology, it also touched on the natural philosophy of man and offered its readers a path to a better life.

In a short time, Combe himself was invited to come lecture in America. He arrived in 1838, and as Spurzheim before him, was met with great public acclaim, packing the phrenological societies, lyceums, and lecture halls up and down the East coast for the next two years.

Combe came in contact with artists such as Rembrandt Peale, Robert Rimmer, William Sidney Mount, Robert Cole, and the sculptor Hiram Powers; as well as writers James Fenimore Cooper, Nathaniel Hawthorne, Edgar Allen Poe, Harriet Beecher Stowe, and Walt Whitman. All were intrigued enough by his teachings to include overt and subtle phrenological references in their works. While meaningful to informed viewers and readers of their time, these are largely unrecognized and overlooked today.
Despite all the learned publications, lectures, readings, and visual arts patrons, the popularizing of phrenology into the everyday life of individual Americans can be credited to the Fowler Brothers.

In 1832, Orson Squire Fowler (1809-1887) an Amherst College student, attended one of Spurzheim’s Boston lectures and began analyzing the heads of his fellow students for three cents each. From this event came, I believe, the second empirical moment for phrenology: that money could be made from examining and interpreting, heads, one at a time. Soon, joined by his brother Lorenzo Niles Fowler (1811-1896), they launched a commercial venture of phrenological self-help which they called Practical Phrenology.

The entrepreneurial brothers co-opted Gall, Spurzheim, and Combe’s writings, added their own interpretations, and as natural showmen, lectured and gave public and private demonstrations for the famous and not-so-famous. In 1835, they moved to New York City and opened their own Phrenological Museum and company headquarters. The museum featured a phrenological cabinet of skulls, available for public comparison, and private rooms for personal phrenological readings (all for a fee). The Fowlers’ museum soon became as popular a tourist attraction as the nearby Barnum Museum. This made them wealthy and raised the ire of George Combe and his “legitimate” phrenology.

Samuel Roberts Wells (1820-1895) was once an assistant to Sylvester Graham (1795–1851), who had taught that temperance, vegetarianism, bland diets, and exercise would result in better health (“a healthy body makes a healthy mind”). Wells brought Graham’s ideas with him in 1843 when he joined the Fowler Bros. firm as a partner, changing its name to Fowler and Wells. Wells assisted in marketing their growing list of phrenological advice books such as: Matrimony, or Phrenology and Physiology Applied to the Selection of Congenial Companions for Life; Love and Parentage, Applied to the Improvement of Offspring: and Temperance and Tightlacing, Founded on the Laws of Life; as well as other works on vegetarianism, mesmerism, and hydrology. The partners also launched the American Phrenological Journal and Life Illustrated, a monthly magazine which reportedly had a readership of 50,000, and their popular and useful Phrenological and Physiological Almanac, which sold more than 120,000 copies yearly. Turning out this explosion of information was the newly developed steam-powered printing press. They also advertised in the leading newspapers and magazines of the day. By the end of the decade, Fowler and Wells was the largest publisher in New York City.

Unsurprisingly, the Fowlers’ money-making practical phrenology also opened the door for many interesting imitators, innovators, and other self-styled phrenological doctors and professors to slip through and set up shop. It is estimated that around 20,000 practitioners traveled throughout the nation over the 19th- and early 20th centuries. Most, I believe, were honest and sincere but others were not, and some even attained notoriety.

One, Dr. Joseph Rhodes Buchanan, combined his practice of phrenology with mesmerism and called it Neurology. He alleged that by his mere touch of certain organs on a subject’s head, he could immediately produce amazing changes in that person’s mental state and actions. In November 1842, Dr. Buchanan was challenged to a series of demonstrations to prove neurology’s authenticity. In New York City, a commission consisting of a Dr. Samuel Forry, physician, William Cullen Bryant, the poet, and John L. O’Sullivan, publisher of the Democratic Review magazine, investigated his claims. After a series of sessions in which, as advertised, the Doctor touched selected organs on several subjects’ heads immediately producing abrupt personality transformations, the commission was convinced. O’Sullivan printed his observations of the sessions in his magazine stating “…that Dr. Buchanan’s neurology was wondrous and held great help for the future of mankind.”

This is but one example of the tactics some practition-
ers employed as they toured cities, towns, and villages, either singularly, or as a show troupe. George Combe, in disgust, held them all in very low esteem, reporting that one even traveled with a trained bear. “Science” and hoopla, however, provided welcome distraction to an entertainment-starved populace. The famous Fowlers, as well as the others, marketed themselves by running advance advertisements for their tours in local newspapers.

In 1843 Horace Mann and Samuel Gridley Howe (1801-1870), abolitionist and educator of the blind, traveled to Europe to observe the successful secular schools in Prussia. After returning to America, Mann launched a common school movement and a teaching school, both in Massachusetts, eventually leading a successful national effort for free secular public schools, all based upon phrenological principles. Mann, writing to a young lawyer in 1852, said “The principles of Phrenology lie at the bottom of all sound mental philosophy, and of all of the sciences depending upon the science of the Mind; and of all of sound theology, too.”

Horace Greely, one-time roommate of Orson Fowler at Amherst, and who became editor of the New York Tribune, suggested that railroad trainmen should be chosen by the shape of their heads and submit phrenological analysis of themselves before employment. It is said that even Presidents Franklin Pierce and Zachary Taylor submitted themselves to “analytical delineations.”

By the 1840s, most of the established Christian denominations, as well as the newer ones, had reconciled themselves to the self-help popularity of phrenology and internalized many of its tenets. The reformers of New England were in the process of establishing free secular schools, ending the inhumane treatment of prisoners and the insane, advocating for the abolition of slavery, and promoting rights for women. Others went, armed with their Bibles and Fowler and Wells publications, into the West’s scattered populations as educators, preachers, and teachers, to save the West for Protestantism and to establish missions among the Indians, Africans, and South Sea Islanders.

The Fowler and Wells’ steam presses continued to print, filling the country with their publications as the itinerant practical phrenologists continued to spread the word.

By the end of the 1840s, however, the voices of non-believers and skeptics who had maintained all along that phrenology was flapdoodle -- not a true science at all -- were beginning to be heard. As the 1860s dawned, all the phrenological societies had folded, leaving the field to Fowler and Wells, their imitators, and the practical phrenologists. Phrenology was still very popular among the general population during the Civil War and into the 1880s, but as the nation’s physicians, lawyers, educators, and people of reason became more sophisticated about science, the voices of doubters and skeptics became louder. Comments such as “phrenology is like reading the contents of a safe by feeling its knobs,” and Ambrose Bierce’s definition in his Devil’s Dictionary that phrenology was “the science of picking one’s pocket through the scalp. It consists in locating and exploiting the organ that one is a dupe with,” undercutting the credulity of the popular mind.

An additional nail was driven into the coffin of Phrenology in 1872 when the famous writer and humorist, Mark Twain, paid a visit to L.N. Fowler for a reading. Twain did not divulge his identity and Fowler proclaimed that among his many positive attributes, he had no sense of humor! In another visit a few months later, in which Twain did identify himself, Fowler, not realizing the trick, proclaimed that Twain did have a great sense of humor.

Twain, in subsequent writings, of course, exposed Fowler and Phrenology as what he felt was a fraud.

By the end of the 19th century, another new fad, psychology, was beginning to catch the imagination of the European and American medical establishment and public. Another wag observed “Phrenology? The phrenologists...
were left so far at sea, that they could not swim to shore.”

Phrenology, as one of the “self-help” movements of the 19th century, took advantage of a renaissance period and helped fan the winds of change. Few who had phrenological readings of the bumps on their heads were able, despite published testimonials to the contrary, to make meaningful and lasting changes in their lives. There was a dark side of phrenology, too, which led to such things as racial profiling, misogyny, and even the development and practice of eugenics. However, phrenology, along with medicine shows, minstrel shows, early circuses, curiosity shows, and other traveling wonders, helped define an era and provided not only entertainment, but also wonderment and hope as America transitioned to a modern society ready to enter the 20th century.

**Bibliography**


**Lee Slider**, a Decatur, Illinois, native, is a longtime member of MOMCC and had the honor of serving as president for three years in the 1980s. He had worked in the construction field before becoming the Historical Interpreter for the Macon County Conservation District. There he restored the historic Trobaugh-Good House, a mid-19th-century upland-southern vernacular log and frame farm house, and established a volunteer interpretive program to staff it. He was also a founder and partner with Archaeological Resource Assessments, a salvage archaeological firm for 20 years. Before retiring in 2000, he started his personification of Professor Phineas Fairhead, Practical Phrenologist, and with his wife, Carroll, has appeared at many Midwestern historical sites over the years. Lee is still liaison between the Rock Springs Ground Squirrels Vintage Base Ball Club and its sponsor, the Macon County Conservation District, which he and others founded in 1993. Continuing with his research and writing on various subjects in local and Illinois history, he still makes a few appearances as Professor Phineas Fairhead—possibly the last of a long line of traveling Practical Phrenologists.

*LEFT, frontispiece from: Phrenological Illustrations, or An Artist’s View of the Craniological System of Doctors Gall and Spurzheim, by George Cruikshank, London, 1830.*
HE time has come, the crisis passed, enlightened woman will no longer conform to uncomfortable fashions in dress.

A meeting of respectable ladies was recently held in the city of New York, whereupon it was—

1. Resolved, that woman has a right to decide what kind of dress is most comfortable, convenient, and healthful.

2. Resolved, that we are heartily tired of carrying from three to twenty skirts on our hips, for mere purposes of show or appearances, thus impeding circulation, perverting the order of nature, and destroying health.

3. Resolved, that we experience very great inconvenience, under all circumstances, from wearing long dresses, while no good arises from that fashion.

4. Resolved, that we will not sweep the streets any longer with our dresses, unless paid by the corporation; and under no circumstances will we with the same, mop up the tobacco spittle of those who disregard the happiness and convenience of woman, and would if possible prevent her from rising to her proper level in society.

5. Resolved, that we will no longer wear consumption shoes and stockings, but will wear those that will promote health and add to our comfort.

6. Resolved, that we will not dress to please a false taste and hollow-hearted world; that we will lay aside all unnecessary wadding, padding, and gatherings, and extra clothing, and hang the weight of our dresses on our shoulders, that we may breathe freely, walk easily, protect all parts of the body alike from the weather, and at the same time secure an equal temperature and circulation of the blood.

7. Resolved, that we will use our best endeavors to convince other women of the evils of our present styles of dress, and turn a deaf ear to all devotees of fashion, and scoffing men.

8. Resolved, that the above resolutions be published in all journals and annuals favoring the improvement and elevation of women.

9. Resolved, that we meet the first Tuesday of every month until our work is accomplished.

10. Resolved, that any woman may become a member of this association who will comply with the above resolutions. Whereupon the meeting adjourned.

Miss Love Independence, Sec.          Mrs. Mary Prudence, President

Note.—The above representation is not designed to show the style of dress to be worn, but to represent a healthy, sound constitution, great energy of mind, and a full development of all the functions of the body.

From the Illustrated Phrenological Almanac for 1852 by L.N. Fowler.
NOTE: This article was originally written by Melinda Garvert for the Iles House newsletter

ONE doesn’t usually envision a Kentucky pioneer in the 1790s writing romantic valentines. That, however, is what was discovered about Thomas Iles from a collection of three valentines donated to the local history collections of Lincoln Library, the Springfield (Illinois) Public Library. At least two of the valentines are thought to have been written by Iles. Thomas was the father of Elijah Iles, a founder of Springfield who deserves the title of “Father of Springfield.” The valentines reveal a personal aspect of his father’s character.

Thomas Iles was born in 1765 in Chester County, Pennsylvania. According to Elijah’s autobiography, his father set out on his own at about the age of 17, following the marriage of his father to a step-mother with whom Thomas did not get along. Thomas immigrated to Kentucky in 1788 where he worked for wages in the summer and, according to Elijah, attended school in the winter. He paid for his board by working mornings, evenings, and Saturdays. Thomas then gained employment as a teacher. Elijah expressed pride that his father was able to teach him beyond the limited education he received during four winters of schooling.

Valentines have been around since the 14th century, and cards were being produced in Europe by the 17th century in addition to those that were lovingly hand-made, often in color and on cloth or paper. The donated cards are of the folded cut-paper variety, which used some simple Scherenschnitte techniques brought to America by Germans, Swedes, and Austrians. It cannot be said for certain that Thomas made the missives or if he had some help, but the one pictured has phrasing that was not usually a part of the traditional oral repeated verses and has enough spelling variations to make it personal. The penmanship is elegant, and one can imagine the amount of time that went into creating this valentine.

There are phrases on the other two cards that were frequently used on valentines, such as “The rose is red, the violet is blue, the lilies fair, and so are you …” and “When lots were cast this I drew, fortune said it must be you …”

The card pictured is the most complete and detailed of the three. As it appears to be an original composition using mythological references, Thomas evidently made good use of the available literature of the day. A poem he wrote at the time of his wife’s death in 1802 gives further evidence that he appreciated the written word and had a sentimental side.

Thomas’s wife was the Betsey Crockett named on the valentine dated February 20, 1792. Betsey arrived in Kentucky in 1790 with four of her siblings. The expressions of love evidently had their intended effect, as Betsey and Thomas were married in November, 1792. The couple moved with Betsey’s two brothers to the Bath County, Kentucky, area. Once there, Thomas was named by the new state’s governor to the Bath County Court. Later he served as justice of the peace and county sheriff. His main occupations, though, were farming and milling.

To read the message on the valentine pictured, rotate it continually – about 4 ½ times – or use the transcription below. Valentine historian, ephemera collector, and author Nancy Rosin feels the circular format is reminiscent of love knots, which symbolized the entwining of hearts. The transcription below uses the spellings and capital letters as found. Admittedly, there are a few instances where a guess was made for a word or two.
So Compeld by your darling Beauty for to write (section missing) ere incite Your brightest virtues hath so Charm’d my heart would make me sorry with my love to part For you are the lady I adore and Likewise shall be forever more Blasing Star all in my sight you seem to me both day and night It was not gold nor Diamonds bright that Caus’d me for to take this flight. but delightful parts in Woman kind I always Endeavor’d for to find. I Write these lines with the intent expecting for to get Consent of your sweet Love & other Charms and then embrace in your sweet Arms. For thou art Comely in my sight like Phebus to that heavenly bright that never was in Cupits Bonds nor from his Shaft Received a Wound. For the Turtle dove constant prove unto her loving mate and so will I until I die for I Cannot use Deceit. But if thou wilt hard hearted be and will not hear my Cry then Troubled Would I say adue for I shall surely die. I have wrote these lines in Black and white and seal them with my love to shew that I prove true to thee my Charming Turtle dove. If you do these lines distain pray send them back Conceal my name but if you take them in good part send me a present from your heart. A pair of gloves I do Demand be sure take Care and fit my hand Thomas Iles Feb 20th, 1792 To Mifs Betsey Crocket

Above is the circular valentine written by Thomas Isles to Miss Betsey Crockett on February 20, 1792. The circular format may be reminiscent of love knots which symbolize entwining of the hearts. The expressions of love evidently had the intended effect as Thomas and Betsey were married in November, 1792.

(Photos courtesy of the author)

THE ELIJAH ILES HOUSE
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS

The son of Thomas Iles, Elijah Iles was known as the father of Springfield, Illinois. He arrived in 1821, built the first store, was involved in selling the first lots in town, and named many of the streets. In 1834, Iles bought a lot at the corner of south 6th and Cook Streets and within a few years, built a Greek Revival house. It was a “raised cottage” with a full basement, a full length porch, and is now the oldest house in Springfield. It has been owned and lived in by many prominent citizens over the years and has been moved and restored twice. The City of Springfield purchased the house in 1993 and created the Elijah Iles House Foundation to restore and preserve the house.

A native of Springfield, Melinda Garvert received her bachelor’s and master’s degrees from Illinois State University. She began her career as an elementary teacher, later taught at ISU and worked as a school librarian. In 1986 she joined the staff in Lincoln Library’s Sangamon Valley Collection. She has worked as a volunteer at the Illinois State Museum and is active in the Sangamon County Historical Society.
FROM FIRST ENCOUNTER TO FUTURE FUNDER
THE ART OF CULTIVATING FINANCIAL SUPPORTERS
By Lesley Barker

As the executive director of the Bolduc House Museum in Ste. Genevieve, Missouri, now known as New France – the OTHER Colonial America, for seven years, I operated under the assumption that every aspect of that historic site was always ALL about development (non-profit code for fund-raising) – its mission, literature, programs, websites, and social media. I insisted that every time the museum was first encountered by anyone - onsite or online - there was an opportunity to engage that person for future participation (non-profit code for giving money) that would eventually include some form of repeat and growing giving. While today you might consider me an expert in museum interpretation and especially in the interpretation of diversity at the American historic house museum or historic site, when I first became involved with the Bolduc House Museum, it was as a nonprofit consultant specializing in development, grant-seeking, and grant-writing. So, it made sense then for me to view the challenges of leading that site through a fund-raiser’s lens. Even now, I believe that every person involved as a museum staff member, volunteer, or board member should be made privy to the site’s development goals and should also be trained to view each visitor as a potential long-term friend and investor in the museum.

Clara Miller, whose career as CEO of the Heron Foundation and founder of the Nonprofit Finance Fund, and who has been devoted to nonprofit development, wrote, “All non-profits are in two ‘businesses’ – one related to their program activities and the other related to raising charitable ‘subsidies’.”¹ For those of us who are in charge of the development of a small museum, this assertion implies that we have to be skilled jugglers. And we DO! There is a different skillset required for fund-raising and grant-writing than for designing exhibits, supervising departments, and leading tours. But, by thinking holistically about the whole system of the museum as a nonprofit organization with stakeholders and beneficiaries, I suggest that we can perhaps become less overwhelmed with the task of keeping all the balls in the air.

I have organized this article into four parts: 1) an overview and flow-chart of the steps that motivate a prospective funder from their first encounter with the museum until they become a major, legacy-leaving donor; 2) what the museum must do to enhance the probability that the funder will take each next step; 3) how the sequence of the steps that an individual tends to take from their first encounter with a museum to become a future funder varies predictably from one audience sector to another; and 4) a few tips about grant-seeking.

Overview

There is a predictable process of eight steps through which every donor moves from first awareness to major donor:

1. First Awareness
2. Mailing List Acquisition
3. Donor Prospect
4. First Gift
5. Donor Development
6. Donor Retention
7. Major Donor
8. Legacy or Bequest

¹ Miller, Clara, President emerita, Heron Foundation. Comments posted on the Heron Foundation website, 2014 (accessed 2014).
Once a person entrusts the museum with their contact information by signing up for the mailing list or following the site on social media, they ask themselves a new set of questions about the museum. It will have to satisfy these questions before most people will risk taking the next step towards becoming a donor. The questions concern what it feels like when you contact them. Are you reliable? Are you non-intrusive? Are you informative? Are you consistent? Are you affordable? Once again, every answer must be “yes” for them to move to the next step, which will not happen unless you can keep each person engaged with the museum.

The next step is for a person to be considered a donor prospect. The person has become engaged with the museum. They bring friends for repeat visits. They leave comments on the Facebook page. They attend classes or special events, but they have yet to make a donation. If the museum appeals to people to give because it “needs” money, it will sabotage its own fundraising efforts. People donate to any nonprofit organization because its mission and values resonate with their individual giving priorities and expectations. Engaged donor prospects ask themselves another series of very important questions which must be answered in the affirmative before they are likely to make their first gift of money: Does this organization match my interests? Does it merit my involvement? Does it make me feel important? Does it make it easy for me to give?

It is essential that the museum treat very small first time financial gifts with the same gratitude and follow-up it gives to very large gifts. Many people who have the “capacity” to become major donors with repeat gifts of over $1000 make a very small first-time gift to test the museum’s response. Tools and strategies need to be in place to help the donor prospect answer “yes” to their new questions. Make written cases for what results when someone invests money in the museum clearly visible both online and in plain view onsite. Easy to use, secure, online giving options should be on the museum website and social media platforms. The museum needs to create and keep handy back-office procedures and materials like response cards, databases, dedicated personnel, and routine procedures. These need to be rigorously followed to acknowledge, recognize, and honor each gift. The museum may be able to double its gifts from certain donors when it participates as a recipient non-profit organization in the employee matching gift programs offered by many major corporations. Sometimes a very effective vehicle to transition a donor prospect to a first-time donor is the “Friends of” organization.

**What the museum must do to motivate people to take each next step**

The first step is for a person to become aware of the museum. It happens when they first encounter or learn about the museum. During this encounter, a visitor processes the site through a series of reflective questions: Is this place hospitable? Is it friendly? Is it fun? Does it provide accurate information? Does it offer a meaningful experience? If the answers to any one of these questions is “no,” it is unlikely that this person will be motivated to visit a second time. It is even more unlikely that they will consider funding the museum outside of the price of admission and, perhaps, the purchase of a souvenir from the gift shop.

First awareness is assisted by the existence and caliber of the museum’s social media platforms, website, brochures, coverage by the traditional media, networking, and word of mouth. The clue that a first-time visitor, whether online or in person, is on track to become a donor is when they take the second step, which is to join the mailing list or to “like” and “follow” the museum on social media.

The museum can facilitate its mailing list acquisition process by using a blast email service like Constant Contact or Mailchimp, for example. These services facilitate easy, non-intrusive ways for museum visitors to sign up for email and regular mail from the museum. Invitations to join the mailing list should be visible at the museum, too. The staff and volunteers should be trained to encourage, but not brow-beat, visitors to sign up. Once new people join the mailing list, it is very important to have routine procedures in place to move them from the sign-up sheet to the data base. It is surprising and welcoming to send a post-card or email to thank a person for choosing to form a relationship with the museum within a week of their visit.

It is the unusual, unexpected person who dives in right away by giving a significant financial donation.
The next step, donor development, starts with the receipt of a first gift of any size. The museum’s response to this first gift determines whether most donors will consider making subsequent gifts. There are some legal requirements for gift acknowledgements for gifts over $250. However, the first gift, even from prospective million-dollar donors, tends to be under $50. Your appreciation and follow-up will impact any future participation by most donors. So will the answers to the new donor’s next set of questions.

New donors ask, “After I send a gift, is the response prompt, sincere, welcoming, thankful, well-planned and well-articulated?” Procedures, acknowledgment forms, and record-keeping must be accurate and on time if the answer to this question will be “yes.” Relationship has to deepen and continue to be built through ongoing personal communication and the provision of appropriate recognition and gratitude for each donor.

Each gift should be understood as a donor’s invitation for the museum to move to a new level of relationship with them. It can involve written, electronic, and face-to-face communication. The more genuinely appreciated a donor feels, and the more their opinion and realistic involvement is invited, the more likely they are to increase their participation. This is what happens at the next step, donor retention, which is evidenced by repeat gifts. As the relationship between the donor and the museum develops, repeat donors ask yet different questions of the museum, such as: over time, is this museum trustworthy, accountable, transparent, communicative, and a good investment?

Newsletters, special events, and personal contact initiated by the museum are ways for donors to find answers to these questions. For this kind of dependable relational growth to happen, the museum must allocate staff time and an adequate budget to its development department. It is important to realize that the fruit of this significant investment in personnel and materials is slow to ripen, taking months and years before the money spent to develop any single donor brings measurable returns, but that the proverbial harvest will happen in its time. It takes from 8-12 months and four to six personal visits for a “qualified” donor to make a major gift to a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization. Major donors are considered “qualified” when they indicate interest in the organization after making repeat gifts and when they also have the financial “capacity” to meet the organization’s definition of a “major gift.” The amount that meets the definition of a “major gift” can range from $1,000 to $100,000 based on the size and budget of the recipient organization. Whether a repeat donor to the museum has the “capacity” to become a “major donor,” in my opinion, should not predict how much attention is given to that person. Especially with museums, repeat donors can be invaluable participants in many more ways than just to be measured by the size of their bank accounts.

Major donors display a combination of interest in, enthusiasm for, and ability to invest in the museum. Their main questions involve how their involvement will be recognized and what ongoing benefits to the museum their giving will produce. To make the answers to these questions “yes,” the museum might consider providing naming opportunities and inviting its major donors to special recognition events. The donors may appreciate when the museum consults them, writes personal letters and emails, and takes the time to visit them. Some major donors may even be interested in serving on the museum’s board of directors.

Some major donors become so involved with a museum that they include it in their wills through a planned and structured gift, bequest, or annuity. Financial planners, accountants, and experts need to help with creating a museum’s planned giving program.

How the sequence of these steps varies with the audience sector

The sequence of these steps, while predictable, varies with the audience sector. This is why it is important to think about each person who enters the museum as a prospective long-term major stakeholder and participant, whether or not they appear affluent or likely donors. People first encounter the museum in various guises, such as Online Web Surfers; Tourists; Members of the Local Community; Homeschoolers, Educators, and Scholars; First Family Members; Board Members and Philanthropists; or Grant-makers. The position from which each person first encounters the museum informs how they tend to move from first awareness to become committed repeat and/or major donors.

Online web surfers can encounter a museum because they are planning weddings or vacations. They may be teachers planning field trips or people who shop online or are active in social media. Obviously, reaching these people presumes that the museum has an online presence. I found that if I spent around thirty minutes each day working with the various online venues, that kept the Bolduc House Museum growing online. We used two Facebook

and two Twitter accounts: serious ones to promote our events and announcements; and others that were more tongue-in-cheek from the perspective of our mascot, Zuts the Squirrel. We hired an outside consultant to revise the museum’s website to make it interactive, informative, and archival. We started to experiment with an online museum shop connected to the website. We connected a Pinterest account and a YouTube channel to the website, and regularly linked new content to our Facebook and Twitter accounts. We created a basic, free account with Wedding Wire. Each time someone booked an event at the site, at least one guest or relative engaged with us in a significant way during and following the event. We added links to tourism sites that made sense for our programs, location, and networks. The sequence with which an online web surfer moved through the steps from first encounter to repeat donor tended to be: 1) “like” the Facebook page; 2) join a mailing list; 3) become a “Friend” of the museum by purchasing a membership in that group; 4) send a donation; 5) attend an event; 6) send repeat gifts.

On their first visit to the museum, tourists rely on the quality of their experience to determine any future engagement. Sometimes they do not show how impactful the visit was, but you find out later. For example, one guest spent an hour watching a living history volunteer make a fish net. Several days later a group of tourists visited because she had highly recommended the site. Another visitor became enchanted with our mascot, Zuts the [puppet] Squirrel. He engaged with our Facebook pages. When we posted about building a Quebec-style outdoor bread oven for which we wanted to locate a source for rough-cut cedar boards to make a shelter, this man asked, on Facebook, what dimensions should the boards be. The next week, he arrived with a pick-up truck loaded with the gift of exactly those boards from a sawmill near his home, 100 miles from our site. A third visitor came with a group while we had a fund-raising campaign to purchase a certain painting. We lacked $1,800 at that time. He asked, and I told him the amount. He gave $900 on the spot and, because he worked for a corporation with a matching gift program, his gift was doubled, allowing us to complete the purchase. This was the first of many gifts from this generous tourist. Tourists first encounter the museum in person. They tend to progress through the steps from first encounter to repeat donor in this sequence: 1) join the mailing list; 2) “like” the Facebook page; 3) attend an event; 4) send a donation; 5) send repeat gifts.

Members of the local community approach, first encounter, and continue to be engaged with the museum through the shop, classes, volunteering, and happenstance. One retiree moved to town to be near family. She had already visited the museum and had asked if there were possible volunteer opportunities. Since then, she has spent a day each week working in our archives with another retired lady. She also answers the phones during the weekly interpretive staff meetings. Another retired editor and graphic artist volunteered to do layouts and illustrations for new exhibits. Still other community members volunteered to help with Living History activities, carpentry work, homeschool events, and other programs. They attended lectures and special events. They attended community groups and activities that met in our facility. They might meet me around town and come, for the first time, out of curiosity. Finding hospitality and meaningful ways to participate, many continued to increase their engagement. Members of the local community tend to become increasingly engaged with the museum by 1) “liking” the Facebook page; 2) joining the mailing list; 3) attending events; 4) joining the “Friends” group; 5) becoming a volunteer; 6) giving money.

Homeschoolers, educators, and scholars usually first encounter the museum by scheduling or attending a field trip or class. A history class for high school students who were being homeschooled became a recruiting tool for six teen volunteers, four of whom became paid staff members when they were old enough. After five years, a monthly program for homeschoolers grew large enough for the museum to hire a dedicated staff coordinator. Parents of the participants in both programs became museum volunteers. They also made financial and in-kind donations to the museum. One area school used the museum for an annual eighth grade community service project that connected with researching local history. We could count on receiving a minimum of 100 volunteer hours each year from this school. They did such things as: dismantling our Christmas light display, doing supervised hands-on historic preservation, working in the garden, and assisting to inventory the books in our library. Many visiting adults mention that they remembered having first attended a fourth-grade Missouri history field trip years ago and decided to bring their own children or grandchildren. Some students enjoy their experience on a field trip to the museum and return the next weekend with their parents. Academic researchers and doctoral students sometimes request to visit, use the archives, and do other serious investigations. When these highly specialized individuals discovered us to be hospitable and interested in their work,
they often returned the favor by doing translations, giving lectures, and helping to refine our interpretation, offering their professional expertise at no cost to the museum. Homeschoolers, educators, and scholars seem to progressively engage with the museum following their first encounter in this typical sequence: 1) “like” the Facebook page; 2) join the mailing list; 3) attend an event; 4) become a volunteer or intern; 5) become a “Friend” of the museum; 6) give money.

First family members may have the most compelling reason to become engaged with a museum. They are, after all, the descendants of the families interpreted at the site. They may first encounter the museum through word of mouth within the family, sometimes finding and following it online. Next, they may engage with it through questions about genealogy and other family-specific stories. When they visit, they often contribute new information that provides new clues for research and programming. They tend to donate or loan family artifacts and heirlooms as a way to honor their legacy. They are the most likely to donate money for preserving or restoring items that connect specifically to one of their ancestors. First family members tend to follow these steps once they have been introduced to the museum: 1) “like” and follow the Facebook page; 2) join the mailing list; 3) attend an event; 4) join the “Friends” of the museum; 5) make an in-kind gift; 6) give money.

Board members are frequently recruited because their influence, affluence, and professional expertise are valuable to the museum. Most organizations expect 100% annual “participation” (i.e. financial donations) from the members of their boards. Board members who are genuinely enthusiastic and engaged with the museum attend museum events, bring guests to visit, volunteer, and become actively involved with the site in strategic but individually meaningful ways. A board member first encounters the museum by visiting by chance, or by being invited or specifically recruited to consider participating with the museum in a capital giving campaign. They may also learn of the museum from a friend or by being affiliated with an associated organization. They often progress from first encounter to major donor through the following steps: 1) attend an event; 2) make a small first gift; 4) become a “Friend” of the museum; 5) attend donor recognition events; 6) make repeat gifts.

Philanthropists and grant-makers may first encounter the museum when it requests a grant to fund a program or some part of the general operating costs. Grants are not magic money. They only happen when the funder’s priority is served by the museum’s programs and when the museum carefully respects the funder’s published guidelines for submitting a proposal. Each foundation stipulates its preferred first approach. Unless this is respected, the chance of receiving money from them is unlikely. However, once a relationship with the foundation is established, repeat or on-going funding is not unusual.

The Grant-Seeking Process

Grant-seeking is an art and a science that depends on an intimate familiarity with the museum as well as a careful analysis of each prospective grant maker. There are specific skills needed to research foundations whose giving priorities match a museum’s vision and mission. Once a short list of prospective foundations has been identified, it is important to follow their individual submission guidelines. It is useful to learn which of your donors, board members, and volunteers are themselves members or know members on the boards of these prospective grant-making organizations. It is essential to listen to any advice about if, when, and how to approach any of these individuals. The first

---

**THE GRANT-SEEKING PROCESS FROM PLANNING TO PROPOSAL**

Once your 501(c)3 organization is awarded a grant, you need to continue to cultivate your relationship with the funder. Invite their representatives to view your program. Send thank you letters and make sure that your program runs according to your plans. Statistics demonstrate that once you have received one grant, it is much easier to receive subsequent grants. You should expect this process to take an average of 12 months.
goal, other than to plan and budget the program or cause for which you are seeking a grant, is to craft a written request that echoes the foundation’s directions, using their language as often as possible. This is aided by studying the foundation’s website, literature, listing on grants databases, and most recent IRS 990 tax return. Some foundations make a habit of rejecting an organization’s first request to see if they will pursue them a second time. Each foundation has a preference about when to submit a request, what the length and format of the request should be, and what protocol to follow when a grant has been made. Grant-seeking is somewhat formulaic but always very customized. Sometimes hiring a skillful consultant is the most cost-effective way for smaller museums to begin to apply for, and, hopefully, receive grants. The consultant can create the best possible ask but there is never a guarantee that funding will be awarded. Often, when I have worked with client organizations, they initially hired me to write grants. However, when I began to collect the documents and information needed, my role would shift from grant-writer to helping to ready the organization to ask for and to receive grants. What this has involved has often taken several months. Once a grant request has been submitted, the average interval between requesting and receiving a funded grant is a year.

Conclusion

Whether a museum seeks small donations, Friends members, and renewals, the way to a person’s pocket is through their heart. Build relationships. Make compelling cases for why anyone should invest time, talent, or treasure in the museum. Do not approach fundraising and development from the point of view that the museum needs money and that your prospective donor has some. This is unlikely to be as successful as starting with the truth that the museum represents a compelling opportunity to which it is inviting the participation of interested, engaged, and enthusiastic people and organizations. Make sure that presentation of this opportunity is strong, based on adequate research, conceptual design, and precedent. Then, because the museum has been diligent about researching each prospective donor’s giving capacity, the request can be tailored accordingly.

Lesley Barker is a museum consultant specializing in interpretation, leadership, and historic house museums. She holds a Ph.D in Museum Studies (approved 2017 to be awarded 2018) from the University of Leicester in the UK. She served first as consultant to the Bolduc House Museum and then as the site’s executive director from 2006-2016. The material in this article was presented twice in 2014: at the MOMCC/ALHFAM Conference in Cincinnati and at the Small Museum Association Conference in Ocean City, MD. It was presented again in 2015 at the MOMCC/ALHFAM Conference in Collinsville, Illinois.
The domestic chicken is descended from the jungle fowl of India and southern Asia. There is some debate as to which type—the red, gray, green, or Ceylon. Green has a non-serrated but multicolor comb and single wattles. The other three have a single, serrated, upright comb and a pair of wattles. The gray is believed to be the source for the modern chicken’s yellow skin.

Early traits which predisposed these fowl to domestication were that they were seed and grass eaters and therefore not in competition with humans, they were adaptable to a wide range of climates, and they imprint on the first encounter (even if the first encounter is with a human).

Domestication of jungle fowl occurred independently in different parts of Asia. Earliest evidence of domestication has been traced to 5400 BCE in China. DNA tests of Chilean chicken bones suggests their presence in the Americas before Columbus.

There are two basic types of chickens. The larger, heavy breeds are used for meat and some can reach market in 5-6 weeks. The smaller-bodied, lighter weight birds divert their energy into producing eggs. Some breeds are dual purpose, and there are also ornamentals and bantams.

**Physical Characteristics:**

The following are differences between hens and roosters: Hens have smaller combs and wattles, rounded hackle and saddle feathers, and shorter rounded tails. Roosters have larger combs and wattles, pointed hackle and saddle feathers, and long sickle feathers in the tail. Roosters have foot spurs while hens generally do not, are bigger, and have shiny and often more colorful feathers.

An interesting fact about the color of a hen’s earlobe is that it roughly corresponds to the color of her eggs. White earlobe—white eggs and red earlobes—brown eggs.

The average life span for chickens is 8-10 years, but it could be twice that. A laying hen is most productive during its first two years, and then production drops.

Chickens have a body temperature of 107.4°F for an adult and a heart rate of 200-350 beats per minute. There is some variance between breeds, and large chickens tend to have the lower rate. The respiratory rate for a rooster is 18-20 per minute; 30-35 per minute for a hen.

The skeletal system is composed of three types of bones: cortical bone for strength (such as the outer surface of the femur and humerus), pneumatic bones that are lightweight due to air cavities (such as the skull, humerus, clavicle, keel...), and medullary bones that store calcium (such as the tibia, ulna, ribs...). Pneumatic bones also function as a second respiratory system. Secondary bronchi lead to separate air sacs in the pneumatic bones which assist in breathing. A broken pneumatic bone can cause respiratory difficulties. Approximately 10-14 days before a hen starts laying, the medullary bones change so they can provide calcium for egg production. This change is only found in chickens and dinosaurs. The bones provide 47% of the calcium for the egg shell and the remainder comes from their feed.

Chickens have three types of muscles: cardiac muscles that circulate blood, skeletal muscles that are attached to the bones and control voluntary movement, and smooth...
muscles that control involuntary movement. White and dark meat differ in the amount of fat they contain and in the amount of a protein called myoglobin-a, which carries iron and oxygen. The more a muscle is used, the more of this protein it needs, and the darker the meat.

For the safety of the chicken, there is a proper way to handle them. It is important to support the sternum and legs with one arm underneath the chicken, using the other hand to cover the wings. In order for the chicken to breathe properly, the chicken needs to be held loosely to allow the sternum to have enough room to move.

A chicken’s skin is composed of the following specialized structures: beak, claws, spurs, scales, earlobes, wattles, and comb. It also has one secretory gland -- the uropygial -- near the base of the tail. The skin colors are black (from the presence of melanin), white (dominant trait), and yellow, which is preferred by consumers. Even with the right genes, there must be enough carotenoid (from corn or alfalfa) in the diet for the skin to turn yellow. Yellow skinned breeds start to lose pigment in their skin during the laying period because it is diverted to the egg yolks. This pigment is lost in a specific order starting with the vent, then the eye ring, earlobes, beak (from the base to the tip), and finally the lower leg. The shank color depends on the color of the epidermis (upper layer) and the dermis (lower layer). Examples: black shank color has a black epidermis and black dermis, slate blue shank color has a white epidermis and black dermis, and a willow green shank color has a yellow epidermis and black dermis.

Feathers give chickens their shape and color, and provide protection. Chickens have five main types of feathers:

Contour – large feathers that give the chicken its shape, color, and protection. Principal examples are the tail (equal vanes) and flight (leading edge narrower) feathers.

Semi-plume – act as extra insulation.

Filo-plume - scattered among the contour feathers; have sensory receptors at their base believed to give information on what is happening to the contour feathers.

Bristle – on the head to spread oil.

Downy/plumule – insulation; short shaft, soft barbs.

Molting

Molting takes place when worn and battered feathers are shed and new feathers grow in. Chicks molt four times, while adults usually molt once per year between laying periods.

In adult birds, molting lasts 6-7 weeks. During molting, some birds will stop laying for 8-10 weeks while some will just lay less. It is influenced by a bird’s health, diet, and care. In the wild, chickens will stop laying at the end of the summer and finish molting before winter. Molting occurs in a particular order starting with the head, neck, and body, followed by the wings and tail.

The feathers represent 6% of a chicken’s body but consume 15.2% of its energy. Feathers are 90% protein, so you need to continue feeding a layer’s ration during molting.

Senses

A chicken has a 300° vision field that sees in color and UV with limited night vision. Chickens have markings visible in UV light believed to cue reproduction. The eye has upper and lower eyelids and a membrane to protect it, as well as double cones to help with motion.

Chickens can see in two different ways: binocular (using both eyes) and monocular (using each eye to see completely different fields). The binocular field is about 26° of the 300° and is used when feeding, to judge distance, and to identify each other. Other interesting facts include:

Their sense of taste is limited. They have only 24 taste buds while humans have 9000.

Chickens can make about 22 different vocalizations.

The upper jaw contains olfactory receptors to help with food choices.

The ear picks up sounds between 15 and 10000 Hz while the feathers that surround the ear opening help funnel sound to the ear.

A chicken’s sensory nerves in the beak respond to pressure when feeding, while other sensory nerves in the skin respond to pain, hot, and cold.

Thermo-regulation

Chickens do not sweat but have other ways to regulate their body temperature. An abundance of capillaries in the comb and wattles provide the red color, but more importantly act as radiators to cool the birds by transferring
heat to the surrounding air. Heat is also transferred by tracheal mucosa, nasal cavity, lungs, and air sacs. Other methods for cooling are by panting, shedding feathers, pressing plumage close to the body, or drooping the wings to increase the surface area exposed to air.

Heat stress can kill a chicken within 15 minutes. For example, at a temperature of 109°F, 30% of chickens will die. Hens will lay fewer eggs if too hot, and young birds will grow more slowly. Heating is metabolic. They will fluff the feathers to trap a layer of air.

**Digestive System**

Food enters the beak, which has a tongue but no teeth, and then continues to the esophagus and into the crop, where it can be stored for up to 12 hours. Mucous is secreted into the crop and the esophagus to lubricate and soften the food. The food continues to the proventriculus (true stomach), where HCL and enzymes are secreted to break down and digest the food. Next is the gizzard/ventriculus or mechanical stomach. It is made up of strong muscular tissue which grinds the food into a fine powder using the grit and stones which collect in the gizzard. No digestion takes place here. From the stomach, the food passes to the small intestines (incl. the duodenum), moving via a series of muscular contractions (peristalsis). Pancreatic juices and bile from the liver and ceca bacteria are added to finish digestion. Finally, the large intestine absorbs water.

A unique characteristic of chickens is they do not urinate in the traditional sense, but instead the waste is ejected with solid uric acid as a white substance on the feces.

**Reproductive System**

A rooster’s sperm is passed through its cloaca (the opening on hens and roosters that allows mating, excreting, and for the hen, laying eggs) into the hen’s cloaca (cloacal kiss). Enough sperm enter and travel up the oviduct to fertilize 12-14 eggs. The hen stores sperm in a funnel-shaped cavity (the infundibulum) for up to four weeks. When the yolk is mature, it drops from the ovary into the infundibulum where fertilization takes place. It then passes through the magnum (albumen and chalazae), isthmus (shell membranes), uterus/shell gland, vagina (cuticle layer), cloaca, and out the vent. This process from ovary to vent takes about 25 hours.

The age of first mating takes place when pullets are at least 18 weeks old and roosters at least 24 weeks old. A hen will lay fertilized eggs for 2 to as long as 3½ weeks. An incubated, fertilized egg will hatch in roughly 21 days. Hens do not have to mate to lay eggs, but they do require 14-16 hours of light each day to lay one egg every 25 hours.

A hen has only one functioning ovary (the left) and is most vulnerable when the yolk drops from the ovary. Panic or stress can cause the yolk to miss the infundibulum leading to the death of the hen.

While passing through the oviduct, the egg will divide two, three, or four times. The egg will be about 105°F when laid and usually will not have an air cell. The air cell will form as the egg cools, and is the result of the different contraction rates between the shell and its contents. All development ceases when the temperature reaches 68°F.

Temperature controls are vital for maximum egg laying. If the temperature is greater than 80.6°F or less than 10°F, egg laying will drop by 25%. Egg laying ceases at 0°F. The ideal temperature range is 50-70°F.

**Behavior**

Chickens are polygamous and live in a harem environment but have long-term memories of individuals within the flock (such as position in pecking order, rooster) and can recognize newcomers. One rooster to 25 hens is a good ratio for fertilization. Roosters and hens can form bonds but can also be competitive. Chickens are omnivores (mostly insect based in the wild) and will share food. They are active during daylight hours and will seek higher spots at night even though they have limited flying ability. Their preference is to nest in well-hidden spots while scanning the sky for predators, and they will issue alarm calls. They are monoparental — only the hen scrapes the nest, incubates eggs, broods, protects the chicks, and leads them to food.

Chickens are known for taking dust baths that absorb oil, usually every other day. Chickens practice preening by using their beak to spread waxy oil from the uropygial gland (located near the base of the tail) through their plumage to restore shine and waterproofing. This oil has some antibacterial properties that protect against feather damaging bacteria. Preening helps to maintain an attractive appearance for mating and to remove dust and feather mites. It also rearranges feathers to keep a smooth appearance and provide protection against the weather.
When mating, hens prefer roosters who are socially dominant, have large fleshy combs, flap their wings more often, and have bright plumage. Roosters prefer hens who are novel and have flashier or bright combs.

**Incubation**

Incubation starts when a clutch, a group of eggs laid on consecutive days, is complete. In the wild this was 8-12 eggs, today it is 12-16 eggs. Development of the embryo begins when the temperature of the egg reaches 86° F and continues as long as the eggs remain around 100°. For the next 21 days the hen will leave the nest once a day to feed, drink, defecate, and bathe. During this period, hens can become secretive, immobile, aggressive, and protective.

A hen will turn eggs three to four times per day, secreting an antibacterial fluid from her breast to clean the eggs and kill bacteria. This practice stops about three days before the eggs hatch so as to not interfere with the chick’s ability to hatch. Brooding hens may develop a naked or brood patch on their belly, which is an area rich in blood vessels and which improves heat transfer to eggs. After about a week, the hen will aid synchronization of the hatching by relocating some eggs to the edge of the nest (cooler so slows development) or to the middle (warmer to speed development) based on the peeping of the chicks within.

The shell thins as the embryo utilizes the calcium in the shell for its skeleton. The embryo receives air from a small bubble near the tip of the egg and through 7000 tiny pores in the shell. During the last few days, there is intensive calling between the hen and unhatched young, and between the embryos. The mother and offspring establish a bond through these calls.

**Hatching**

One day before hatching, the chick makes a small hole near the blunt end using its egg tooth (a sharp keratinized bump on the top of the beak which is shed soon after hatch). It then rotates around inside of the egg to create a circular cut, taking frequent rests and peeps. The chick absorbs the yolk sac with its lipid storage just before hatching. Once the eggs have started to chip, the hen will not want to come off the nest. She will sit on the nest without food or water for up to 48 hours.

After the chicks have hatched, the temperature should be maintained at 89-90° F. It is dangerous for the baby chicks if the temperature falls below 79° as the chicks are unable to regulate their body temperature.

**Keeping Chickens**

Some factors to consider when selecting a breed of chicken are site historical context and weather. For historic breeds, one source of information is the *British Poultry Standard* published by the Poultry Club of Great Britain (starting 1865) or the *Standard of Perfection* published by the American Poultry Association (starting in 1874 and with 41 breeds). By the turn of the 20th century the number of classes had grown to over 100. The World Wars accelerated the process of breeding for productivity.

Dual-purpose breeds were developed in the early 20th century. Until recent times, all domesticated chickens were laying breeds. When they ceased to lay, they went to the table. The intention of creating dual-purpose breeds was to create poultry for the small-scale farmer -- hens for eggs and surplus males for meat.

The “Chickens of Tomorrow” contest after WWII was organized by farmers, breeders, and suppliers with cash prizes from A&P Grocery stores. The object was to create the ultimate breed — the most meat in the shortest time and at the lowest feed cost. “No longer farm chicken but chicken farming” (from: d.lib.ncsu.edu)

Weather must also be taken into consideration. In climates with harsh winters, breeds with pea combs and small wattles are not as susceptible to frostbite. In hot climates the lighter breeds will handle the temperatures better.

**Nutritional Needs**

Chicken feeds must fulfill four basic needs: growth, maintenance, energy, and production. The complete ration requirements are protein (growth, maintenance, and production), carbohydrates (soluble for energy and insoluble/fiber for palatability), fats and oils (provide 2.2-2.5 the energy of carbs), mineral salts (mainly calcium and phosphorus for new and replacement tissue, maintenance of blood pressure), vitamins (A, B complex, D, E, and K), and water.
Nutritional feeds are the most important factor in a chicken’s welfare. The wrong feeds can lead to reduced disease resistance, egg eating, feather pecking, and even cannibalism.

Since chickens do not have teeth, it is important that grit/stones (included in most commercial feeds) be included in the diet to mechanically break down food.

Laying hens need a diet rich in calcium and nutrients to generate lipids, vitamins, hormones deposited in the eggs, and the enzymes with antibacterial properties of the albumin to protect the embryo. Chicks require a ground feed (easy for them to eat and digest) different from layers’ rations (calcium levels in laying feeds can damage their kidneys).

## Housing

Different types and breeds of chickens have different housing requirements. The light breeds need higher fencing or roofed runs. Laying stock need room to roam and forage while it is best to limit the space for meat stock.

Birds need shelter from wind and rain. Solid floor space needs to be 1.5-2 ft² per bird, while slotted floor space should be 9 in² per bird.

Perches need to be 12-24 in. high constructed of soft lumber (easy to grip) and run either lengthwise or on the end of the shelter. The hen’s path to the nesting boxes from the perches should not be through fresh droppings.

Nesting boxes should be a cube that is 12” on a side with the lowest row 15” off the floor and the second tier 29” off the floor. The boxes should be in a low light area with one box for every five birds.

Good ventilation should be draft-free and provide 4.5 in² of air flow per bird. Exit and entry doors of 12” x 12” should be located on the south or west side of the shelter. One door is required for every 6-25 birds. Windows should be located on the south wall to maximize light into the hen-house.

In-line feeders provide 4” of space per bird and circular feeders need a minimum of 1” diameter per bird. A watering fount should be ½” per bird, while a trough waterer should provide 1” per bird.

There are four basic systems of housing. The first is free-range, where each bird has 6 yds² or you have less than 100 birds per acre in a fenced enclosure. The second type are folding units that are moved to fresh ground each day. The third type is semi-intensive housing (a shelter included in a fenced enclosure). If a single run is provided, it should include 6 yds² per bird, but if alternating runs are provided you only need 3 yds² per bird. Shade should be provided over the runs. The fourth type is intensive housing (deep litter houses). It requires 4 ft² per bird with the floor covered with wood shavings or straw starting with 4” and adding as needed up to 9-10”. It is necessary to turn and mix to keep the litter dry. Litter should be cleaned at least once a week. Outside shade in the summer months is important.

### Dealing with Eggs

The USDA has established guidelines for preparing eggs for market. The guidelines state that eggs should be washed with water at least 20° F warmer than the egg or 90° F, whichever is warmer. (Cold water causes the egg contents to contract and draw in polluted water.) Use only potable water with low iron content. Use detergent and detergent sanitizer that will not give odor to the eggs. Then rinse with water that is warmer than the wash water and use an approved sanitizer. Lastly, you need to dry the eggs.

Washing the eggs removes most of the outer cuticle which increases the rate of CO₂ and moisture loss. To reduce this loss, the eggs are sprayed with a light coating of food grade mineral oil.

Today eggs are sorted by size which is determined by the weight of the egg expressed in ounces per dozen.

### Candling

The grading system includes the condition of the shell as to the normal oval shape with one end larger and checking for thin spots or ridges or roughness that affects the shell strength. Candling is performed to check the quality of the egg (no dark circular areas indicative of germ development and no visible blood lines or rings) for cracks in the shell, the yolk, and the size of the air cell.
Eggs are sorted by size which is determined by weight in ounces per dozen.

An alternative way to grade is to check the size of the air cell. The size of the air cell is an indication of freshness – the smaller, the fresher. A grade “AA” egg has an air cell smaller than a dime, a grade “A” egg has an air cell bigger than a dime, but smaller than a nickel and a grade “B” has an air cell bigger than a nickel but smaller than a quarter. The air cell is what forms the dimple at the wide end of a hard-boiled egg. For further information on egg handling refer to the USDA Egg Grading Manual available online.

Candling of eggs is also used to check the developing chicks. After the hen has been incubating the eggs for 5-7 days, the eggs are candled. This is usually at night in the dark when the hen is in a dormant state. The candling will check the condition of the embryo for the following problems: the chick has died, there is no chick present (unfertilized egg), blood vessels are disrupted, bacterial rings are present, blood spots are visible, or cracks are detected. If any of these conditions exist, the egg should be discarded.
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HISTORIC CHICKEN BREEDS AND VARIETIES
In the 19th and Early 20th Centuries
By Tom Vance

CHICKENS are a favorite attraction at historic sites and living history farms. They are relatively inexpensive and easy to keep so are often the vanguard of any new historic livestock program. A “chicken is a chicken,” however, is not a sound approach to a poultry program. As with any aspect of a historic site and it’s programs, sound research and historical accuracy are not only important, but can also add a great deal to the daily interpretation.

This article, through examining 20 primary source books and other relevant information, will attempt to sort out what varieties of chickens were available and commonly used during different periods of the 19th and early 20th centuries. All the listed primary sources can be found on Internet Archives in digitized form. The easiest way to find a book on Internet Archives is to type the book name followed by “Internet Archive” in Google search and it will come right up in the listing. Other good primary and secondary sources are also available with some searching.

Additional research should focus on the particular state and area where a historic site is located. While some varieties were more universally available, others were popular only in certain areas of the country. Networking with other historic sites and farms that already have poultry programs can also give good insights as well as possible sources for historic breeds.

A good source of information on historic and heritage breeds of chickens is The Livestock Conservancy. This organization, based in North Carolina, provides information on heritage breeds including cattle, horses, sheep, goats, pigs, and donkeys, as well as poultry. Regarding chickens, information includes a definition of heritage breeds, a listing and status of heritage breeds, breed comparison chart, listings of breeders and hatcheries, and a “Heritage Chicken Manual” that gives detailed information.

1.1. White Dorkings
2.2. Poland Fowls
3.3. Creoles or Belton Grays

A GROUP OF DOMESTIC FOWLS.
5.5. Gray Game Fowls
4.4.4. Cochin Chinas
6.6. Hamburg Fowls
7.7. Bantams

on keeping and raising heritage breed chickens.

Two more sources include the Heritage Poultry Conservancy with breed profiles and other information, and the American Poultry Association, which sets and maintains the standards for heritage poultry breeds.

As mentioned above, The Livestock Conservancy provides listings of certified heritage breeders as well as a listing of hatcheries that carry heritage breeds. At least one Midwest historic site, Conner Prairie, is included in the list of heritage breeders. The hatchery we ordered from when I was at Lincoln Log Cabin was Murray McMurray Hatchery in Webster City, Iowa. Every spring the mailman would drive up with a box full of cheeping chicks.

Another way to obtain more period-correct varieties of the historic breeds, many of which have changed over the years, is to do selective back-breeding. Based on period illustrations and descriptions, different breeds, each with some desired characteristics, can be bred, and the offspring with the closest correct appearance selected.

The specific primary source publications that are utilized are listed below and were accessed on Internet Archives. Many of them have multiple editions. The first printing that was not accessed is indicated in parenthesis. Full listings are in the bibliography. Primary source books include:

(1844), 1847, 1852, 1856, 1867, 1878 - C. N. Bement, The American Poulterer’s Companion.
(1850), 1856 - John C. Bennett, The Poultry Book
1850 - Browne, D. J. The American Poultry Yard
1853 - T.B. Miner, Miner’s Domestic Poultry Book.
1854 - Martin Doyle, The Illustrated Book of Domestic Poultry
1864 - Jennings, Robert, Sheep, Swine, and Poultry
1865, 1877 - Simon M. Saunders, Domestic Poultry
1867 - Solon Robinson, Facts for Farmers.
1885, 1904 - L. Wright, The Practical Poultry Keeper.
1890 - Lewis Wright, The Illustrated Book of Poultry
1892 - Martin Doyle, The Illustrated Book of Domestic Poultry
1914 - A. H. Baker, Livestock, A Cyclopedia for the Farmer
1918 - Prairie Farmer, Reliable Directory of Farmers and Breeders; Coles & Douglas Counties, IL.

The information presented in this article is only a sampling of the volumes of available information on poultry. However, we hope it will be an inspiration to the reader to follow up with additional research. Information on the breeds that are not discussed in depth is available in the cited sources.

A chart of all breeds and years can be found on page 34. This article will be divided into three general areas: pre-1850, the “hen mania” period of the last half of the 19th century, and late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Dunghill Fowl

There is a long list of recognized breeds in C. N. Bement’s The American Poulterer’s Companion, first published in 1844. Many of these breeds had been around for many years and some breeders in the first half of the 19th century were making an effort to cross different breeds and improve their characteristics.

Most poultry, however, was a mixture of the many breeds that were brought to America over three centuries, and allowed to breed indiscriminately. These were loosely termed dunghill fowl, barnyard fowl, or common fowl.

Bement in 1844, devotes a section to dunghill fowl, and states, in part:

“This variety is a mongrel, though a common and useful fowl, and generally proves profitable, at least in this country; it is therefore that which, in general, is adopted.

“The distinguishing characters of the dunghill cock are a thin indented or scalloped comb, with wattles on each side, under the bill; the tail rising in an arch above the level of the rump; the feathers of the neck long and line-like. Their plumage exhibits endless varieties, which also differ among themselves, which probably arises from crossing with all sorts and varieties. The best are of a middle size, with dark or speckled colors, and black or slate-colored legs. Light-colored or white fowls are considered tender constitution, and are not generally so good layers...”

The first paragraph above indicates that dunghill fowl were in wide use in the first half of the 19th century and before. Although not mentioned in the literature after 1852, it can be reasonably assumed that many farmers continued to use the common fowl in lieu of the new and improved breeds throughout the rest of the 19th century.

At the 1989 ALHFAM conference in Indianapolis, I attended a session presented by John L. Skinner of the University of Wisconsin, one of the foremost experts on poultry history. During the question-and-answer session,

I asked him what currently available breed of chicken most closely approximates the dunghill fowl. His answer was, the Old English Game.

**The American Dominique**

According to information on The Livestock Conservancy website, the Dominique is recognized as America’s first chicken breed. Barred chickens with both rose combs and single combs were somewhat common in the eastern United States as early as 1750. Early names of these fowl included Blue Spotted Hen, Old Grey Hen, Dominico, Dominic, and Dominicker. The gray-and-white barred pattern was also referred to as “cuckoo” and “hawk” pattern. The breed was widely known on the eastern coast of the US as the Dominique.

The Dominique was widely bred on American farms as early as the 1820s, where they were a popular dual-purpose fowl (good for both meat and eggs). In 1871, the New York Poultry Society decided that only the rose-combed Dominique would become the standard for the breed, and the single-combed Dominiques were relegated to, and folded into, the Plymouth Rock breed, which eventually eclipsed them on the farm.

Bement in 1844 does not specifically list the Dominique. He may have considered it under the heading of Dunghill Fowl. He does, however, mention the breed in relation to a farmer breeding a Dominique with a Malay fowl about 20 years prior which dates the Dominique as early as the 1820s. The Dominique is officially listed in Bement’s 1856 edition, where he confirms the Dominique’s farm-yard fowl status:

“This well-known variety of our domestic fowl...is old and distinct, though it is generally looked upon as a mere ‘farm-yard fowl;’ that is, the accidental result of promiscuous crossing...”

Bement goes on to quote Mr. G.C. Piece, a “breeder of merit” from Danvers, Mass, concerning the Dominique fowl:

“Taken all in all, I believe them to be one of the very best breeds of fowls we have, and I do not know of any breed that alters so little by in-and-in breeding.”

John C. Bennett in *The Poultry Book*, first published in 1850, says the following about the Dominique:

“The fowls are a very perfect breed. I have never witnessed the least variation in their appearance, for the last thirty years [documenting them to 1820]. Plumage, invariably gray, both cock and hen—all over gray; heads, small and smooth; combs, double generally, though occasionally single, and small; wattles, small; size, below ordinary. They are very hardy, healthy, and excellent layers. I know of no fowls which have stood the test of mixing without deteriorating, better than the pure Dominique.”

Heritage Dominiques are raised by Conner Prairie near Indianapolis, along with 39 other breeders around the country. They are listed in most of the sources through 1914.

**The Java Fowl**

The Livestock Conservancy lists the Java as the second oldest breed developed in America. It is known to have been in existence in America between 1835 and 1850 but was not introduced into England until 1885. Bement in 1844 includes the Java as a domestic fowl, but only talks about its origins in Java and used mostly in cockfighting.

Bennett in 1850 talks about a pair of Javas owned by Mr. E. T. Packard as follows:

“These like all other pure Java fowls, are of a black or dark auburn color, with very large black legs, single comb and wattles. They are good layers, and their eggs are very large and well-flavored. Their gait is slow and majestic. They are in fact, amongst the most valuable fowls in the country...”

Javas are not widely mentioned in the literature again until 1884, although they were used in the creation of such breeds as the Plymouth Rock. Lewis Wright in *The Practical Poultry Keeper* in 1904 writes:

“This is a very fine large black fowl, well known in the United States ever since 1850...Had it stood alone then...it must have become very popular; but the Langshan and the Orpington, in which its own blood undoubtedly runs, had already occupied the field and only at present [has the Java] become very sparingly diffused.”

There are currently 11 breeders of heritage Javas around the country.

---

2. Ibid, 123.
3. Ibid, 123.
5. Ibid.
Malay Fowl

The Malay (see front cover) is an ancient breed originating in Asia. They are a large breed, standing 26 to 30 inches. Bement in 1844 says:

“[The Malay] if not the largest, is among the largest, of the gallinaceous tribe. In color, they are generally brown or dull yellow. They are what is termed serpent -headed, on account of having little or no comb and wattles.” 7

Bement quotes a writer from The American Agriculturist who says the Malay “is an awkward, bony, leggy, cowardly race.” He goes on to quote a Dr. Kittredge who says: “The Malay is a large noble fowl....I should think them superior to any other breed for the market.”

One of the most useful roles of the Malay, however, may have been their use in crossing with other breeds. Bement says: “Crossed...with the common dunghill fowl, they give increased size both to their eggs and body…”

Another citation by Bement creates a picture of poultry breeding in the 1820s:

“Mr. Coons, a farmer in Renssellaer county, who is very curious in the breed of his fowls, commenced about twenty years ago, with the pure Canton or Malay breed, but finding them rather poor layers and unprofitable sitters, he first crossed them with the Dominique cock, and then introduced white cocks with yellow legs; and afterwards by selection, keeping in view the yellow legs, small comb and gills, and the small tail peculiar to the breed, has succeeded in retaining these characteristics, and reduced them to the size of our common fowls, and of a pure white color.”8

Heritage Malays are raised by four breeders around the country, and appear consistently in the books through 1904.

Game Fowl

Game fowl (see front cover) were introduced into England in the first century by the Romans and were primarily kept as fighting cocks until cock-fighting was outlawed in 1849. According to The Livestock Conservancy, the Old English Game fowl are descended from the early fighting cocks and have changed little in shape and appearance in 1,000 years.

Bement in 1844 describes the Game’s history of cock-fighting, but then says, “Cock-fighting is regarded at the present day barbarous in the highest degree, and unworthy of the present enlightened age…”9

He goes on to say, “The Game breed are not the fowls for the farmer or those who breed for the market; they are very quarrelsome, and their pugnacious disposition is manifested in the chickens at the earliest possible period.”10

Bennett in 1850 says, “The Game fowl is one of the most gracefully-formed and most beautifully colored of our domestic breeds of poultry...As a cross with other breeds, they are invaluable, in improving the flavor of the flesh…”11

Lewis in 1904 indicates that Old English Games are used both for exhibition and for crossing with other breeds for table poultry, the best such resulting from crossing with Dorkings.

Games are found in most of the publications and are raised by 12 heritage breeders around the country.

Dorkings

The Dorking (see front cover) originated in England and is named for the town of Dorking (earlier called Darking) in Sussex County. They are famous as high-quality table poultry. One unique feature of the Dorking is its fifth toe. They are one of the largest of fowls, and colors include white, colored, and silver gray. They are good layers and sitters and will lay during winter months.

Dorkings were well-distributed in America before 1840 and were featured in the first poultry show in 1849. John E. Diehl in The Practical Poultry Book, published in 1884, says: “For the table, they are voted to be the best fowl in existence except perhaps the Games.”12

Dorkings are featured in every publication listed and are bred by 17 breeders, eight of which are in the Midwest.

Black Spanish Fowl

The Black Spanish (see front cover) is the aristocrat of chickens. It is of ancient but unknown lineage and was originally imported from Holland. The distinguishing feature is the black plumage with white face and ear lobes. It is also known for laying large numbers of large white eggs.

The Black Spanish was one of the best known breeds in America from about 1825 to 1895 according to The Livestock Conservancy. In the 1860s, Spanish chickens were popular in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and as far west as Ohio. Farmers specializing in market eggs kept large flocks of this breed as late as the 1890s.

Simon Saunders in The Poultry Book in 1865 says of the Spanish breed, “It is easy to describe this beautiful and noble race of fowl, as no variety of color is admissible. These birds must be black throughout, richly shaded with a metallic green lustre. A purely white face is imperatively

7. Bement, 147.
8. Ibid, 150.
10. Ibid.
necessary...They are invaluable layers, because...their eggs are larger than those of any other fowl.”

Spanish fowl are listed in every publication except 1878, and there are currently four breeders in the country.

**Black Polands**

The Polish chicken (see back cover) is characterized by the large top-knot of feathers on its head. Its early history is unclear, but despite it’s name, it is not from Poland, but rather was imported from Holland. It arrived in America between 1830 and 1840.

Bement in 1844 quotes poultry author Mowbray, “The Polishers are not only kept as ornamental, but they are of the most useful varieties, particularly on account of the abundance of the eggs they lay, being least inclined to sit of any other breed, whence they are sometimes called everlasting layers.”

There are several varieties of Polish chickens. Bement in 1844 lists the golden and silver top-knots as separate breeds apart from the Polands. By 1853, however, Wingfield and Johnson in *The Poultry Book*, list, in addition to the White-crested Black Poland, 10 varieties of Polands including the golden and silver.

Later in the 19th century, Polands lost favor to the Leghorns and were then mostly used for exhibition. Polish or Black Polands are listed in every poultry book of the study, and are raised by 18 breeders around the country.

**Hamburgs**

Hamburgs were in Holland by the 14th century and came to America by the 1840s. They appear in the list of relatively unknown breeds in Bement in 1844, but Silver and Golden-spangled Hamburgs are prominently featured with a color illustration (see back cover) in *The Poultry Book* in 1853 and 1867.

Hamburgs are prolific egg layers but never popular for the table because of their dark bones. They lost favor to other utility breeds by the 1890s.

Hamburgs appear in all the poultry books listed and are raised by five heritage breeders around the country.

**Sebright Bantams**

The term bantam refers to any small variety of chicken. Most regular chicken breeds have a bantam counterpart but true bantams, such as the Sebright, do not have a large counterpart. The bantam name derives from a seaport in Indonesia where sailing ships procured small-size chickens from the locals.

Wright in 1904 says of the Bantams, “They are in many cases the exact counterparts of ordinary domestic breeds, carefully dwarfed and perfected by the art of man. They are, in fact, more than any other class, ‘artificial fowls,’ and their attractiveness consists rather in their beauty than in any economic value.”

Sir John Sebright, about 1800, developed Gold and Silver-laced bantams that came to be known as Sebrights (see back cover). Bantams were mostly kept for exhibition although they were also known for being easily tamed, domestic, faithful sitters, good mothers, and prolific layers. They are included in all the poultry books and there are nine heritage Sebright breeders around the country.

**Other Breeds from 1844**

Other breeds mentioned in many of the early publications that the reader may wish to check out include the Bolton Gray, Bucks County, Creeper, English Red Cap, Frizzled, Silky, Rumpless, Guilderland, Black Russian, and French breeds of Houdan, Crevecour, and LaFleche.

**The Era of “Hen Fever”**

Beginning about 1850, newly imported breeds from Asia ignited a wide interest and even obsession in all things poultry in the United States and England. Each Asian breed was named after the town or area in which it originated. Breeds such as Cochin, Shanghai, Chittigong, Hong Kong, Brahma Pootra, and Langshan became common place. This was also reflected in the dozens of poultry books that appeared during the last half of the 19th century. Most breeds went by more than one name, and breeders continually came up with new names for varieties they had bred.

**Shanghai/Cochin**

When the Cochin and Shanghai (spelled Shanghae in early books) made their appearance in America around 1850, they were met with astonishment, wonder, and awe due to their gigantic size, abundance of feathers, and calm disposition.

The Cochin China and Shanghai were initially thought to be two different breeds and were listed separately in the earlier poultry books. In later books, however, they were combined under the Cochin breed. Doyle in 1854 said that Shanghais were commonly called Cochins. The 1853 version of *The Poultry Book* includes paintings of Buff and Partridge Shanghais. In the 1867 version of the book, however, these same paintings are labeled Buff and Partridge Cochins (see front cover). But there is also a painting of a Grey Shanghai included in the 1867 version.

Bement in 1856 says of the two, “Cochins differ very little in their qualities, habits, and general appearance, from our (later introduced) Shanghais, to which they are un-
doubtedly nearly related, the Cochin slightly differing from the Shanghais chiefly in being somewhat deeper and fuller in the breast, not quite so deep in the quarter, and being usually smooth-legged, while the Shanghais generally are more or less heavily feathered [in the legs]. The plumage is much the same in both cases.\textsuperscript{16}

Despite being good layers and large bodied, the Cochins were not a commercial success. Cochins were admitted to the Standard of Perfection of the American Poultry Association in 1874. There are 30 recognized varieties of Cochins, including a barred Cochin which was called a “Dominique Shanghai” by Miner in 1853. There are 30 breeders that raise heritage Cochins around the country.

**Brahma**

Brahmas (see front cover) are often referred to as the “King of All Poultry” and are known for their great size, strength, and vigor according to The Livestock Conservancy. The Brahma, along with the Cochin/Shanghai, were responsible for the “hen mania” that overtook the United States and England starting about 1850.

They were originally thought to have come from the area of the Brahma-Putra River in the Indian State of Chittagong, thus the early name of Brahma-Pootra. More recent information, however, indicates that the breed was developed in the United States from large fowls imported from China and the Chittagong breed that came from India. Sewell and Tilson in *The Poultry Manual* indicate the cross was between the Grey Shanghai (see front cover) and the Grey Chittagong.

Brahmas are the heaviest of domestic fowl, and are very hardy, good winter egg-layers, and good sitters. The Brahma was considered the leading meat breed from the 1850s through about 1930. Heritage Brahmas are raised by 25 breeders around the country.

**Langshans**

Langshans were first imported to England in 1872 from China. The enthusiasm and popularity of the Cochins and Brahmas had crested when this third Asian breed arrived. The first reference to Langshans in the literature is in 1884 where John Diehl writes:

“Within the last few years the Langshans have come to the front as desirable fowls. Being almost as large as Brahmas, they make good market fowls...One of the greatest advantages of the Langshans is that they begin to lay when but five months old, thus rivaling some of the smaller breeds.”\textsuperscript{17}

Langshans are a good general purpose breed and are the only Asiatic breed that does well in the Southern states. There are seven heritage Langshan breeders in the country.

**Plymouth Rock**

A breed called Plymouth Rock was first developed by Dr. John Bennett in the late 1840s by crossing the Cochin, Fawn-colored Dorking, Malay, and Wild Indian. This Plymouth Rock was exhibited at the first poultry show in 1849, but then disappeared for two decades. A different Plymouth Rock emerged about 1869, the result of crossing the Spanish, White and Buff Cochin, the Dominique, Black Java, and Brahma. The barred variety was the first one developed, with others coming later.

The Plymouth Rock quickly became very popular and according to The Livestock conservancy, it was the most extensively kept and bred breed through WWII. It was an outstanding farm chicken due to its hardiness, docility, broodiness, egg production, and good meat, and it was one of the foundation breeds for the broiler industry in the 1920s.

Diehl in 1884 said of the Plymouth Barred Rock, “The great popularity that the Plymouth Rock fowl has attained is without a parallel, and no other breed is so highly esteemed in America today.”\textsuperscript{18}

The first Plymouth Rocks appear in the literature in 1850 and 1854, but not again until 1884. There are 29 heritage Plymouth Rock breeders in the country.

**Leghorns**

Leghorns originated in Italy around the port of Leghorn. They first arrived in the United States in 1852. Their qualities of being good foragers, prolific, hardy, good layers, and small eaters caught the attention of the poultry industry about 1870, and their popularity rose from there.

The Leghorns first appear in the literature in 1877 in Simon Saunter’s book, *Domestic Poultry*, where he says they have attained notoriety in the past few years. Diehl in 1884 calls Leghorns “egg machines” that are unrivaled as foragers.

The original imports were the brown and white varieties, but buff, silver and other varieties were added later, and the leghorn can be either single or rose comb. There are 13 heritage leghorn breeders.

**Wyandottes**

The Wyandotte originated in the United States in the 1870s. It was first called “Sebright Cochin” and “American Sebright.” The name was changed to “Wyandotte” after an American Indian tribe in upper New York when the breed was added to the National Standard of Perfection in 1883.

---

16. Bement, 102
17. Diehl, 38.
18. Ibid, 22.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breed</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Avail Today</th>
<th>1844</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1853</th>
<th>1854</th>
<th>1856</th>
<th>1864</th>
<th>1867</th>
<th>1877</th>
<th>1878</th>
<th>1884</th>
<th>1885</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1892</th>
<th>1904</th>
<th>1908</th>
<th>1914</th>
<th>1918</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancona</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andalusian</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bantam, Sebright</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton Grey</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahma</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucks Co.</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittigong</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochin</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creeper, Scotch</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crested</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crevecoeurs</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominique</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorking</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunghill Fowl</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frizzled</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelderland</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburgh</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houdan</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Java</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey Blue</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langshan</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leghorn</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorca</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orpington</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrich</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Rock</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish, Black</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptarmigan</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cap</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island Red</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumpless</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakebag</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silky</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Pheasant</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish, Black</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan, Turkish</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumatra</td>
<td>Sumatra</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandotte</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first variety was the Silver-laced. Wright in 1904 indicates that the breed was created through a cross of the Dark Brahma, Silver-spangled Hamburg, and Polish. The Gold-laced variety was produced by breeding the Silver-laced with Gold-spangled Hamburg and Partridge Cochin. There are also black, white, and a Columbian variety, named after the 1893 Columbian Exposition.

The Wyandotte is a hardy, dual-purpose breed. Sewell and Tilson in 1908 say, “This breed shares with Plymouth Rocks the honor of the most popular American Variety.” The Wyandotte was taken off of The Livestock Conservancy’s endangered list in 2015.

Orpington

The Orpington was created in England in 1886 from a cross of Minorcas, Langshans, and Plymouth Rocks. When the Orpington was shown in Madison Square Garden in 1885, its popularity soared.

According to Wright in 1904, “The Black Orpingtons are massive and deep in body, with prominent breasts, and, short clean legs. They are hardy, capital layers, good eating, and very general favorites.”

As with the Wyandottes, they have been taken off The Livestock Conservancy’s endangered list.

Minorca

The Minorca was imported to England in 1834, but not to the United States until 1884. The rose comb version was developed around 1900.

Minorcas are the largest of the Mediterranean class. They are good layers of large white eggs, non-sitters, and hardy, but their meat is somewhat dry. There are four heritage Minorca breeders.

Rhode Island Reds

The Rhode Island Red is probably America’s best known breed of chicken. It is the most successful dual purpose chicken and an excellent farm chicken. They are the best layers of all the dual purpose breeds.

The breed was developed in Massachusetts and Rhode Island in the 1880s and 90s. It resulted from crosses of the Malay, Cochin, Java, and Brown Leghorn. There are single and rose comb varieties. They were shown in poultry shows in the 1890s, and the Rhode Island Red boom started about 1900.

The breed has been improved for commercial production and the older type is what breeders are attempting to preserve. There are 37 heritage breeders of Rhode Island Reds.

Other Breeds

Space has not allowed all breeds to be included or analyzed in depth. The intended purpose of the information presented is to give the reader an idea of the breadth and depth of poultry information available, and to hopefully inspire some innovative history poultry programs at our living history sites. Many historic and heritage breeds are available from a variety of hatcheries and heritage poultry breeders, and it would be great to see more back-breeding programs and a resurgence of the “dunghill fowl.”
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CHAMPION EGG CASE MAKING MACHINE

Debra A. Reid, The Henry Ford

NOTE: This article appeared in a slightly different form in In the Know, The Henry Ford’s employee newsletter (September 14, 2017).

WHICH came first, the chicken or the egg? Poultry producers did not debate that much. They just tried to get both to market as quickly as possible.

Farmers who depended on egg laying as their source of income managed their egg supply to keep consumers satisfied even as days shortened and chickens produced fewer eggs. Egg purveyors held eggs from the height of production in the summer for sale in the fall. Eggs have some durability, particularly if they are not washed, and preserving eggs extended their shelf life. Tavern and saloon keepers who depended on eggs as part of their daily fare preserved eggs by pickling them, as did families.

As urban populations increased after the Civil War, demand for eggs increased. During the 1870s, prescriptive literature appeared that provided step-by-step directions for establishing poultry and egg farms near cities and on railway lines. These locations guaranteed a strong market for fresh poultry and eggs. The term "country" became associated with freshness, and land-grant colleges encouraged technical experts to help farm families realize the potential of shipping fresh poultry and eggs to market.

Part of producing eggs for market required delivering intact eggs to those markets. One Civil War veteran, James K. Ashley (1845-1926), devised a machine that standardized transport of eggs from farm to market. This machine was called the Champion Egg Case Machine. The Henry Ford acquired one of Ashley’s machines in May 2017 (Fig. 1).

Ashley secured his first patent in 1896 for the machine to make boxes for shipping eggs. The jig, which he called a box machine, held the pre-sawn dimension lumber steady while the box-maker nailed the box together. He received two more patents for variations on the case and box machine in 1902 and 1925 (Fig. 2). This machine created a type of light wooden box or case with two compartments. The dimensions were standardized to accommodate 12 flats that held 30 eggs each, six flats on one side, and six flats on the other—a total of 360 eggs (30 dozen). By 1912, John H. Robinson described it as "the standard wholesale package for eggs" [Principles and Practice of Poultry Culture (1912), pg. 327].

In 1897, Ashley began advertising his machine in The Egg Reporter, a news magazine published for egg shippers. He paid for advertisements in six months of each annual issue for at least eleven years. Issues published in January, April, November, and December of 1906, March 1907, and January 1909 featured drawings of Ashley’s Egg-Case Machine (Fig. 3). They identified distributors of the machine and credited Ashley as the patentee and manufacturer. He invented the machine in Illinois, but by 1906, he lived and worked in Science Hill, Kentucky.

Ashley reputedly earned the high praise of judges at the St. Louis World’s Exposition in 1904, receiving a medal for his Champion Egg Case Machine. The Egg Reporter described Ashley as “the pioneer in the egg case machine business, and the inventor and manufacturer of the Champion Egg Case Machine” [See “Pioneer in His Line” The Egg Reporter, 14, no. 6 (August 20, 1908), pg. 77]. In turn, Ashley praised The Egg Reporter as the best publication in the country to reach egg shippers, the audience he targeted with his paid advertising. Ashley explained his rationale for advertising in the article, “Still Fishing in the Same Old Pond,” published in The Egg Reporter: “My invention was

1. The donor, Charles Witt, indicated that his father purchased the jig at an auction in Iowa. Mr. Witt described the machines function: [It] has 3 locking clamps to hold end pieces and center piece while bottom is nailed across, then foot lever raises...the started work so it can be turned to side on top for nailing on sides. (then filled with eggs & put on train for them to ar-rive in the big city over night).” Mr. Witt also donated pressed-paper egg flats that fit the standard box, and that remain readily available today (2017). The design of each tray allows a person to use two fingers on each side to place the full flats into the case and to remove the flats without damaging the eggs.
new...and I was anxious to get acquainted with the trade... I have tried a few other publications that have a good reputation along produce lines, but when it comes to hitting the egg shippers, my special patrons, in my opinion, The Egg Reporter leads every other publication in the country” [The Egg Reporter (January 20, 1909), pg. 19].

Others manufactured box-nailing machines, and others received awards at world’s fair expositions (i.e., Chicago in 1893), while others have been identified as inventors of egg crates, namely F. Q. White of Yorktown, New York [see James E. Rice, Marketing Poultry Products (1904), 368] (Fig. 4). Evidence points to James K. Ashley as the inventor of the machine that poultry farmers could purchase to produce the standard wholesale package. The machine’s design reduced the number of hands needed to nail lumber at 90-degree angles. A handle moved the clamps to hold the two sides and one interior divider in place. Then the operator pumped the treadle, which flipped the clamps and the three wooden pieces so the operator could nail the sides and base to the three clamped members.

Many interesting interpretive themes can radiate out from this machine.

One relates to the life experiences of inventors like James King Ashley who served with the 20th Battery of the Indiana Light Artillery as a private during the Civil War. His Find A Grave listing indicates that he spent nine months as a prisoner of war in Cahaba prison in Alabama. He survived the sinking of the Sultana, an overloaded steamboat that blew up on the Mississippi River on April 27, 1865, packed with 2,100 passengers. He lived in Rushville, Illinois (Schuyler County), when he filed his first patent on April 25, 1895 and his second on May 17, 1901, but lived in Science Hill, Kentucky (Pulaski County), when he applied for a third patent on December 14, 1923.

Efforts continue to find his Civil War pension records to document the extent of his injuries. More remains to be learned about Ashley and the factors in his life that prompted him to invent a machine that held boards securely and hastened box construction.

Fig. 2. J. K. Ashley Case and Box Machine, 1902
Patent no. 695,364. (Courtesy of the author)

Fig. 3: Champion Egg Case Machine advertisement, The Egg Reporter 11 (January 20, 1906), pg. 54. (Courtesy of the author)

Another interpretive theme relates to the big business of egg shipping during the early 20th century. Ashley identified Mr. W.F. Priebe as the first person who bought his machine [Ashley, “Still Fishing in the Same Old Pond,” The Egg Reporter 14, no. 14 (January 20, 1909)]. By 1896-1897, William Frederick Priebe (1858-1934), and his brother-in-law, Fred Simater, had built a successful poultry and egg shipping business in Minonk, Illinois, Ashley’s adopted state. Priebe and Simater had started the Minonk Produce Company in 1884, and it became one of the largest suppliers of eggs and chickens in the country (http://www.minonktalk.com/mproduce.htm).

Ashley appears to have operated out of a rural factory, but eggs became the basis for big-city business. Priebe apparently moved on from the Minonk Produce Company and formed his own firm, W.F. Priebe Company. Swift & Co., the big meat packing firm in Chicago, purchased Priebe Co. at some point, and kept W. F. Priebe as the chief administrator on the monthly payroll. On March 1, 1918, Priebe resigned his position as president and director of W.F. Priebe Co. to work with the Poultry Department of the Federal Food Administration during the Great War. Around 1919, W.F. Priebe invested in Ovson-Keith Egg Company, a company specializing in frozen eggs. By 1921, W.F. Priebe was senior member of the firm of Priebe and Sons, Inc., Chicago, wholesale buyers of poultry, eggs, and butter, as well as sales agent for western packers of these products [Reliable Poultry Journal (June 1921), 394].

Connections between rural producers and urban processors and between the Midwest farmers and eastern urban markets remained. By the late 1930s and into the 1940s, Frank Priebe (one of W.F. Priebe’s sons) had a syndicated column in rural Midwestern newspapers, “Frank Priebe’s Weekly Letter to Poultry Raisers.” One installment, copyrighted October 21, 1939, reminded readers of the Dixon Evening Telegraph [Illinois] about the ways that Eastern consumers relied on Midwest producers for fresh poultry and eggs.

Continued on page 38
Champion Egg case Making Machine (cont’d)

Sources to put the poultry industry into context:

The agricultural extension service in each state produced advice manuals for use by farm families interested in the poultry industry. Items from the Core Historical Agriculture Literature collection at Cornell University provide examples, all published by Cornell University. The archives of land-grant universities in the Midwest or the agricultural library at these universities have these publications available to researchers. Search HathiTrust for digitized copies. □

*The Egg Reporter* (issues available via HathiTrust).

Rice, James E. “Marketing Poultry Products,” *Cornell Reading Course for Farmers.* 1904. (HathiTrust)


Debra A. Reid is curator of Agriculture and the Environment at The Henry Ford (since January 9, 2017). Before that, from 1999 to 2016, she taught in historical administration, history, and women’s studies at Eastern Illinois University in Charleston, Illinois. She has recently authored a book, *Interpreting Agriculture at Museums and Historic Sites,* published by AASLH.
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Cover Photos - “Coloured illustrations of the most prized birds drawn from life” by Mr. Harrison Weir and first appearing in The Poultry Book published in 1853 by the Rev. W. Wingfield and G.W. Johnson, Esq. These illustrations also appeared in color in the 1867 version of the same book and in many other poultry books in black & white even up to 1910.