

ICPSR 4284

**White Attitudes Toward Black
Civil Equality in the Nineteenth
Century: Iowa's Equal Rights
Referenda of 1857, 1868, and
1880**

Robert R. Dykstra
State University of New York-Albany

Codebook

Inter-university Consortium for
Political and Social Research
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
www.icpsr.umich.edu

ICPSR PROCESSING NOTE STUDY 04284

1.) For both of the Township files (Parts 3 and 4), ICPSR created a new variable, TNSHIP2 to provide a unique township identifier for each observation. Originally there were two variables (COUNTY and TNSHIP) that used two digit codes to identify the county and township respectively. However, the TNSHIP identifiers were not unique. Hence, ICPSR created the TNSHIP2 variable which combines the original county and township code to form a unique identifier. For example, Superior township in Buchanan county would be coded as 1012 (Buchanan county=10, Superior township=12) and Jefferson township in Clayton county would be coded as 2212 (Clayton county=22, Jefferson township=12), whereas previously both would have simply been coded as 12.

2.) The data column locations described in the codebook (e.g. page 30) refer to the original Microsoft Excel files submitted by the PI. These column locations do not apply to the data files produced by ICPSR.

Data Completeness Report

Notes: (1) Variables are individually listed only if they have greater than 5% missing data. These variables are listed under the appropriate percentage category in the order in which they appear in the data file. (2) The Data Completeness Report only captures information about system missing or other values that are declared missing. Codes that have a label implying that they are missing but that are not declared missing values are not reflected in this report. Data users should consult the codebook for more specific information about missing values. (3) Some variables that have 100% missing data may have been blanked by ICPSR to protect respondent confidentiality. Data users should consult the codebook for more specific information about blanked variables. (4) Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--County File, Referenda and Elections

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 99)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
60.4% (116 of 192 variables)		have 0% Missing Values
0.0% (0 of 192 variables)		have 0% - 1% Missing Values
2.6% (5 of 192 variables)		have 1% - 3% Missing Values
0.0% (0 of 192 variables)		have 3% - 5% Missing Values
0.0% (0 of 192 variables)		have 5% - 10% Missing Values
7.8% (15 of 192 variables)		have 10% - 20% Missing Values
EEV57A	New Constitution 1857: Estimated eligible voters, August	19.2%
Y57C	New Constitution 1857: Yes	19.2%
N57C	New Constitution 1857: No	19.2%
NV57C	New Constitution 1857: not voting (estimated)	19.2%
Y57BS	Black Suffrage 1857: Yes	19.2%
NB57BS	Black Suffrage 1857: No (ballots)	19.2%
NRO57BS	Black Suffrage 1857: No (roll-off)	19.2%
NV57BS	Black Suffrage 1857: not voting (estimated)	19.2%
EEV57O	Governor 1857: Estimated eligible voters, October	14.1%
R57G	Governor 1857: Republican	14.1%
D57G	Governor 1857: Democrat	14.1%
A57G	Governor 1857: American (Know-Nothing)	14.1%
NV57G	Governor 1857: not voting (estimated)	14.1%
EEV58J	Banking Reform (Proposition 1) 1858: Estimated eligible voters, June	16.2%
NV58B1	Banking Reform (Proposition 1) 1858: not voting (estimated)	11.1%
14.1% (27 of 192 variables)		have 20% - 40% Missing Values
EEV54	Governor 1852: Estimated eligible voters	33.3%
W54G	Governor 1852: Whig	33.3%

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--County File, Referenda and Elections

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 99)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
D54G	Governor 1852: Democrat + scattering	33.3%
NV54G	Governor 1852: not voting (estimated)	33.3%
D54T	State Treasurer 1854: Democrat	37.4%
FS54T	State Treasurer 1854: Free Soil	37.4%
NV54T	State Treasurer 1854: not voting (estimated)	37.4%
W54C	Congress 1854: Whig	36.4%
D54C	Congress 1854: Democrat	36.4%
NV54C	Congress 1854: not voting (estimated)	36.4%
EEV55	Commissioner 1855: Estimated eligible voters	32.3%
W55C	Commissioner 1855: Whig	32.3%
D55C	Commissioner 1855: Democrat + scattering	32.3%
NV55C	Commissioner 1855: not voting (estimated)	32.3%
Y55P	Prohibition 1855: Yes	33.3%
N55P	Prohibition 1855: No	33.3%
NV55P	Prohibition 1855: not voting (estimated)	33.3%
EEV56	President 1856: Estimated eligible voters	20.2%
R56P	President 1856: Republican	20.2%
D56P	President 1856: Democrat	20.2%
A56P	President 1856: American (Know-Nothing)	20.2%
NV56P	President 1856: not voting (estimated)	20.2%
Y58B1	Banking Reform (Proposition 1) 1858: Yes	27.3%
N58B1	Banking Reform (Proposition 1) 1858: No	27.3%
Y58B2	Banking Reform (Proposition 2) 1858: Yes	27.3%
N58B2	Banking Reform (Proposition 2) 1858: No	27.3%
NV58B2	Banking Reform (Proposition 2) 1858: not voting (estimated)	27.3%
15.1% (29 of 192 variables)		have 40% - 99% Missing Values
EEV48A	Congress 1848: Estimated eligible voters, August	67.7%
W48C	Congress 1848: Whig	67.7%
D48C	Congress 1848: Democrat	67.7%
L48C	Congress 1848: Liberty Party	67.7%
NV48C	Congress 1848: not voting (estimated)	67.7%
EEV48N	President 1848: Estimated eligible voters, November	67.7%
W48P	President 1848: Whig	67.7%

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--County File, Referenda and Elections

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 99)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
D48P	President 1848: Democrat 67.7%
FS48P	President 1848: Free Soil 67.7%
SC48P	President 1848: scattering 67.7%
NV48P	President 1848: not voting (estimated) 67.7%
EEV49	Public Works (President) 1849: Estimated eligible voters 62.6%
W49PPW	Public Works (President) 1849: Whig 62.6%
D49PPW	Public Works (President) 1849: Democrat 62.6%
FS49PPW	Public Works (President) 1849: Free Soil 62.6%
NV49PPW	Public Works (President) 1849: not voting (estimated) 62.6%
WF49SPW	Public Works (Secretary) 1849: Whig/Free Soil 62.6%
D49SPW	Public Works (Secretary) 1849: Democrat 62.6%
NV49SPW	Public Works (Secretary) 1849: not voting (estimated) 62.6%
EEV50	Governor 1850: Estimated eligible voters 57.6%
W50G	Governor 1850: Whig 57.6%
D50G	Governor 1850: Democrat 57.6%
FS50G	Governor 1850: Free Soil 57.6%
NV50G	Governor 1850: not voting (estimated) 57.6%
EEV52	President 1852: Estimated eligible voters 50.5%
W52P	President 1852: Whig 50.5%
D52P	President 1852: Democrat 50.5%
FS52P	President 1852: Free Soil 50.5%
NV52P	President 1852: not voting (estimated) 50.5%
0.0% (0 of 192 variables)	have 100% missing values

Data Completeness Report

Notes: (1) Variables are individually listed only if they have greater than 5% missing data. These variables are listed under the appropriate percentage category in the order in which they appear in the data file. (2) The Data Completeness Report only captures information about system missing or other values that are declared missing. Codes that have a label implying that they are missing but that are not declared missing values are not reflected in this report. Data users should consult the codebook for more specific information about missing values. (3) Some variables that have 100% missing data may have been blanked by ICPSR to protect respondent confidentiality. Data users should consult the codebook for more specific information about blanked variables. (4) Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--County File, Miscellaneous

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 99)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
3.3% (1 of 30 variables)	have 0% Missing Values
0.0% (0 of 30 variables)	have 0% - 1% Missing Values
0.0% (0 of 30 variables)	have 1% - 3% Missing Values
0.0% (0 of 30 variables)	have 3% - 5% Missing Values
0.0% (0 of 30 variables)	have 5% - 10% Missing Values
0.0% (0 of 30 variables)	have 10% - 20% Missing Values
56.7% (17 of 30 variables)	have 20% - 40% Missing Values
METH85	Methodist 26.3%
PRES85	Presbyterian 26.3%
CATH85	Roman Catholic 26.3%
BAP85	Baptist 26.3%
CONG85	Congregationalist 26.3%
DISC85	Disciples of Christ 26.3%
QUAK85	Quaker 26.3%
LUTH85	Lutheran 26.3%
EPIS85	Episcopalians 26.3%
MISC85	Smaller denominations 26.3%
FAR56_1	farmers, prosperous counties 21.2%
FAR56_2	farmers, middling counties 21.2%
FAR56_3	farmers, poorer counties 21.2%
LAB56	laborers 20.2%
CARP56	carpenters 20.2%
MER56	merchants 20.2%
OTH56	other occupations 20.2%
40.0% (12 of 30 variables)	have 40% - 99% Missing Values
METHD60	Methodist (downstate) 40.4%

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--County File, Miscellaneous

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 99)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
PRES60	Presbyterian	40.4%
METHU60	Methodist (upstate)	40.4%
CATH60	Roman Catholic	40.4%
BAP60	Baptist	40.4%
CONG60	Congregationalist	40.4%
DISC60	Disciples of Christ	40.4%
QUAK60	Quaker	40.4%
LUTH60	Lutheran	40.4%
EPIS60	Episcopalian	40.4%
MISC60	Smaller denominations	41.4%
TOTAL60	Total church seats	40.4%
0.0% (0 of 30 variables)	have 100% missing values	

Data Completeness Report

Notes: (1) Variables are individually listed only if they have greater than 5% missing data. These variables are listed under the appropriate percentage category in the order in which they appear in the data file. (2) The Data Completeness Report only captures information about system missing or other values that are declared missing. Codes that have a label implying that they are missing but that are not declared missing values are not reflected in this report. Data users should consult the codebook for more specific information about missing values. (3) Some variables that have 100% missing data may have been blanked by ICPSR to protect respondent confidentiality. Data users should consult the codebook for more specific information about blanked variables. (4) Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Township File, Referenda

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 186)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
36.6% (15 of 41 variables)	have 0% Missing Values
0.0% (0 of 41 variables)	have 0% - 1% Missing Values
0.0% (0 of 41 variables)	have 1% - 3% Missing Values
0.0% (0 of 41 variables)	have 3% - 5% Missing Values
0.0% (0 of 41 variables)	have 5% - 10% Missing Values
9.8% (4 of 41 variables)	have 10% - 20% Missing Values
R56P	President 1856: Republican 19.4%
D56P	President 1856: Democrat 19.4%
A56P	President 1856: American (Know Nothing) 19.4%
NV56P	President 1856: not voting (EV56 minus the above) 18.8%
53.7% (22 of 41 variables)	have 20% - 40% Missing Values
EV70	Eligible voters, 1870 (the sum of all local voters enumerated in TOWNSHIP FILE.VOTERS) 31.7%
R68P	President 1868: Republican 31.7%
D68P	President 1868: Democrat 31.7%
NV68P	President 1868: not voting (EV70 minus the above) 31.7%
Y68S	Black Suffrage 1868: Yes 31.7%
N68S	Black Suffrage 1868: No 31.7%
RO68S	Black Suffrage 1868: Roll-off 31.7%
NV68S	Black Suffrage 1868: not voting (EV70 minus the above) 31.7%
EV80	Eligible voters, 1880 (the sum of all local voters enumerated in TOWNSHIP FILE: VOTERS) 31.7%
R80P	President 1880: Republican 31.7%
D80P	President 1880: Democrat 31.7%
GB80P	President 1880: Greenback 31.7%
PR80P	President 1880: Prohibition 31.7%
A80P	President 1880: American National 31.7%

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Township File, Referenda

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 186)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
NV80P	President 1880: not voting (EV80 minus the above)	31.7%
Y80BL	Black Legisltors 1880: Yes	31.7%
N80BL	Black Legisltors 1880: No	31.7%
RO80BL	Black Legisltors 1880: Roll-off	31.7%
NV80BL	Black Legisltors 1880: not voting (EV80 minus the above)	31.7%
Y82P	Prohibition: Yes	32.3%
N82P	Prohibition: No	32.3%
NV82P	Prohibition: not voting (EV80 minus the above)	32.3%
0.0% (0 of 41 variables)	have 40% - 99% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 41 variables)	have 100% missing values	

Data Completeness Report

Notes: (1) Variables are individually listed only if they have greater than 5% missing data. These variables are listed under the appropriate percentage category in the order in which they appear in the data file. (2) The Data Completeness Report only captures information about system missing or other values that are declared missing. Codes that have a label implying that they are missing but that are not declared missing values are not reflected in this report. Data users should consult the codebook for more specific information about missing values. (3) Some variables that have 100% missing data may have been blanked by ICPSR to protect respondent confidentiality. Data users should consult the codebook for more specific information about blanked variables. (4) Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Township File, Voters

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 186)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
25.8% (25 of 97 variables)	have 0% Missing Values
0.0% (0 of 97 variables)	have 0% - 1% Missing Values
0.0% (0 of 97 variables)	have 1% - 3% Missing Values
0.0% (0 of 97 variables)	have 3% - 5% Missing Values
0.0% (0 of 97 variables)	have 5% - 10% Missing Values
0.0% (0 of 97 variables)	have 10% - 20% Missing Values
45.4% (44 of 97 variables)	have 20% - 40% Missing Values
NE70	1870 Birthplaces: New England 31.7%
NY70	1870 Birthplaces: New York 31.7%
NJ70	1870 Birthplaces: New Jersey 31.7%
PA70	1870 Birthplaces: Pennsylvania 31.7%
OH70	1870 Birthplaces: Ohio 31.7%
IN70	1870 Birthplaces: Indiana 31.7%
SO70	1870 Birthplaces: South (slave states, 1860) 31.7%
MISUS70	1870 Birthplaces: Miscellaneous United States 31.7%
CAN70	1870 Birthplaces: Canada 31.7%
EW70	1870 Birthplaces: England + Wales 31.7%
SCOT70	1870 Birthplaces: Scotland 31.7%
IR70	1870 Birthplaces: Ireland 31.7%
GERM70	1870 Birthplaces: Germany 31.7%
AHB70	1870 Birthplaces: Austria + Hungary + Bohemia 31.7%
NETH70	1870 Birthplaces: Netherlands 31.7%
NOR70	1870 Birthplaces: Norway 31.7%
SWED70	1870 Birthplaces: Sweden 31.7%
DEN70	1870 Birthplaces: Denmark 31.7%
LUX70	1870 Birthplaces: Luxembourg 31.7%

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Township File, Voters

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 186)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
SWITZ70	1870 Birthplaces: Switzerland	31.7%
FR70	1870 Birthplaces: France	31.7%
MISFB70	1870 Birthplaces: Miscellaneous foreign born	31.7%
NE80	1880 Birthplaces: New England	32.3%
NY80	1880 Birthplaces: New York	32.3%
NJ80	1880 Birthplaces: New Jersey	32.3%
PA80	1880 Birthplaces: Pennsylvania	32.3%
OH80	1880 Birthplaces: Ohio	32.3%
IN80	1880 Birthplaces: Indiana	32.3%
SO80	1880 Birthplaces: South (slave states, 1860)	32.3%
MISUS80	1880 Birthplaces: Miscellaneous United States	32.3%
CAN80	1880 Birthplaces: Canada	32.3%
EW80	1880 Birthplaces: England + Wales	32.3%
SCOT80	1880 Birthplaces: Scotland	32.3%
IR80	1880 Birthplaces: Ireland	32.3%
GERM80	1880 Birthplaces: Germany	32.3%
AHB80	1880 Birthplaces: Austria + Hungary + Bohemia	32.3%
NETH80	1880 Birthplaces: Netherlands	32.3%
NOR80	1880 Birthplaces: Norway	32.3%
SWED80	1880 Birthplaces: Sweden	32.3%
DEN80	1880 Birthplaces: Denmark	32.3%
LUX80	1880 Birthplaces: Luxembourg	32.3%
SWITZ80	1880 Birthplaces: Switzerland	32.3%
FR80	1880 Birthplaces: France	32.3%
MISFB80	1880 Birthplaces: Miscellaneous foreign born	32.3%
28.9% (28 of 97 variables)		have 40% - 99% Missing Values
GONLY70	German States Subfile, 1870: 'Germany' only	45.7%
SCHL70	German States Subfile, 1870: Schleswig	45.7%
HOLS70	German States Subfile, 1870: Holstein	45.7%
OLD70	German States Subfile, 1870: Oldenburg	45.7%
MECK70	German States Subfile, 1870: Mecklenburg	45.7%
HAN70	German States Subfile, 1870: Hanover	45.7%
PRUS70	German States Subfile, 1870: Prussia	45.7%
HESS70	German States Subfile, 1870: Hesse	45.7%

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Township File, Voters

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 186)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
SAX70	German States Subfile, 1870: Saxony	45.7%
BAV70	German States Subfile, 1870: Bavaria	45.7%
WURT70	German States Subfile, 1870: Wurttemberg	45.7%
BAD70	German States Subfile, 1870: Baden	45.7%
ALS70	German States Subfile, 1870: Alsace	45.7%
MISG70	German States Subfile, 1870: Miscellaneous German states	45.7%
GONLY80	German States Subfile, 1880: 'Germany' only	62.4%
SCHL80	German States Subfile, 1880: Schleswig	62.4%
HOLS80	German States Subfile, 1880: Holstein	62.4%
OLD80	German States Subfile, 1880: Oldenburg	62.4%
MECK80	German States Subfile, 1880: Mecklenburg	62.4%
HAN80	German States Subfile, 1880: Hanover	62.4%
PRUS80	German States Subfile, 1880: Prussia	62.4%
HESS80	German States Subfile, 1880: Hesse	62.4%
SAX80	German States Subfile, 1880: Saxony	62.4%
BAV80	German States Subfile, 1880: Bavaria	62.4%
WURT80	German States Subfile, 1880: Wurttemberg	62.4%
BAD80	German States Subfile, 1880: Baden	62.4%
ALS80	German States Subfile, 1880: Alsace	62.4%
MISG80	German States Subfile, 1880: Miscellaneous German states	62.4%
0.0% (0 of 97 variables)	have 100% missing values	

CODEBOOK

Robert R. Dykstra

WHITE ATTITUDES TOWARD BLACK CIVIL EQUALITY

IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY:

IOWA'S EQUAL RIGHTS REFERENDA OF 1857, 1868, AND 1880

October 2005

I

The objective of the data collection described here was to provide a quantitative underpinning for an analysis of Northern racial attitudes in the Civil War era. The primary publication resulting from the study is Robert R. Dykstra, *Bright Radical Star: Black Freedom and White Supremacy on the Hawkeye Frontier* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1993); paperback edition (Ames: Iowa State, 1997).

Like slavery itself, the civil equality of African Americans was a powerful political issue in all antebellum Northern states --even though none of them save New Jersey possessed any significant proportion of blacks in its population. But several of these free jurisdictions lay adjacent to slave states, and the main fear of those opposed to instituting black civil equality in such states as Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa was the prospect of an African American influx from over their borders. Even after Emancipation these fears continued to motivate racially conservative newspaper editors and politicians. Northern states held some two dozen popular referenda proposing black equality during the Civil War era. Most failed, and failed miserably.

Iowans shared a 225-mile border with Missouri, originally a slave state. They voted three times on black civic equality, in

1857, 1868, and 1880--once just before the Civil War, a second time just afterward, and again at the close of Reconstruction. Iowa's three referenda remain unique in their spacing at strategic historical moments, in the straightforward nature of their ballot presentations to white voters, and in their distinctively varied outcomes: one failed, two succeeded.

The conveniently adjacent censuses of 1856, 1870, and 1880 invited me to statistically compare Iowa's available voter characteristics in those census years with the voting returns of 1857, 1868, and 1880.

No specific theoretical framework informed the study. The major hypothesis tested was that that white attitudes toward black civil equality would prove to be *not* across-the-board negative but would instead vary according to various population attributes: political affiliation, commitment to antislavery and/or prohibition reform, ethnicity (as indicated by birthplace), religion, and class.

Only in the concluding phase of the study was it discovered that the data provided a test of a number of older behavioral hypotheses concern white racial attitudes, most notably Gunnar Myrdal's contention that white racism is vulnerable to traditional egalitarian ideals (usefully modified by Robert K. Merton and T. W. Adorno), and Gordon W. Allport's argument

(subsequently elaborated by James F. Pettigrew) that such racism is seldom deeply fixed in the psychological makeup of individuals, but is surprisingly easy to alter in a positive direction in most whites.

II

The collection includes four files, three of them divided into subfiles.

a. COUNTY FILE: ELECTIONS AND REFERENDA, 1848-1882

b. COUNTY FILE: MISCELLANEOUS

Church seats, 1860

Church seats, 1885

Work force, 1856

c. TOWNSHIP FILE: REFERENDA

*1857 returns (N=186)**

1868 returns (N=127; 59 cases excluded)

1880 returns (N=127; 59 cases excluded)

d. TOWNSHIP FILE: VOTERS

1856 birthplaces (N=186)

1870 birthplaces (N=127; 59 cases excluded)

German states subfile (N=101)

1880 birthplaces (N=127; 59 cases excluded)

* The 1850s data in both Township Files were originally combined; that combined file is referred to in Dykstra, *Bright Radical Star*, pp. 275-283, as the "186 subfile." Likewise, the 1868/70 and 1880 data in both Township Files were originally combined into a "127 subfile," and are referred to as such in *ibid*.

German states subfile (N=70)

To provide an appropriate political context for these uniquely well-spaced referenda, the COUNTY FILE: ELECTIONS AND REFERENDA contains all relevant annual elections (and referenda on banking and liquor prohibition) between August 1848 and June 1882--that is, from the first elections involving antislavery candidates through Reconstruction's close. Thus the data are very comprehensive in their reach, and should also prove useful to any researcher investigating nonracial aspects of Iowa politics in the mid-nineteenth century, such as prohibition reform, Greenbackism, and (when augmented by post-1882 data) the long-term evolution of two-party voting behavior in what many identify as the prototypical Midwestern state.

I decided that I would let the virtually complete voting returns of COUNTY FILE: ELECTIONS AND REFERENDA establish the parameters of Iowa's larger political configuration at any given moment in the period 1848-1882, and would use the two township files to offer less systematic--but much more statistically intimate--information on possible associations among local political cultures, ethnic backgrounds, religion, and racial attitudes. Of these, only the church seats are housed in COUNTY FILE: MISCELLANEOUS (for more information on this religious variable see Dykstra, *Bright Radical Star*, pp. 274-275).

TOWNSHIP FILE: REFERENDA and TOWNSHIP FILE: VOTERS embrace the variables mainly important for measuring the relationship of voters' personal attributes, their politics, and their attitudes toward equal rights. There are no extensive published data on individual voter birthplaces for nineteenth-century Iowa; as elsewhere, it has to be extracted from individual manuscript census entries. To minimize this enormously labor-intensive effort, I shifted the focus to the smallest electoral unit for which both voting and manuscript census returns are available. This, in Iowa, is the township. Unfortunately, the Hawkeye State did not regularly collect and publish township voting returns until after 1884.

I next concentrated on locating township returns for Iowa's three equal rights referenda. For the 1857 referendum local newspapers and courthouse records revealed complete township returns for twenty counties, with partial returns for two more. In all, I recovered 292 township returns for the 1857 referendum. (For the geographical distribution of these townships see Dykstra, *Bright Radical Star*, p. 276.)

No 1857 referenda were held in underpopulated northwest Iowa and in six other counties; therefore, the extant township data for that year clustered in the eastern third of the state far more than I would have liked. That they composed an almost

exclusively eastern Iowa sample seemed less important, however, than that the sample extended almost the entire distance from north to south, this axis being a more important geographical feature of early voting variation than the state's east-to-west dimension.

In all instances the returns for the concurrent referendum to accept or reject the new 1857 state constitution came with the 1857 equal suffrage returns. I also sought out and recovered as many as I could of my 292 townships' voting returns for the 1856 presidential election. These would provide the partisan context of referendum voting at the local level.

I next turned to gathering corresponding voter nativity from the 1856 Iowa manuscript census. My assistants and I undertook the recovery of voter nativities for as many of the 292 townships as possible from Iowa's 1856 manuscript census. We recorded the birthplace of every township resident for whom either the "Native voters" or "Naturalized voters" column had been checked by the census takers. Ultimately, 186 successfully tabulated townships, or a healthy 64 percent of the original 292, became part of TOWNSHIP FILE: VOTERS. This sample included birthplace data for 31,677 individuals--or 31 percent of all Iowa's eligible voters in 1856. (For its geographical distribution see Dykstra, *Bright Radical Star*, p. 279.)

My ultimate goal was to possess a file that included both voting returns and birthplace data for the same 186 townships, over time, for all three referenda, thus exposing change and continuity in racial attitudes. In collecting the data for 1868 and 1880, however, some townships had to be eliminated either because of illegibility or some discovered defect in their data. Such contingencies forced the exclusion of 59 of the original 186 townships. But the attrition proved relatively minor. While the analysis of 1857 would rest on 186 townships (or the "N=186 sample"), analyses of the 1868 and 1880 referenda would be accomplished via an "N=127 sample." Moreover, any longitudinal analysis of the three referenda together would employ, for 1857, only 127 townships from the larger N=186 sample.

From the 1870 federal census manuscript my assistants and I tabulated the birthplaces of townships voters ("Male Citizens of U.S. of 21 years of age and upwards"). But for 1880 the census presented a problem: no designation of citizenship is anywhere specified. My decision was that, plausibly enough, we would tabulate all adult males as the closest approximation. But the 1880 census also offered a unique opportunity, in that it recorded the nativities for each enumerated person's parents-- thereby adding a better characterization for the now many

second-generation Iowans whose instate nativities would be of little analytical use. We therefore collected the *father's* birthplace for each adult male listed as a township resident, assuming this to be the best index to the individual's ethnocultural character in 1880. For the relatively few individuals whose fathers' birthplaces were unknown we substituted mothers' nativities.

Ultimately the N=127 sample of the two township files included returns for all three referenda, plus corresponding voter nativity data from all three census manuscripts, or 62 percent of the townships for which returns could be located for all three referenda. The set's individual voters numbered 21,195 for 1856 (21 percent of Iowa's total voters); 34,392 for 1870 (13 percent); and 43,441 for 1880 (10 percent). (For the geographic configuration of these 127 cases see Dykstra, *Bright Radical Star*, p. 279.)

Other than the matter of geography, had any systematic bias been built into the two township files? I tested for this by obtaining from the data of COUNTY FILE: ELECTIONS AND REFERENDA the statewide percentages of the estimated electorate voting "Yes" in the referenda of 1856, 1868, and 1880 and comparing them with those yielded by each of the township samples. The result: voter attitudes of the N=186 sample (9.4 percent "Yes")

were virtually identical to those of the state as a whole (7.6 percent "Yes"). But for the other two referenda the N=127 sample registered as rather less egalitarian than the state as a whole, in 1868 by 9 percentage points and in 1880 by 5 points. Though this represented more bias in the second and third referenda than I would have liked, at least it was bias in a conservative (i.e., "No") direction. Because the most interesting unknown to be addressed by the township analyses would be identifying correlates of white racial progressivism, I felt more comfortable seeking conclusions via conservatively biased data than if they had been skewed toward progressive behavior. Nevertheless, a user of the data is reminded of this bias in TOWNSHIP FILE: REFERENDA when examining the township votes of 1868 and 1880. (See Dykstra, *Bright Radical Star*, p. 281.)

A similar assessment of bias in the township *nativity* data proved more problematic. I therefore decided to compare the nativity breakdown of the *total* population of the N=127 sample townships with that for the entire State of Iowa, as a substitute for comparing their political components. This test could be accomplished at only two points in the mid-nineteenth century, but--fortunately for my purposes--they came at the beginning (1856) and shortly after the end (1885) of the

referendum sequence, so as to effectively bracket the N=127 sample. For 1885 only the birthplaces of the foreign-born had been tallied and published, but a limited comparison still seemed plausible.

In most cases the sample percentages do not deviate much from that of the state as a whole, the largest biases being a 4-point deficit of Indianans in 1856, a 3-point surplus of Germans in both 1856 and 1885, and 3- and 2-point deficiency of Scandinavians in 1856 and 1885. And little change in the percentage breakdowns, both for all foreign-born Iowans and the sampled foreign-born, occurred in the years between the fifties and the eighties. This makes it all the more likely that a comparison of the statewide and sampled native-born in 1885, if permitted, would much resemble the similarities of 1856. (See Dykstra, *Bright Radical Star*, p. 282.)

What has been said of the N=127 sample is also true of the N=186 sample, since they are virtually interchangeable with respect to their percentaged 1856 voter nativity breakdowns. Their greatest divergences, the percentages for Pennsylvanians and Southerners, amount to less than 2 points in each case.

Despite the good results of these tests, I remained sensitive to matters of size. *Bright Radical Star's* regression analyses employed only birthplace categories that contained at least six

hundred voters each, smaller groups being relegated to an "other" catchall.

For more information on the varied sources, organization, and tests of the collection's data see Dykstra, *Bright Radical Star*, pp. 273-283.

III

The data are presented here in numbers rather than frequencies, since potential users may wish to percentage them in various ways. It will be seen that some entries take the form of large even numbers--e.g., 200, 300, 700. These are obviously estimates made by county-seat election officials for losing candidates in lopsided elections, no partisan poll-watchers bothering to demand an exact count. Such entries are not serious errors, however, since they are not systematic. In any event, they are (given present knowledge) the only extant data, and can only be utilized or excluded as the user sees fit.

Since the estimated "Nonvoters" variables are arithmetic calculations, they occasionally are represented as minus numbers. This simply means that the number of actual voters in a county or township exceeded the number of estimated eligible voters. These negative numbers are usually small and do not reflect systematic error in the data.

Not included in the collection is a sometimes useful "Ineligibles" variable. Employed in the comparison of any two elections, it designates new voters coming into the electorate since the first of the compared elections. It may be calculated simply by subtracting the first election's EEV from that of the second.

COUNTY FILE:
ELECTIONS AND REFERENDA

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Code</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>
A	COID	County identification number
		<u>Congress 1848</u>
B	EEV48A	Estimated eligible voters, August
C	W48C	Whig
D	D48C	Democrat
E	L48C	Liberty Party
F	NV48C	not voting (estimated)
		<u>President 1848</u>
G	EEV48N	Estimated eligible voters, November
H	W48P	Whig
I	D48P	Democrat
J	FS48P	Free Soil
K	SC48P	scattering
L	NV48P	not voting (estimated)
		<u>Public Works (President) 1849</u>
M	EEV49	Estimated eligible voters
N	W49PPW	Whig
O	D49PPW	Democrat
P	FS49PPW	Free Soil
Q	NV49PPW	not voting (estimated)
		<u>Public Works (Secretary) 1849</u>
R	WF49SPW	Whig/Free Soil
S	D49SPW	Democrat
T	NV49SPW	not voting (estimated)

Governor 1850

U	EEV50	Estimated eligible voters
V	W50G	Whig
W	D50G	Democrat
X	FS50G	Free Soil
Y	NV50G	not voting (estimated)

President 1852

Z	EEV52	Estimated eligible voters
AA	W52P	Whig
AB	D52P	Democrat
AC	FS52P	Free Soil
AD	NV52P	not voting (estimated)

Governor 1854

AE	EEV54	Estimated eligible voters
AF	W54G	Whig
AG	D54G	Democrat + scattering
AH	NV54G	not voting (estimated)

State Treasurer 1854

AI	D54T	Democrat
AJ	FS54T	Free Soil
AK	NV54T	not voting (estimated)

Congress 1854

AL	W54C	Whig
AM	D54C	Democrat
AN	NV54C	not voting (estimated)

Commissioner 1855

AO	EEV55	Estimated eligible voters
AP	W55C	Whig
AQ	D55C	Democrat + scattering
AR	NV55C	not voting (estimated)

Prohibition 1855¹

AS	Y55P	Yes
AT	N55P	No
AU	NV55P	not voting (estimated)

President 1856

AV	EEV56	Estimated eligible voters
AW	R56P	Republican
AX	D56P	Democrat
AY	A56P	American (Know-Nothing)
AZ	NV56P	not voting (estimated)

New Constitution 1857

BA	EEV57A	Estimated eligible voters, August
BB	Y57C	Yes
BC	N57C	No
BD	NV57C	not voting (estimated)

Black Suffrage 1857

BE	Y57BS	Yes
BF	NB57BS	No (ballots)
BG	NRO57BS	No (roll-off)
BH	NV57BS	not voting (estimated)

Governor 1857

BI	EEV570	Estimated eligible voters, October
BJ	R57G	Republican
BK	D57G	Democrat
BL	A57G	American (Know-Nothing)
BM	NV57G	not voting (estimated)

Banking Reform (Proposition 1) 1858

BN	EEV58J	Estimated eligible voters, June
----	--------	---------------------------------

¹ The source note for table 9.4 of *Bright Radical Star*, p. 186, incorrectly indicates that the analysis of the 1855 prohibition referendum was undertaken with township data.

BO	Y58B1	Yes
BP	N58B1	No
BQ	NV58B1	not voting (estimated)

Banking Reform (Proposition 2) 1858

BR	Y58B2	Yes
BS	N58B2	No
BT	NV58B2	not voting (estimated)

Secretary of State 1858

BU	EEV580	Estimated eligible voters, October
BV	R58SS	Republican
BW	D58SS	Democrat + scattering
BX	NV58SS	not voting (estimated)

Governor 1859

BY	EEV59	Estimated eligible voters
BZ	R59G	Republican
CA	D59G	Democrat + scattering
CB	NV59G	not voting (estimated)

President 1860

CC	EEV60	Estimated eligible voters
CD	R60P	Republican
CE	D60P	Democrat
CF	U60P	Constitutional Union
CG	BD60P	Breckinridge Democrat
CH	NV60P	not voting (estimated)

Governor 1861

CI	EEV61	Estimated eligible voters
CJ	R61G	Republican
CK	D61G	Democrat
CL	CU61G	Constitutional Union
CM	SC61G	scattering
CN	NV61G	not voting (estimated)

Secretary of State 1862

CO	EEV62	Estimated eligible voters
CP	R62SS	Republican
CQ	D62SS	Democrat + scattering
CR	NV62SS	not voting (estimated)

Governor 1863

CS	EEV63	Estimated eligible voters
CT	R63G	Republican
CU	D63G	Democrat + scattering
CV	NV63G	not voting (estimated)

President 1864

CW	EEV64	Estimated eligible voters
CX	R64P	Republican
CY	D64P	Democrat + scattering
CZ	NV64P	not voting (estimated)

Governor 1865

DA	EEV65	Estimated eligible voters
DB	R65G	Republican
DC	UASD65G	Union Anti-Negro Suffrage/Democrat + scattering
DD	NV65G	not voting (estimated)

Lieutenant Governor 1865

DE	R65L	Republican
DF	UASD65L	Union Anti-Negro Suffrage/Democrat + scattering
DG	NV65L	not voting (estimated)

Secretary of State 1866

DH	EEV66	Estimated eligible voters
DI	R66SS	Republican
DJ	CRD66SS	Conservative Republican/Democrat +

DK NV66SS scattering
not voting (estimated)

Governor 1867

DL EEV67 Estimated eligible voters

DM R67G Republican

DN D67G Democrat + scattering

DO NV67G not voting (estimated)

President 1868

DP EEV68 Estimated eligible voters

DQ R68P Republican

DR D68P Democrat

DS NV68P not voting (estimated)

Black Suffrage 1868

DT Y68BS Yes

DU N68BS No

DV R068BS Roll-off

DW NV68BS not voting (estimated)

Governor 1869

DX EEV69 Estimated eligible voters

DY R69G Republican

DZ D69G Democrat

EA NV69G not voting (estimated)

Secretary of State 1870

EB EEV70 Estimated eligible voters

EC R70SS Republican

ED D70SS Democrat

EE NV70SS not voting (estimated)

Governor 1871

EF EEV71 Estimated eligible voters

EG	R71G	Republican
EH	D71G	Democrat
EI	NV71G	not voting (estimated)

President 1872

EJ	EEV72	Estimated eligible voters
EK	R72P	Republican
EL	LRD72P	Liberal Republican/Democrat
EM	NV72P	not voting (estimated)

Governor 1873

EN	EEV73	Estimated eligible voters
EO	R73G	Republican
EP	AM73G	Antimonopoly
EQ	NV73G	not voting (estimated)

Secretary of State 1874

ER	EEV74	Estimated eligible voters
ES	R74SS	Republican
ET	AM74SS	Antimonopoly
EU	NV74SS	not voting (estimated)

Governor 1875

EV	EEV75	Estimated eligible voters
EW	R75G	Republican
EX	AM75G	Antimonopoly
EY	NV75G	not voting (estimated)

President 1876

EZ	EEV76	Estimated eligible voters
FA	R76P	Republican
FB	D76P	Democrat
FC	GB76P	Greenback
FD	NV76P	not voting (estimated)

Governor 1877

FE	EEV77	Estimated eligible voters
FF	R77G	Republican
FG	D77G	Democrat
FH	GB77G	Greenback
FI	NV77G	not voting (estimated)

Secretary of State 1878

FJ	EEV78	Estimated eligible voters
FK	R78SS	Republican
FL	D78SS	Democrat + scattering
FM	NV78S	not voting (estimated)

Governor 1879

FN	EEV79	Estimated eligible voters
FO	R79G	Republican
FP	D79G	Democrat
FQ	GB79G	Greenback
FR	NV79G	not voting (estimated)

President 1880

FS	EEV80	Estimated eligible voters
FT	R80P	Republican
FU	D80P	Democrat
FV	GB80P	Greenback
FW	NV80P	not voting (estimated)

Black Legislators 1880

FX	Y80BL	Yes
FY	N80BL	No
FZ	RO80BL	Roll-off
GA	NV80BL	not voting (estimated)

Governor 1881

GB	EEV81	Estimated eligible voters
GC	R81G	Republican

GD	D81G	Democrat
GE	GB81G	Greenback
GF	NV81G	not voting (estimated)

Prohibition 1882

GG	EEV82	Estimated eligible voters
GH	Y82P	Yes
GI	N82P	No
GJ	NV82P	not voting (estimated)

COUNTY FILE:
MISCELLANEOUS

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Code</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>
A	COID	County identification number
<u>Church Seats 1860</u>		
B	METHD60	Methodist (downstate)
C	PRES60	Presbyterian
D	METHU60	Methodist (upstate)
E	CATH60	Roman Catholic
F	BAP60	Baptist
G	CONG60	Congregationalist
H	DISC60	Disciples of Christ
I	QUAK60	Quaker
J	LUTH60	Lutheran
K	EPIS60	Episcopalian
L	MISC60	Smaller denominations
M	TOTAL60	Total church seats
<u>Church Seats 1885</u>		
N	METH85	Methodist
O	PRES85	Presbyterian
P	CATH85	Roman Catholic
Q	BAP85	Baptist
R	CONG85	Congregationalist
S	DISC85	Disciples of Christ
T	QUAK85	Quaker
U	LUTH85	Lutheran
V	EPIS85	Episcopalians
W	MISC85	Smaller denominations
<u>Work Force 1856</u>		
X	FAR56,1	farmers, prosperous counties
Y	FAR56,2	farmers, middling counties
Z	FAR56,3	farmers, poorer counties
AA	LAB56	laborers
AB	CARP56	carpenters
AC	MER56	merchants
AD	OTH56	other occupations

TOWNSHIP FILE: REFERENDA

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Code</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>
A	COUNTYID	County identification number
B	TNSHIPID	Township identification number
<u>1856/57</u>		
C	EV56	Eligible voters, 1856 (the sum of local voters enumerated in TOWNSHIP FILE: VOTERS)
<u>President 1856</u>		
D	R56P	Republican
E	D56P	Democrat
F	A56P	American (Know Nothing)
G	NV56P	not voting (EV56 minus the above)
<u>County Judge 1857</u>		
H	R57J	Republican
I	D57J	Democrat
J	A57J	American (Know Nothing)
K	NV57J	not voting (EV56 minus the above)
<u>New Constitution</u>		
L	Y57C	Yes
M	N57C	No
N	NV57C	not voting (EV56 minus the above)
<u>Black Suffrage</u>		
O	Y57S	Yes
P	NB57S	No (ballots)
Q	NRO57S	No (roll-off)
R	NV57S	not voting (EV56 minus the above)
<u>1868/70</u>		
S	EV70	Eligible voters, 1870 (the sum of all local voters enumerated in TOWNSHIP FILE.VOTERS)

President 1868

T	R68P	Republican
U	D68P	Democrat
V	NV68P	not voting (EV70 minus the above)

Black Suffrage 1868

W	Y68S	Yes
X	N68S	No
Y	RO68S	Roll-off
Z	NV68S	not voting (EV70 minus the above)

1880/82

AA	EV80	Eligible voters, 1880 (the sum of all local voters enumerated in TOWNSHIP FILE: VOTERS)
----	------	---

President 1880

AB	R80P	Republican
AC	D80P	Democrat
AD	GB80P	Greenback
AE	PR80P	Prohibition
AF	AM880P	American National
AG	NV80P	not voting (EV80 minus the above)

Black Legislators 1880

AH	Y80BL	Yes
AI	N80BL	No
AJ	RO80BL	Roll-off
AK	NV80BL	not voting (EV80 minus the above)

Prohibition 1882

AL	Y82P	Yes
AM	N82P	No
AN	NV82P	not voting (EV80 minus the above)

TOWNSHIP FILE: VOTERS

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Code</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>
A	COUNTY	County identification number
B	TNSHIP	Township identification number

1856 Birthplaces

C	NE56	New England
D	NY56	New York
E	NJ56	New Jersey
F	PA56	Pennsylvania
G	OH56	Ohio
H	IN56	Indiana
I	SO56	South (slave states, 1860)
J	MISUS56	Miscellaneous United States
K	CAN56	Canada
L	EW56	England + Wales
M	SCOT56	Scotland
N	IR56	Ireland
O	GERM56	Germany
P	AHB56	Austria + Hungary + Bohemia
Q	NETH56	Netherlands
R	NOR56	Norway
S	SWED56	Sweden
T	DEN56	Denmark
U	LUX56	Luxembourg
V	SWITZ56	Switzerland
W	FR56	France
X	MISFB56	Miscellaneous foreign born

1870 Birthplaces

Y	NE70	New England
Z	NY70	New York
AA	NJ70	New Jersey
AB	PA70	Pennsylvania
AC	OH70	Ohio
AD	IN70	Indiana
AE	SO70	South (slave states, 1860)
AF	MISUS70	Miscellaneous United States
AG	CAN70	Canada

AH	EW70	England + Wales
AI	SCOT70	Scotland
AJ	IR70	Ireland
AK	GERM70	Germany
AL	AHB70	Austria + Hungary + Bohemia
AM	NETH70	Netherlands
AN	NOR70	Norway
AO	SWED70	Sweden
AP	DEN70	Denmark
AQ	LUX70	Luxembourg
AR	SWITZ70	Switzerland
AS	FR70	France
AT	MISFB70	Miscellaneous foreign born

German States Subfile, 1870

AU	GONLY70	"Germany" only
AV	SCHLES70	Schleswig
AW	HOLST70	Holstein
AX	OLDEN70	Oldenburg
AY	MECK70	Mecklenburg
AZ	HANOV70	Hanover
BA	PRUS70	Prussia
BB	HESSE70	Hesse
BC	SAX70	Saxony
BD	BAV70	Bavaria
BE	WURT70	Wurttemberg
BF	BADEN70	Baden
BG	ALSACE70	Alsace
BH	MISG70	Miscellaneous German states

1880 Birthplaces

BI	NE80	New England
BJ	NY80	New York
BK	NJ80	New Jersey
BL	PA80	Pennsylvania
BM	OH80	Ohio
BN	IN80	Indiana
BO	SO80	South (slave states, 1860)
BP	MISUS80	Miscellaneous United States
BQ	CAN80	Canada
BR	EW80	England + Wales
BS	SCOT80	Scotland
BT	IR80	Ireland
BU	GERM80	Germany

BV	AHB80	Austria + Hungary + Bohemia
BW	NETH80	Netherlands
BX	NOR80	Norway
BY	SWED80	Sweden
BZ	DEN80	Denmark
CA	LUX80	Luxembourg
CB	SWITZ80	Switzerland
CC	FRANCE80	France
CD	MISFB	Miscellaneous foreign born

German States Subfile, 1880

CE	GONLY80	"Germany" only
CF	SCHL80	Schleswig
CG	HOLS80	Holstein
CH	OLD80	Oldenburg
CI	MECK80	Mecklenburg
CJ	HAN80	Hanover
CK	PRUS80	Prussia
CL	HESS80	Hesse
CM	SAX80	Saxony
CN	BAV80	Bavaria
CO	WURT80	Wurttemberg
CP	BAD80	Baden
CQ	ALS80	Alsace
CR	MIS80	Miscellaneous German states

DOCUMENTATION

TOWNSHIP FILE: VOTING UNIT IDENTIFICATIONS

N=186 Sample

Case	County	Township
1.	06 Benton	01 Benton
2.	06 Benton	02 Big Grove
3.	06 Benton	04 Canton (incl. Shellsburg)
4.	06 Benton	05 Cedar
5.	06 Benton	09 Harrison
6.	06 Benton	13 Le Roy
7.	06 Benton	14 Monroe
8.	06 Benton	15 Polk
9.	10 Buchanan	01 Alton
10.	10 Buchanan	03 Byron
11.	10 Buchanan	04 Jefferson
12.	10 Buchanan	07 Newton
13.	10 Buchanan	08 Perry
14.	10 Buchanan	12 Superior
15.	10 Buchanan	13 Washington (incl. Independence)
16.	16 Cedar	03 Rochester (incl. Rochester village)
17.	16 Cedar	04 Springdale
18.	22 Clayton	02 Buena Vista
19.	22 Clayton	03 Cass
20.	22 Clayton	04 Clayton
21.	22 Clayton	07 Farmersburg
22.	22 Clayton	08 Garnavillo
23.	22 Clayton	10 Grand Meadow
24.	22 Clayton	11 Highland
25.	22 Clayton	12 Jefferson (incl. Guttenberg)
26.	22 Clayton	13 Lodomillo
27.	22 Clayton	15 Marion (Morasser in 1856)
28.	22 Clayton	16 Mendon (incl. McGregor and N. McGregor)
29.	22 Clayton	17 Millville
30.	22 Clayton	18 Monona
31.	22 Clayton	19 Read
32.	22 Clayton	20 Sperry
33.	22 Clayton	21 Volga

34.	23 Clinton	07 Deep Creek
35.	23 Clinton	08 De Witt (incl. De Witt village)
36.	23 Clinton	09 Eden
37.	23 Clinton	10 Elk River

38.	23 Clinton	12 Liberty
39.	23 Clinton	14 Olive
40.	23 Clinton	15 Orange
41.	23 Clinton	16 Sharon
42.	23 Clinton	17 Spring Rock (incl. Wheatland)
43.	23 Clinton	18 Washington
44.	26 Davis	03 Fabius
45.	26 Davis	04 Fox River
46.	26 Davis	07 Marion
47.	26 Davis	09 Soap Creek
48.	26 Davis	11 Prairie
49.	26 Davis	12 Roscoe
50.	26 Davis	14 Wycondah
51.	28 Delaware	02 Coffin's Grove
52.	28 Delaware	03 Coldwater
53.	28 Delaware	04 Colony
54.	28 Delaware	05 Delaware (incl. Manchester)
55.	28 Delaware	06 Delhi (incl. Delhi village)
56.	28 Delaware	07 Elk
57.	28 Delaware	09 Milo
58.	28 Delaware	10 North Fork
59.	28 Delaware	11 Oneida
60.	28 Delaware	12 Richland
61.	28 Delaware	13 South Fork (incl. Hopkinton)
62.	28 Delaware	14 Union
63.	28 Delaware	15 York
64.	29 Des Moines	01 Augusta
65.	29 Des Moines	02 Benton
66.	29 Des Moines	05 Flint River
67.	29 Des Moines	06 Franklin
68.	29 Des Moines	07 Huron
69.	29 Des Moines	08 Jackson
70.	29 Des Moines	09 Pleasant Grove
71.	29 Des Moines	10 Union
72.	29 Des Moines	11 Washington
73.	29 Des Moines	12 Yellow Spring
74.	31 Dubuque	01 Cascade
75.	31 Dubuque	02 Center
76.	31 Dubuque	03 Concord
77.	31 Dubuque	05 Iowa
78.	31 Dubuque	06 Jefferson
79.	31 Dubuque	07 Julien (incl. Dubuque)
80.	31 Dubuque	09 Mosalem

81.	31 Dubuque	12 Prairie Creek
82.	31 Dubuque	13 Table Mound
83.	31 Dubuque	14 Taylor
84.	31 Dubuque	15 Vernon
85.	31 Dubuque	16 Washington
86.	31 Dubuque	17 Whitewater
87.	33 Fayette	01 Auburn
88.	33 Fayette	03 Clermont
89.	33 Fayette	04 Dover
90.	33 Fayette	05 Eden
91.	33 Fayette	06 Fairfield
92.	33 Fayette	07 Illyria
93.	33 Fayette	08 Jefferson
94.	33 Fayette	10 Putnam
95.	34 Floyd	01 Cedar
96.	34 Floyd	02 Floyd
97.	34 Floyd	04 Rock Grove
98.	49 Jackson	01 Bellevue (incl. Bellevue village)
99.	49 Jackson	04 Fairfield
100.	49 Jackson	05 Farmer's Creek
101.	49 Jackson	06 Iowa
102.	49 Jackson	07 Jackson
103.	49 Jackson	08 Maquoketa (incl. Maquoketa village)
104.	49 Jackson	09 Otter Creek
105.	49 Jackson	11 Richland
106.	49 Jackson	13 Tete des Morts
107.	49 Jackson	14 Union (incl. Sabula)
108.	49 Jackson	16 Washington
109.	51 Jefferson	01 Black Hawk
110.	51 Jefferson	02 Cedar
111.	51 Jefferson	03 Des Moines
112.	51 Jefferson	05 Liberty
113.	51 Jefferson	07 Locust Grove (incl. Batavia)
114.	51 Jefferson	08 Penn
115.	51 Jefferson	09 Polk (incl. Abingdon)
116.	51 Jefferson	10 Round Prairie
117.	51 Jefferson	11 Walnut
118.	52 Johnson	01 Big Grove
119.	52 Johnson	02 Cedar
120.	52 Johnson	03 Clear Creek

121.	52 Johnson	06 Iowa City (incl. Iowa City and Coralville)
122.	52 Johnson	07 Jefferson
123.	52 Johnson	08 Liberty
124.	52 Johnson	09 Monroe
125.	52 Johnson	11 Oxford
126.	52 Johnson	14 Scott
127.	52 Johnson	15 Union
128.	52 Johnson	16 Washington
129.	56 Lee	02 Charleston (incl. Charleston village)
130.	56 Lee	03 Denmark (incl. Denmark village)
131.	56 Lee	04 Des Moines
132.	56 Lee	05 Franklin (incl. Franklin village)
133.	56 Lee	06 Green Bay
134.	56 Lee	13 Pleasant Ridge
135.	56 Lee	16 West Point (incl. West Point village)
136.	57 Linn	01 Brown
137.	57 Linn	02 Buffalo
138.	57 Linn	04 Fayette
139.	57 Linn	05 Franklin (incl. Mt. Vernon and Lisbon)
140.	57 Linn	06 Jackson
141.	57 Linn	08 Maine (incl. Waubeek and Central City)
142.	57 Linn	09 Marion
143.	57 Linn	10 Monroe
144.	57 Linn	14 Spring Grove
145.	61 Madison	02 Center
146.	61 Madison	05 Monroe
147.	61 Madison	10 Webster
148.	62 Mahaska	01 Adams
149.	62 Mahaska	02 Black Oak
150.	62 Mahaska	03 Cedar
151.	62 Mahaska	04 Des Moines
152.	62 Mahaska	06 Jefferson
153.	62 Mahaska	07 Madison
154.	62 Mahaska	08 Monroe

155.	62 Mahaska	09 Oskaloosa (incl. Oskaloosa village)
156.	62 Mahaska	10 Pleasant Grove
157.	62 Mahaska	11 Prairie
158.	62 Mahaska	12 Richland
159.	62 Mahaska	13 Scott
160.	62 Mahaska	14 Union
161.	62 Mahaska	15 White Oak
162.	70 Muscatine	01 Bloomington (incl. Muscatine)
163.	70 Muscatine	02 Cedar
164.	70 Muscatine	06 Moscow (incl. Moscow village)
165.	70 Muscatine	07 Pike
166.	70 Muscatine	08 Seventy Six
167.	77 Polk	01 Allen
168.	77 Polk	02 Beaver
169.	77 Polk	03 Camp
170.	77 Polk	04 Delaware
171.	77 Polk	06 Elkhart
172.	77 Polk	07 Four Mile
173.	77 Polk	08 Franklin
174.	77 Polk	09 Jefferson
175.	77 Polk	10 Madison
176.	77 Polk	11 Saylor
177.	77 Polk	12 Washington
178.	82 Scott	01 Allens Grove
179.	82 Scott	02 Le Claire (incl. Le Claire village)
180.	82 Scott	03 Rockingham
181.	89 Van Buren	07 Jackson
182.	89 Van Buren	08 Lick Creek
183.	89 Van Buren	09 Union = Fremont + Winchester (incl. Birmingham)
184.	89 Van Buren	11 Van Buren = Keosauqua + Pittsburgh (incl. Keosauqua)
185.	89 Van Buren	12 Village = Portland + Village
186.	89 Van Buren	13 Washington (incl. Bentonsport)

N=127 Sample

Case	County	Township
1.	06 Benton	01 Benton

2.	06 Benton	04 Canton = Canton + Shellsburg
(1880)		
3.	06 Benton	05 Cedar
4.	06 Benton	09 Harrison
5.	16 Cedar	03 Rochester
6.	16 Cedar	04 Springdale
7.	22 Clayton	02 Buena Vista
8.	22 Clayton	03 Cass
9.	22 Clayton	04 Clayton
10.	22 Clayton	07 Farmersburg
11.	22 Clayton	08 Garnavillo
12.	22 Clayton	10 Grand Meadow
13.	22 Clayton	11 Highland
14.	22 Clayton	12 Jefferson
15.	22 Clayton	13 Lodomillo
16.	22 Clayton	15 Marion (Morasser in 1856)
17.	22 Clayton	16 Mendon
18.	22 Clayton	17 Millville
19.	22 Clayton	18 Monona
20.	22 Clayton	19 Read
21.	22 Clayton	20 Sperry
22.	22 Clayton	21 Volga
23.	23 Clinton	07 Deep Creek
24.	23 Clinton	08 De Witt = De Witt + Welton
(1868)		
		ff.)
25.	23 Clinton	09 Eden
26.	23 Clinton	10 Elk River
27.	23 Clinton	12 Liberty
28.	23 Clinton	14 Olive
29.	23 Clinton	15 Orange
30.	23 Clinton	16 Sharon
31.	23 Clinton	17 Spring Rock
32.	23 Clinton	18 Washington
33.	28 Delaware	02 Coffins Grove
34.	28 Delaware	04 Colony
35.	28 Delaware	05 Delaware
36.	28 Delaware	06 Delhi
37.	28 Delaware	07 Elk
38.	28 Delaware	10 North Fork
39.	28 Delaware	11 Oneida = Bremer + Oneida
		(1868)+ Earlville Pct + Delaware
		Pct (1880)

40.	28 Delaware	12 Richland
41.	28 Delaware	13 South Fork
42.	28 Delaware	14 Union
43.	29 Des Moines	01 Augusta
44.	29 Des Moines	02 Benton
45.	29 Des Moines	05 Flint River
46.	29 Des Moines	06 Franklin
47.	29 Des Moines	07 Huron
48.	29 Des Moines	08 Jackson
49.	29 Des Moines	09 Pleasant Grove
50.	29 Des Moines	10 Union
51.	29 Des Moines	11 Washington
52.	29 Des Moines	12 Yellow Spring
53.	31 Dubuque	01 Cascade
54.	31 Dubuque	02 Center
55.	31 Dubuque	03 Concord
56.	31 Dubuque	05 Iowa
57.	31 Dubuque	06 Jefferson
58.	31 Dubuque	09 Mosalem
59.	31 Dubuque	12 Prairie Creek
60.	31 Dubuque	13 Table Mound
61.	31 Dubuque	14 Taylor
62.	31 Dubuque	15 Vernon
63.	31 Dubuque	16 Washington
64.	31 Dubuque	17 Whitewater
65.	49 Jackson	01 Bellevue
66.	49 Jackson	05 Farmer's Creek
67.	49 Jackson	06 Iowa
68.	49 Jackson	07 Jackson
69.	49 Jackson	09 Otter Creek
70.	49 Jackson	13 Tete des Morts
71.	49 Jackson	14 Union
72.	51 Jefferson	01 Black Hawk
73.	51 Jefferson	02 Cedar
74.	51 Jefferson	03 Des Moines
75.	51 Jefferson	05 Liberty
76.	51 Jefferson	07 Locust Grove
77.	51 Jefferson	08 Penn
78.	51 Jefferson	09 Polk
79.	51 Jefferson	10 Round Prairie
80.	51 Jefferson	11 Walnut
81.	52 Johnson	01 Big Grove

82.	52 Johnson	02 Cedar
83.	52 Johnson	03 Clear Creek
84.	52 Johnson	06 Iowa City = Iowa City pcts + Lucas pcts (1880)
85.	52 Johnson	07 Jefferson
86.	52 Johnson	08 Liberty
87.	52 Johnson	09 Monroe
88.	52 Johnson	11 Oxford
89.	52 Johnson	14 Scott
90.	52 Johnson	15 Union
91.	52 Johnson	16 Washington = Hardin + Washington (1868 ff.)
92.	56 Lee	02 Charleston
93.	56 Lee	03 Denmark
94.	56 Lee	04 Des Moines
95.	56 Lee	05 Franklin
96.	56 Lee	06 Green Bay
97.	56 Lee	13 Pleasant Ridge
98.	56 Lee	16 West Point
99.	57 Linn	01 Brown
100.	57 Linn	02 Buffalo
101.	57 Linn	04 Fayette
102.	57 Linn	05 Franklin = Mt. Vernon Pct + Lisbon Pct (1880)
103.	57 Linn	06 Jackson
104.	57 Linn	08 Maine = Waubeek Pct + Central City Pct (1880)
105.	57 Linn	10 Monroe
106.	57 Linn	14 Spring Grove
107. ½	70 Muscatine	01 Bloomington = Bloomington Pct » Rake Pct 1 (1868 ff.) + Muscatine wards (1880)
108.	70 Muscatine	02 Cedar
109.	70 Muscatine	06 Moscow
110.	70 Muscatine	07 Pike
111.	70 Muscatine	08 Seventy-Six
112.	77 Polk	01 Allen
113.	77 Polk	03 Camp
114.	77 Polk	06 Elkhart
115.	77 Polk	07 Four Mile
116.	77 Polk	08 Franklin
117.	77 Polk	10 Madison = Lincoln + Madison

		(1880)
118.	77 Polk	11 Saylor = Crocker + Saylor (1880)
119.	77 Polk	12 Washington
120.	82 Scott	01 Allen's Grove
121.	82 Scott	02 Le Claire
122.	82 Scott	03 Rockingham
123.	89 Van Buren	07 Jackson = Cantril Pct + Milton Pct (1880)
124.	89 Van Buren	08 Lick Creek
125.	89 Van Buren	11 Van Buren = Keosauqua + Pittsburgh (1857 ff.)
126.	89 Van Buren	12 Village = Portland + Village (1857 ff)
127.	89 Van Buren	13 Washington