

The account of his coming to America and of his experiences in Hancock County, Indiana, from the date of departure from Bremen, August 3, 1835, to the date of the last letter, June 20, 1836, is full of interesting detail from beginning to end. The language is good, the intelligence of the writer is manifest, and no reader can doubt his sincerity. Many students of Indiana history have read numerous first-hand descriptions of life in the frontier period, quite a few of which are as valuable and interesting as this by Jacob Schramm. It seems too bad that he did not write a new account of his pioneer experiences ten or twenty years after his arrival in Indiana. While he had not been in his new environment, when he wrote in 1836, long enough to properly evaluate his opportunities, he did present a good picture of what the first year on a frontier farm was like. In regard to the sea voyage, the canal passage, and the journey from Portsmouth to Cincinnati on the Ohio, it is hard to see how his story could have been improved. Indeed there is so much in Jacob Schramm's tale of his long journey from Bremen to the new lands of Indiana and of his early experiences in his crude home and in connection with his wilderness farm which is unusually fine, that we strongly recommend *The Schramm Letters* to everyone who has any interest in the colonization of the old northwest by emigrants from the East or Europe.

WILLIAM O. LYNCH.

In the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* for June, 1935, there appeared an article by Richard Lyle Power, entitled "Wet Lands and the Hoosier Stereotype." The portion of this article that deals with the influence of the flat divides of northwestern Ohio and northern Indiana, which areas were handicapped by very poor natural drainage, on the colonization of the Hoosier state is valuable. Not only was the level belt that constitutes the divide between the St. Lawrence and Mississippi drainage basins wet, but it is also true, as the author discovered, that the highest lands between the drainage areas of any particular tributary and another of the Wabash in north central Indiana were likewise wet and difficult to drain. In the period from 1835 to 1860, when the rush to other areas of the Northwest from the New England states and New York was so great, it is certainly correct that

the colonists from these states avoided Indiana. Undoubtedly what they had heard about the wet lands influenced them to go to Michigan, northern Illinois, Wisconsin and Iowa, rather than settle in Indiana.

Some census figures will show the strong tendency of the westward moving currents from New England and New York to flow around or through and beyond the still new areas of northern Indiana between 1850 and 1860. Of persons born in the six New England states, there were living in Indiana in 1850, 10,646. In 1860, the figure was 12,307, an increase of only 1,661. In Illinois in the same decade the number of New Englanders increased by 28,551; in Michigan, by 7,183; in Wisconsin, by 27,309; in Iowa, by 20,305. In regard to colonists born in New York, the increase in Indiana from 1850 to 1860 was 6,545; the increase in Illinois was 54,328; in Michigan, 57,372; in Wisconsin, 52,042; in Iowa, 37,919. The contrast between Indiana and the other states listed is startling. It has been hard to understand why the westward moving currents from New England and New York avoided Indiana, and Professor Power is to be commended for the discovery of one important explanation.

Though it is true that there was a considerable amount of flat, wet land north of the Wabash in Indiana, it is likewise true that almost every where there were in close proximity rolling lands that invited settlement. Often the wet, level strips were not a mile wide and were bordered by the valleys of little creeks, larger creeks and rivers along the bluffs of which farms were laid out all through the country, not by pioneers from New England and New York, but by a large number of colonists who came from the older areas of Indiana supplemented by considerable numbers from Pennsylvania, Ohio and foreign countries. Virginia, North Carolina and Kentucky furnished large contingents to Indiana before 1850, but not afterwards.

It should be remembered that Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin and Iowa were all younger than Indiana. The increase in population in these states, from outside sources, was naturally greater than that of Indiana in the later antebellum period. Illinois entered the Union about as early as Indiana, but the census returns show a much larger population in the Hoosier state as late as 1850, while Michigan,

Wisconsin and Iowa were still far behind Indiana in 1860. The relative importance of the states of the Northwest, beyond Ohio, in the national House and in the electoral college in the last decade before the Civil War is revealed in the number of representatives apportioned to each following the census of 1850: Indiana, 11; Illinois, 9; Michigan, 4; Wisconsin, 3; Iowa, 2. The population of Indiana in 1840 was 685,886; in 1850, it was 988,416, surpassed only by Ohio, Tennessee and Kentucky among the states west of the mountains. By 1860, Indiana, with a population of 1,350,428, led Kentucky and Tennessee, being now behind only Ohio and Illinois, of the states in the trans-Appalachian area. On the eve of the Civil War, only New York and Pennsylvania among the older states ranked above Indiana in population.

The facts here presented seem to leave little room for the contention that Indiana deserved to be thought of as a "benighted" region in the important period of growth preceding 1860. In the three quarters of a century since, Indiana has receded, relatively, in economic importance, but whether it has likewise receded, relatively, in other matters is open to serious question. Professor Power, in as far as he has explained the effects of Indiana's wet lands on migration from the older East, has done well. When he accepted the notion that the Hoosier state deserved a reputation as a backward commonwealth in the days before the Civil War, he fell into error, because he failed to consider a mass of evidence that proves the contrary. In regard to a "Hoosier Stereotype", he produces no evidence of value. It is, in fact, very unfortunate that he permitted himself to include anything on this subject in his article. That a Hoosier stereotype may exist or may have developed in the period covered by the article, "Wet Lands and the Hoosier Stereotype" is not denied. The only point made here is that in the study under review, the author seems to have made no progress in regard to the matter.

W. O. L.

The trustees of the Illinois State Historical Library have published two volumes dealing with early census returns of Illinois Territory and State. The first volume, *Illinois Census Returns, 1810-1818*, covers the territorial period. The sec-

ond, *Illinois Census Returns, 1820*, deals with the first federal census after statehood. Both volumes have been compiled and edited by Margaret C. Norton. Each volume sells for \$2.50. These volumes (*Illinois Historical Collections*, XXIV and XXVI) will be reviewed in December.