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As discussed in the preceding article, this volume details a research project conducted by graduate students at New York University and Columbia University intended to construct and use a GIS-based database to analyze the lifeways and history of rural farmers who occupied the Hector Backbone during the 19th and early-20th centuries. In order to establish a context within which the remainder of this volume can be understood, this article provides a general historical outline of the region.

This historical outline will consist of a discussion of four rather broadly defined successive periods: 1) Conquest and pioneer settlement, ca. 1775–1800; 2) Settlement and agricultural “boom”, ca. 1800–1865; 3) Economic and population decline, ca. 1865–1900; and 4) Rural abandonment and federal management, ca. 1900–present. The time spans into which these periods are divided are not based on specific historic events and should not be considered rigid or binding. Rather, these periods were chosen as a way to meaningfully discuss the major trends and events relevant to the study area in the 19th and early-20th centuries. Providing a cursory overview of these periods for the Finger Lakes region is necessary so that the archaeological and historical data described in this volume can be better understood and interpreted.

Conquest and Pioneer Settlement, ca. 1775–1800

The Finger Lakes region of New York has been relatively well researched by archaeologists interested in the prehistory of the Northeast. The territory comprising the National Forest, however, may not reflect the density of sites or amount of prehistoric activity typical of the region due to its position atop a steeply sloped ridge with no large rivers or streams (Crane and Perry 1977: 5). The lowland areas beyond the limits of the National Forest are more likely to contain prehistoric sites, and several have been identified and investigated by local collectors. There are many known sites in the surrounding region, and several considerations of the prehistoric cultures in the Finger Lakes have been published (e.g., Niemczycki 1984; Ritchie 1980). During late prehistoric and early historic times, the Hector Backbone was located between the traditional territories of the Cayuga and Seneca Nations of the Iroquois Confederacy. The removal of these people from the Finger Lakes region resulted from a combination of military and legislative action during the late-18th century. In the summer of 1779, Generals James Clinton and John Sullivan of Washington’s Continental Army led a body of about 3,500 soldiers against Loyalists and their Iroquois allies in central and western New York. The intended and realized result of this mission was essentially to “break the power of the Iroquois” (Ellis et al. 1967: 116) and punish those who were loyal to the British during the Revolutionary War.

The so-called Sullivan Campaign of 1779 was a crucial action in New York frontier history. Raiding parties were dispatched throughout the Finger Lakes region and proceeded to bring devastation to the Iroquois, burning their villages, cornfields, and orchards along both Seneca and Cayuga Lakes (Higgins 1931: 99; Ellis et al. 1967: 116). These raids are today commemorated by roadside signs identifying the location of villages and orchards destroyed during the campaign (Delle and Heaton, 2003). Some of these villages were located on the eastern shore of Seneca Lake in the present day Town of Hector (Sexton 1885: 232, 240), just outside the boundaries of the National Forest.

This military campaign was the first step toward preparing these lands for Anglo-American settlement in the 19th century. During the Revolution, the revolutionary government had pledged 600 acres of land to each New York soldier as payment for their services during the war (Ellis et al. 1967: 153; Friedenberg 1992: 184; Higgins 1931: 104; Schein 1993: 9). To satisfy this obligation, the
state legislature proposed to create the “New Military Tract” in 1782, consisting of over 1,500,000 acres in central New York. As of 1782, however, most of the lands within the New Military Tract were legally the territory of the Iroquois Confederacy, and not within the official boundaries of the state of New York.

The boundary between the Iroquois and New York had been vaguely identified by the Proclamation Line of 1763, and formally defined at the Treaty of Fort Stanwix in 1768 (Ellis et al. 1967: 151). As the Sullivan Campaign succeeded in its goal of decimating the native population, the Iroquois could not enforce this treaty. The Iroquois Confederacy was broken by conflicting loyalties during the Revolutionary War; their military strength greatly weakened, the Seneca and Cayuga were decimated by Sullivan’s raiding, and many Iroquois fled to western New York or Canada (Graymont 1976: 440). Thus, New York bargained with a greatly diminished power in the 1780s and 1790s.

Although officially engaged in boundary negotiations with the Iroquois and in legal disputes with the federal government over the very right to engage in those contested negotiations, New York State began to survey the New Military Tract in May of 1789 under the direction of Moses Dewitt (Graymont 1976: 459-460; Schein 1993: 11; Vecsey and Starna 1988). By 1790, twenty-five rectilinear townships (in total, the New Military Tract would eventually include twenty-eight townships) each consisting of 60,000 acres had been outlined on the landscape of central New York (FIG. 1). The first map of these townships was presented to the state government in July of 1790, at which time these towns were named with classical designations (e.g. Hector, Ovid, Romulus, and Ulysses). The townships were then sub-divided into 100 lots of 600 acres each, to be awarded to veterans of the Revolution (Schein 1993: 12–16). The survey of these sub-divisions was completed by 1792.

Each soldier had been promised 100 acres by the Continental Congress, and an additional 500 acres by the state of New York, as reward for their service. If soldiers relinquished their 100 acre claim from the central government to the state, they would receive a full 600 acre allotment in the New Military Tract. For patentees who claimed or sold the 100 acre federal grant, New York designated 500 acres and reserved the 100 acres in the southeast corner of each lot for later sale by the state (Higgins 1931: 106; Schein 1993: 19). The allotment of these parcels was determined by lottery, although some larger and better parcels of land were reserved for higher ranking officers.

William Wickham was the “first permanent settler in Hector ... in 1791” (Sexton 1885: 241), and George Faussett the first settler in Lodi, a village located in Ovid, in 1789 (French 1860: 616). In the 1790’s, a few of the veterans (listed in Sexton 1885) claimed their patents and became pioneer settlers in Hector. However, the designation and allotment of the New Military Tract did not result in an immediate large-scale settlement of the area. Many of the soldiers never claimed their patents. Of those who did, the vast majority sold their claims to land speculators (Ellis et al. 1967: 153; Schein 1993: 21); these parcels were later resold to individual settlers. These transactions actually retarded the settlement of the area, for “the patentees not infrequently sold the same grants to different persons, [resulting in] a long period of litigation” (Higgins 1931: 113). Thus, the people who came to settle the New Military Tract were not necessarily the veterans for whom these parcels had been created. Even though they did not settle these lands, many of the veterans of the revolution returned home to the Hudson Valley and New England spreading stories of the rich and open wilderness of central and western New York (Higgins 1931: 101; Pierce and Hurd 1879: 116; Schein 1993: 21). These stories served as an active promotion for the settlement of the area in the early-19th century.

The survey of the New Military Tract was not, however, an insignificant event for the settlement of New York’s frontier. The “military grid” which was created during this survey determined the location of many of the roads which made this frontier landscape accessible (Crane and Perry 1977: 13). Although the 500 and 600 acre parcels bought by speculators were further sub-divided before being sold, the basic framework established by the military grid was retained and is still visible on the
Figure 1. A map of the towns in central New York laid out during the New Military Tract survey (Pierce & Hurd 1879: 226).

landscape today (Fig. 2). The effect of this survey on later settlement patterns is readily visible from historic maps of the region.

Richard Schein has addressed the importance of the New Military Tract for the settlement of central New York. He details how the orderly layout of townships and square parcels served very specific utilitarian and ideological functions for the newly independent state: "It was at once an answer to the pressing political economic demands of a fledgling nation-state, a framework for colonization by an expanding American populace, and a symbol of a new American order" (1993: 6). The survey provided a practical solution for the colonization of the region, and simultaneously expressed the "rational, egalitarian, [and] pragmatic" (1993: 26) ideology of the
new nation. Schein’s analysis is relevant here for it addresses the significance of the New Military Tract not only for New York in the late-18th century, but recognizes the degree to which this survey determined the subsequent settlement of central New York and the Finger Lakes in the following decades. The military and legislative appropriation of these lands from the Iroquois opened the way for American settlers. The layout of townships, distribution of lands, and establishment of roads during the survey of the New Military Tract prepared these lands for incorporation into the larger scheme of the expanding population, economy, and political control of young New York State.

Settlement and Agricultural “Boom,” ca. 1800–1865

The town of Hector was officially incorporated into Cayuga County in 1802, and was transferred to Tompkins County in 1812 (Sexton 1885: 240). Lodi was formed from a part of the town of Covert, in Seneca County, in 1826. In 1854 the area was re-organized, and parts of Steuben, Chemung, and Tompkins Counties (including Hector) were consolidated to form Schuyler County (French 1860: 609-615). These dates are provided so that information presented in this volume derived from different censuses, maps, and historic documents do not appear contradictory.

Both townships were settled relatively quickly in the early 1800s. Although the first Anglo settlers were faced with the challenges of clearing lots, building homes, and turning woodlands into productive farmsteads (Ellis et al. 1967: 163–165), the settlement of the Finger Lakes region was quite rapid, with the upland areas like the Hector Backbone being settled as quickly as the low lying areas along the lakes (Crane and Perry 1977: 14). This early settlement is evident in the study area. For many of the properties now inside the Finger Lakes National Forest, the title chains begin with transactions recorded between 1830 and 1850.

As of 1830, there was a relatively large and stable population in the region. The census statistics displayed in Figure 3 demonstrate that the Towns of Hector and Lodi were settled quite rapidly, and their populations increased steadily throughout the early-19th century. These trends are consistent with the rest of New York. Following the Revolution the state experienced a “Yankee Invasion,” as thousands came from New England in search of the widely available farmland (Ellis et al. 1967: 187–189). These farmers quickly set about turning the wilderness into a productive agricultural landscape.

Although a labor-intensive and time-consuming task, the clearing of the land was a priority for these settlers. By 1835, there were 12,611 improved acres in the town of Lodi (approximately 70% of the land in that township) and 36,725 (approximately 57%) improved acres in Hector (Gordon 1836). These early farms were mainly self-sufficient enterprises, and the improvement of the land would continue as local markets became available in which farmers could sell their surplus produce.

The economic livelihood of this region in the 19th century was dependent on new technologies of transportation. Transportation has
been identified as “the key to the development of the political, social, and economic history of New York in the years between 1825 and 1860” (Ellis et al. 1967: 244). Turnpikes and highways were the first networks to be built, and by 1821 over 4000 miles of roads had been constructed in the state. The immediate effect of this network “was to encourage the opening of new settlements; to make more profitable the production of crops; to increase the products of agriculture; and to facilitate every species of internal commerce” (Hedrick 1933: 165). These roads served as a mechanism for “the culture of mobility” which characterized early-19th-century New York farmers (Parkerson 1995: 25–30). The rapid increase in population displayed in Figure 3 reflects the scale of migration which took place during this period. On a local level, such roads began to connect the rural upland settlers of Hector and Lodi to villages and commercial centers along the lakes (Chudyk-Carlson 1974: 61–62). In 1825, New York completed the construction of the Erie Canal, which is credited with being the primary stimulus for the settlement and economic growth of central New York in the mid-19th century (Ellis et al. 1967: 180–182, 244).

The importance of the canal was immediately recognized in the Finger Lakes as local settlers had access to this new transport system via shipping on both Cayuga and Seneca Lake. “Previously to the opening of the Erie Canal, agriculture here was in a languishing condition; ... Since that period, however, the lands have been rapidly cleared, and the agriculture, manufactures [sic] and commerce of the country, have increased in a manner not less gratifying than astonishing” (Gordon 1836: 730). These effects can be seen in the increase in improved lands documented in the Gazetteer for 1858. Improved lands increased to over 17,000 acres in Lodi, and over 45,000 acres in Hector (French 1860).

Railroads also contributed to the prosperity of central New York. Between 1831 and 1855 railroads were constructed all across the state, and they gradually began to replace the canals as the primary venue for shipment of various products (Ellis et al. 1967: 250–251). In the Finger Lakes, these systems increased the region’s ability to export produce and import manufactured items from other areas. By 1855 railroads had been constructed between Ithaca (at the southern end of Cayuga Lake) and Owego (on the Susquehanna River), and through Watkin’s Glen (at the southern end of Seneca Lake) connecting the village to both Elmira in the south and Rochester to the northwest (Chudyk-Carlson 1974: 66). All of these transportation systems increased local farmers’ ability to participate in wider networks of exchange and commerce.

The local farming strategy throughout the 19th century was a non-specialized approach, and most farms raised a diversity of crops, kept pastures for a variety of livestock, planted orchards, and kept wood lots for timber (FIG. 4). One major source of income in early-19th-century rural New York was wool, and after 1820, there was a state-wide boom of wool production (Ellis et al. 1967: 169). Agricultural statistics from Hector and Lodi indicate that farmers in these towns participated in wool production. In 1835 there were 14,096 sheep recorded in Hector and 4,081 sheep in Lodi (Gordon 1836). Dairying, especially the production of butter and cheese, was also an important part of the local economy (Mather and Brockett 1851: 375). Frontier farmers also benefited from the initial clearing of their land for crop fields and pastures. Beyond the use of timber for domestic construction, lumber became an important resource for each farmstead.

While agriculture was the mainstay of this population, a number of other “cottage industries” and small scale manufacturing indus-
tries contributed to the economic growth of the region. Wood was processed in local sawmills, ashes from the burning of fields was boiled in water to make potash, and the bark of hemlock and oak trees was sold to tanneries (Chudyk-Carlson 1974: 49-51; Ellis et al. 1967: 167; Parkerson 1995: 67-69). Secondary agricultural products contributed to a number of local manufacturing industries. In the mid-19th century, important local industries included the production of flour, oil, woolen goods, lumber, leather, distilled liquors, paper and potash (Mather and Brockett 1851: 375).

An examination of timber-based industries reveals a significant trend in the local economy. In 1835 there were 41 sawmills in the town of Hector, and 5 tanneries (Gordon 1836: 736). By 1855, there were only 7 sawmills reported for Hector, and 2 tanneries (French 1860: 611). These statistics hint at a more general economic process. The early settlers of this region experienced an economic boom due to the rapid clearing, use, and depletion of the abundant natural resources. These short-term (and short-sighted) economic strategies, however, quickly exhausted the productivity of the local landscape.

Economic and Population Decline, ca. 1865-1900

The same phenomena which resulted in the rapid settlement and overall prosperity of this region in the early-19th century contributed to the area's decline in the late 1800s. The populations of Hector and Lodi reached their peak by the 1850 census (Fig. 3). Between 1850 and 1900, the combined population of the two towns dropped from 8,321 to 5,773. This decline in population was the result of the depletion of the region's productivity by over exploitation, the creation of a new frontier by the United States' westward expansion, and the continued improvement of transportation and shipping to and from that new frontier. This dramatic population decline represents the emigration of the local population to either these western farms or urban centers.

The fresh soils of western New York had allowed farmers to replace the Hudson and
Mohawk valleys as the primary grain producers in the state between 1825 and 1850 (Ellis et al. 1967: 272). For New York State as a whole, the period between 1850 and 1870 was the time of greatest prosperity for farmers. In this period, New York exceeded all other states in the number of farms, the number of improved acres in farms, the value of its farms, livestock, orchard products, the number of dairy cows, the sale of fluid milk, and the production of butter and cheese, hay, potatoes, hops, and maple sugar” (Gates 1969: 117). Immediately following this peak of prosperity, New York agriculture went into a period of marked decline from 1870 through the turn of the century.

Along the Hector Backbone this general trend was more pronounced, as the topsoil began to erode down the clear-cut slopes with each heavy spring rain (Chudyk-Carlson 1974; Crane and Perry 1977). These soils had already started to suffer and reach exhaustion due to cultivation, yet regardless of erosion and this deterioration of soil quality, the farmers continued to pursue abundant harvests. In the Burnt Hill Study Area, much of the timber had been cleared in the first half of the century, thus eliminating major sources of income for the landowners, including lumber and potash (Crane and Perry 1977: 14). Combined with the rise of “big business” lumbering in the Adirondacks and Catskills (Ellis et al. 1967: 277), the depletion of local timber resources resulted in the disappearance of many small mills. The clear-cutting of the landscape in the early-19th century doubly impacted the local economy, resulting in erosion and deterioration of the soil as well as the loss of income derived from secondary timber products.

These problems were hardly unique to Hector in the late-19th century. Ellis et al. argue that this trend was typical for many parts of New York: “Farm management practices of the ordinary farmer continued to be soil depleting and slovenly—almost every county reported serious soil exhaustion and falling crop yields” (Ellis et al. 1967: 275). Similarly, Gates has argued that these farmers approached their land with a strategy of short range investment, wherein the labor involved in clearing and planting the land was the extent of capital investment on most farms. The additional investments in technology and improved practices necessary for long-term success were ignored in favor of a quick return on the initial investment (Gates 1969: 132–133). The soil deterioration resulting from these practices prompted many farmers in the Finger Lakes to look for more promising opportunities elsewhere.

The post-Civil War period saw many improvements in technology, inventions of new farming machines, and the sophistication of scientific farming practices (Ellis et al. 1967: 275–276). Many of the machines designed to plow, plant, and harvest were ineffective or too difficult to operate on the steep slopes of upland farms (Chudyk-Carlson 1974: 72), and many of the farmers in our study area likely did not have sufficient capital to invest in them.

Just as turnpikes and railroads had contributed to the local economy in the early-19th century, their expansion westward allowed for the Midwest to become connected to the mercantile centers of the east coast. “The extension of the railroads into the middle west and the rate wars arising from competition for the control of the meat and grain shipped from Chicago robbed eastern farmers of their geographical advantage” (Ellis et al. 1967: 278). The flat terrain of the Midwest allowed for cheaper and easier shipping, creating a further disadvantage for the highland farmers of central New York (Chudyk-Carlson 1974: 72).

American expansion into the Midwest after the Civil War contributed to the decline of rural New York. Farmland in the West was of superior quality and could be purchased at a significantly cheaper cost than land in New York (Gates 1969: 129). New technological innovations designed for large, flat farms and improved systems of shipping and transportation, combined with the deterioration of the local soil for agricultural purposes, resulted in a situation in which many farmers in Hector and Lodi could not compete with those farming the fertile lands to the west. These western farms were likely attractive to many of the farmers for the same reasons that the New York frontier had been in the early 1800s.

Mid-western farms were not the only cause of this decline in the economy and population of the area. The promise of better opportunity in the city also lured many people away from the farms. In 1850, 72% of New York’s population lived in rural areas; by 1930 only 16% of the population remained in rural areas while 84% of the population lived in urban centers (Bond 1954: 2; Hedrick 1933: 433). For an impoverished and disillusioned generation of young farmers, the city offered hope of prosperity and opportunity (Ellis et al. 1967: 278). For prosperous farmers, the city held the appeal of better opportunities for the education
of their children, and other advantages in business and entertainment (Hedrick 1933: 215).

Rural Abandonment and Federal Management, ca. 1900–Present

The decline of the population and abandonment of farmland became even more pronounced at the turn of the century. The population in this region continued to drop in the first decades of the 20th century, reaching a record low of 2904 in Hector, and 1044 in Lodi, by 1930. In each of these towns, the population had decreased by more than 50% since 1850. South-central New York state became known as a “problem area,” as over 1,000,000 acres of farmland were abandoned between 1900 and 1930 (Crane and Perry 1977: 14). This abandonment and depopulation created a number of economic and social problems, as the region became more depressed.

As the land decreased in productivity, the local population had difficulty obtaining an adequate income, the region’s economy suffered, and the local and state government lost tax revenue (Crane and Perry 1977: 15). These problems encouraged the government to intervene in the local economy. In 1929, the New York State Reforestation Amendment was passed, which supported a policy of reforesting idle and abandoned lands (Chudyk-Carlson 1974: 87). During the Great Depression, the government began to survey and classify marginal farming areas, in order to establish a classification of land quality and determine appropriate action for renewal of those areas. The land within the National Forest fell within two classifications, types I and II. These classes describe lands which were idle or non-productive for agricultural activity, and better suited for reforestation and careful management.

Legislation was also passed by the federal government intended to deal with places like Hector. The National Recovery Act of 1933 and the Emergency Relief Act of 1935 provided the federal government with the funds necessary to buy marginal and abandoned agricultural lands (Crane and Perry 1977: 15). These policies were further strengthened by the passage of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937. Under the guidelines of these pieces of legislation, the government began to purchase suffering farms and relocate those farms’ inhabitants.

These acts were passed during a period when the farms in our study area were experiencing acute environmental problems. In July of 1935 an intense rainstorm passed through the Finger Lakes. In three days over nine inches of rain fell in the immediate vicinity (Bonsteel and Patton 1943). The erosion and deterioration which had plagued the hillsides farms for 50 years resulted in horrific landslides of topsoil along the Hector Backbone. By 1938, the state had purchased 350,000 acres of farmland in central New York (Crane and Perry 1977). In the next three years, over 100 farms were purchased by the federal government, forming the core of the present day Finger Lakes National Forest (USDA 1997). The purchase of individual farmsteads along this ridge resulted in the somewhat irregular configuration of the present National Forest.

Of the 100 farms purchased between 1938 and 1941, 58 had already been abandoned. The Bankhead-Jones Act provided for the relocation of the remaining 42 families. Many of the former occupants moved to towns in the region and pursued work in various trades, while others were relocated to better farms in the immediate vicinity (Soil Conservation Service 1941). The surveys, assessments, and purchases of land during this period have provided a rich archival resource regarding the abandoned farmsteads.

The purchased farms were organized as the Hector Land Use Area in 1941, managed by the Soil Conservation Service. This agency pursued a policy of planting conifers to stabilize the eroding hillsides, and converting previously cultivated lands to pasture (USDA 1997; Chudyk-Carlson 1974: 94). These pastures were leased to neighboring farmers. These policies have been largely successful, recovering some economic potential from this landscape through managed timbering and grazing.

By the 1950s many of the original management objectives had been met, and the Hector Land Use Area’s supervision was transferred to the U.S. Forest Service. Following this shift in management, the Forest Service began a wildlife conservation program in Hector, and promoted public recreation and education (USDA 1997). These management practices have continued to the present. In 1982, the government considered resale of this land to private interests. These measures were not supported by the local population, and in 1985
the area was incorporated into the National Forest System and renamed the Hector Ranger District, Finger Lakes National Forest.

Conclusion

This article has provided a general outline of the demographic and economic trends relevant to an understanding of the historic farmstead sites in the Finger Lakes National Forest. Beginning with the conquest and forced relocation of the Iroquois in the late-18th century, and the survey and allocation of the New Military Tract, this land was prepared for colonization by American settlers. In the early 1800s an influx of migrants from New England populated numerous rural areas in New York, including the Finger Lakes. Most of the historic farmsteads located in the national forest were established by these migrants during the first three decades of the 19th century. These early settlers prospered by taking advantage of the region’s rich natural resources. Their participation in production for regional markets was facilitated by the construction of local and statewide transportation networks. In the latter half of the 19th century, the region entered into a sharp economic and population decline as the landscape suffered from over-exploitation.

After the Civil War farmers in New York as a whole, and especially farmers located in less than ideal agricultural areas such as the uplands of the Hector Backbone, suffered from competition with Midwestern farmers. As American imperialist expansion moved westward, transportation networks and shipping interests were reoriented away from the agricultural lands of the Northeast. Many local farmers migrated to the Midwest, other rural areas of New York, or to urban centers in search of better opportunities. These trends intensified through the turn of the century, and by the 1930s south-central New York was in a state of crisis. This crisis prompted the government to intervene and purchase large tracts of sub-marginal farmland, including the farmsteads which are now characterized as archaeological sites in the National Forest.

The particular “boom, bust, and abandonment” economic sequence experienced by farmers in our study area during the 19th and early-20th centuries provides a context for interpreting the archaeological evidence and historic records from the farmsteads in the National Forest. Subsequent articles in this volume examine these different classes of archaeological and historical data within this broad historical framework.
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