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Chapter I: Introduction

World Expositions have had a tremendous impact and influence on international social and cultural history. National identities, technological advancements, and economic stimulation have long influenced the architectural environments created by the historical phenomena popularly known as World’s Fairs. Some of the most iconic structures from around the world were built for World’s Fairs. Easily identifiable: Paris’ Eiffel Tower, Seattle’s Space Needle, and Montreal’s Habitat. Lesser known, but nonetheless exceptional pieces of World’s Fair history are: the New York State Pavilion, Tokyo’s International Forum, London’s Millennium Dome, the Barcelona Pavilion, and the Crystal Palace in London, among others. Expositions have allowed architects to create and display their designs for millions of people to admire. Why did some of these architectural wonders survive while others have sadly been demolished or left to their eventual demise? Those remaining masterpieces of past World’s Fairs are part of our historical architectural culture. By examining two buildings that exist from the 1893 Chicago Columbian Exposition, the Norway Building and Maine State Building, I hope to discover the significance for their survival.

World’s Fairs architecture inspires those who are involved with and interested in Historic Preservation. There are a surprising number of Exposition buildings that are still standing within the United States. A specialized critique is needed to comprehend the significance of why some Fair architecture survives while others do not. The Norway Building
and Maine State Building exemplify continued public use and tourist attraction. Options considered for categorizing and choosing these two existing World Fair buildings for analysis include their current location, Exhibition of origin, and current use. Further research indicated that the most prominent World’s Fair held within the United States, the Columbian Exposition, had only four buildings remaining intact. The Palace of Fine Arts, Dutch House, Norway Building, and Maine State Building all have unique historical aspects that can be used to explain their continued existence. Selection of the Norway Building and Maine State Building included criteria relative to: how a temporary building was preserved, how intact the original construction materials were, how a Fair building was moved, and the differences between state and national buildings. An examination of the history of World’s Fairs and the documented histories of the Norway and Maine State Buildings provide an insight for these structures. The background to the International Expositions and a historical narrative of the Columbian Exposition of 1893 leads to a detailed discussion and evaluation of the Norway and Maine State Buildings showing justification to their survival.

When the thesis process began just over a year ago, I was interested in the preservation of World Exposition buildings and knew that I wanted to focus on this for my topic. It was difficult figuring out exactly what to include since the topic is so encompassing, but I started by researching which buildings still existed from Fairs within the United States. I found that the Columbian Exposition of 1893 held in Chicago had four buildings remaining. Since the Norway Building was located in southwest Wisconsin and my hometown is in southeast Minnesota, I was able to visit the site in August 2008. That visit convinced me to continue with the analysis of Columbian Exposition buildings. Through continued research, I found that the Norway Building and the Maine State Building were the only two that still remained with their original buildings
materials, with the Palace of Fine Arts and Dutch House both having been reconstructed with more permanent materials. Since this is a preservation thesis, I decided to focus on the Norway and Maine State Buildings. Also, I thought there was an uneven representation of these two buildings from the Fair because very few sources discussed them in detail. The Columbian Exposition has been researched and written about to a great extent and has proven the importance of the technological advancements and social/racial views that the Fair perpetuated, but there is a gap in the research about the existing architecture.

History of World’s Fairs

The first International Exposition, the Great Exhibition of All Nations, was held in London in 1851. The success of this exhibition immediately impressed other nations enough to hold their own International Fairs. This idea spread throughout Europe, including Paris, which hosted World Fairs in 1867, 1878, 1889, and 1900. However, the success of these Fairs created international confusion and chaos because of a lack of leadership and cohesiveness with the planning of events. A regulating committee was deemed necessary in order to promote, restrict, designate, regulate, and “reduce the diplomatic and financial embarrassment.”

Germany took the initiative of promoting the idea to other interested nations, but the discussions stopped at the Berlin Diplomatic Conference with the beginning of World War I in 1914 and were not resumed until 1920. Even so, it was not until November 1928 that an agreement was reached in Paris with delegates from thirty-one countries signing to officially

---

create the Bureau International des Expositions (BIE). It became international law on January 17, 1931.²

The BIE was created to ensure the compliance of World’s Fairs with an agreement to regulate the frequency and quality of the Expositions. The organization’s mission statement was, and still is today, to “represent the commitment of its Member States to pursue the cultural, economic and political mission connected to events that are unique for their breadth, their drive to innovate and their force of attraction: Universal and World Expos.”³ The goals of World’s Fairs are to “commemorate a historic event, to educate and entertain, to sell new products, to peer into the future, and, although it’s rare, to turn a profit for the sponsors.”⁴

There is a process which a country must go through to be admitted into the BIE. First, it is beneficial for the nation to be a member of the United Nations prior to their application. If not a United Nations member, membership in the International Court of Justice or the International Atomic Energy Agency is sufficient to be considered for joining the BIE. Along with a membership in one of these organizations, the nation must obtain a two-thirds majority vote from the General Assembly of the Bureau. Once included in the BIE, there are many benefits for


the country joining the organization. The first benefit is that the country is able to speak their opinion of the organization’s procedures and policies. Secondly, priority is given to a membership nation wanting to organize an exposition over non-members. Thirdly, a member is required to pay only half of the application fees when participating in or hosting a World’s Fair. For these bureaucratic and financial reasons, it is advantageous for a nation to join. There are currently ninety-eight countries that are members of the BIE.5

The BIE has gone through several stages since its creation. Between the World Wars, the organization was directed by the League of Nations, an association created with the Versailles Treaty of 1919 to maintain international peace. Specialized exhibitions, smaller events of a select category lasting only three months, became recognized (but not registered) by the BIE in 1972. Examples of the categories these fairs are focused on include industry, agriculture, machinery, and cotton. The occurrence of these exhibitions is limited to ten-year intervals. Comparatively, the more well-known BIE-registered expositions were regulated to a single six-month fair every five years; these major expositions tend to start on years that end in zero or five due to the time constraints.6 To date there have been one-hundred and three official International Expositions since 1851, with thirty-six being held within North America (see Appendix A).

History of the 1893 Columbian Exposition

The Columbian Exposition was the first major World’s Fair held within the United States. The Exposition commemorated the four-hundredth anniversary of Columbus’ discovery of North


6 Findling, 373.
America (ultimately a year late because of various construction delays). The city of Chicago prevailed over New York City, St. Louis, and Washington DC to be the host location for the Fair. The Chicago Fair Commission was able to gather a group of substantial businessmen to raise more than five million dollars, with a pledge to increase that amount to ten million to be spent on the beginning stages of conducting the Fair.\(^7\) Chicago was officially named the host city with an act passed by Congress and declared by President Benjamin Harrison on April 25, 1890:

“... it is fit and appropriate that the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America be commemorated by an exhibition of the resources of the United States of America, their development and of the progress of civilization in the New World ... such an exhibition should be of a national and international character, so that not only the people of our Union, and this Continent, but those of all nations, as well, can participate ... [it will be] an exhibition of arts, industries, manufacturers, and product of soil, mine and sea.”\(^8\)

From May 1 to October 30, 1893, a total of twenty-eight million people attended this Exposition, visiting the two hundred buildings arranged on the almost seven-hundred acres of Jackson Park (see Figure 1).\(^9\) This land area dedicated to the Fair was four times larger than that of the Paris Exposition, with five million dollars spent solely on the ‘laying out and beautification’ of the grounds.\(^10\) All forty-four states participated by submitting buildings, structures, and


\(^9\) Findling, 130.

\(^10\) Flinn, 27. Washington Park was essentially used as the gateway entrance to the Fair, while the Midway was located on a strip of land connecting Jackson and Washington Parks.
Figure 1: Aerial Map of the 1893 Columbian Exposition in Chicago, Illinois. Source: Geospatial Resources and Map Collection, Bracken Library, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana.
exhibits to display at the Fair. Fifty countries participated as well, but only nineteen had buildings representing their nation on the fairgrounds. All of the buildings constructed for this Fair were built of glass, iron, staff (a plaster-like material), and/or wood, with one building made of marble. The cost of the Fair totaled $27.2 million, which is equal to $534 million today. This compared to the Paris Exposition which cost $9.5 million just fifteen years earlier.

The Columbian Exposition introduced many innovations, with a variety of new products and inventions making their debut to the public at the Fair. For example, it was the first World’s Fair to have an amusement park and a new form of entertainment: the first Ferris Wheel. George Ferris intended to create as much impact and public interest as the Eiffel Tower did for the Paris Exposition of 1889, and ultimately succeeded. Some of the edible consumer items introduced at the Chicago World’s Fair included the hamburger, Juicy Fruit gum, Shredded Wheat cereal, Cracker Jack popcorn, Aunt Jemima syrup, Pabst Blue Ribbon beer, Cream of Wheat cereal, and carbonated soda. Other notable firsts at the Fair included the singing of the Pledge of Allegiance, hula dancing, moving pictures, the first artificial ice skating rink,


12 The country buildings were: Austria, Canada, Ceylon, China, Columbia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, France, Germany, Great Britain, Guatemala, Haiti, Italy, Japan, Nicaragua, Norway, Russia, Sweden, and Turkey.

13 Flinn, 37 – 38. ‘Staff’ is a mixture of alumina, dextrine, glycerin, powdered gypsum, and water that was used in the construction of many of the Fair buildings. Over 32,000 tons were used by mixing without heat, casting into the desired shape, and applying the material over cloth in half inch molds. Staff was invented in France in 1876 and was first used in the Paris Exposition two years later. This material was popular because it was relatively cheap (one-tenth the cost of marble or granite), water-proof, had a natural color of white, and was still considered a permanent building material.


15 Flinn, 37.
celebration of Columbus Day, and picture post cards for mailing. The sights and experiences of
the Fair sparked creativity and inspiration in visitors. Among those inspired were Walt Disney
(to create permanent fairs), L. Frank Baum (author of the *Wizard of Oz*), Katharine Lee Bates
(poet and author of *America the Beautiful*, “Thine alabaster cities gleam”), and the development
of Coney Island (which incorporated ideas from the Midway Plaisance).  

Architecturally, the Chicago World’s Fair inspired the *City Beautiful Movement*. The
fairgrounds were nicknamed the ‘White City’ because of the white stucco used on the Beaux
Arts and Neoclassical styled-buildings found in the primary area known as the Court of Honor.
The two lead designers of the Fair were Daniel Burnham and Frederick Law Olmsted, the father
of modern landscape architecture. Other renowned architects who contributed building designs
included Henry Ives Cobb, Richard Morris Hunt, Charles McKim, Louis Sullivan, Robert Swain
Peabody, and John Goddard Stearns, Jr.  

The fairgrounds, social events, and people that came
together for the Columbian Exposition showed the rest of the nation and the world the potential
the city of Chicago had to be a cultural center, which still resonates today. 

---

16 University of Delaware Library, “World’s Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893,”

(Washington DC: Smithsonian Institute Press, 2000), 33. The Board of architects and their buildings are as
follows: Richard M. Hunt, Administration Building; W.L.B. Jenney, Horticultural Building; McKim, Mead &
White, Agricultural Building; Adler & Sullivan, Transportation Building; George B. Post, Manufactures
Building; Henry Ives Cobb, Fish and Fisheries Building; Peabody and Stearns, Machinery Building; S.S.
Beman, Mines and Mining Building; Van Brunt & Howe, Electricity Building; C.B. Atwood, Peristyle, Music
Hall and Casino, Palace of Fine Arts, Forestry and Dairy Buildings, Terminal Railway Station; Sophia B.
Hayden, Woman’s Building.

18 For more information about the 1893 Columbian Exposition, please see: Christopher Robert Reed, *All
the World Is Here!* The Black Presence at White City; Arnold Lewis, *An Early Encounter with tomorrow:*
Europeans, Chicago's Loop, and the World’s Columbian Exposition; G.L. Dybwad and Joy V. Bliss,
Annotated Bibliography World’s Columbian Exposition Chicago 1893; Robert Muccigrosso, Celebrating the
New World: Chicago’s Columbian Exposition of 1893; Joann A. Grote, Chicago World’s Fair; John E.
Findling, Chicago’s Great World’s Fairs: Studies in Design and Material Culture; Julie K. Brown, Contesting
impressive since the city was devastated by the Great Chicago Fire only twenty years earlier, destroying nearly twenty thousand buildings at a cost of $200,000,000.\textsuperscript{19}

The closing of the Fair was surprisingly abrupt; destruction of buildings on the fairgrounds followed quickly thereafter due to arson fires, dismantling, and deterioration. Three days before the closing ceremony, Chicago’s Mayor, Carter Henry Harrison, was murdered. Because of Harrison’s ill timed death, the Fair’s closing events were cancelled and flags flew at half-mast in his honor. The fairgrounds became quickly sparse of visitors and only days after the Mayor’s funeral, graffiti was found on many of the buildings. Some members participating in the Pullman Strike, the first national strike within the United States, set fire to seven of the buildings remaining on the fairgrounds on July 7, 1894. The strikers were rebelling against their employer, who cut their wages by thirty percent and charged an extraordinary amount of rent for the mandatory worker housing. The Chicago fairgrounds were a target of the group because the Pullman Company had a replica of its ‘model town’ along with luxury Pullman railroad cars and a street car exhibit all at the Columbian Exposition.\textsuperscript{20}


\textsuperscript{19} Department of Publicity and Promotion, 12.

Most of the buildings on the fairgrounds were destroyed by fire, torn down for material salvage, sold, and moved, while very few were initially planned to be saved for long term use after the Fair. The fire in January 1894, destroyed the Casino, Music Hall, Peristyle, and Moveable Sidewalk, some of the structures found in the Court of Honor. Soon after, in that same year, a series of accidental fires destroyed many of the other buildings in the main corridor. Of those not destroyed by fire, most were razed for scrap metal.21

Of the forty-four state represented buildings, most were sold and relocated to other sites to be used for a variety of purposes, ranging from residences to business offices. Many survived for several decades, but ultimately all, except for Maine’s, were lost through fire, disrepair or demolition.22 Wisconsin’s state building was the last to be destroyed. It had been moved to Kansas City by Daniel Burns Dyer, a prominent businessman, who created a large private estate containing the Wisconsin building, as well as buildings from the 1904 St. Louis World’s Fair. After Dyer’s death in 1912, the ownership of the estate changed several times before the complex was torn down in 1940.23

In order to understand and recognize the Norway Building and Maine State Building in terms of comparison with their counterparts at the Columbian Exposition, a description of the other state and national buildings will now be subsequently addressed.

21 David F. Burg, Chicago’s White City of 1893 (Louisville: The University of Kentucky Press, 1976), 119.

22 Among the survivors immediately following the Fair were the Connecticut, Delaware, South Dakota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Idaho, and Wisconsin buildings.

23 Bolotin and Laing, 154-55.
National Buildings of the Chicago World’s Fair

All of the nineteen international buildings were grouped on the northeastern part of the Exposition fairgrounds. These buildings were located near the north pond and just east of the Art Gallery and Fisheries Building (see Figure 8). Each country was allocated a land lot that was varied in size. Germany, France, and Great Britain all had the largest sized lots, measuring 250,000 square feet, followed by Austria with 150,000 square feet, and Belgium next with 120,000 square feet. Denmark, Italy, Greece, Sweden, and Spain all were assigned lots less than 50,000 square feet, which was the lot size for the Norway Building.\(^\text{24}\)

The Norway Building was located near the national buildings of Austria, Ceylon, Ecuador, and Germany, all of which were assembled near the intramural railway and the Lake Michigan shoreline. The Ceylon Building was architecturally modeled after ancient Indian temples. The center shape of the building was an octagon with wings extending fifty feet from either side and was built of native woods that were polished to show the natural beauty of the grain (see Appendix F, Figure 4). The Germany Building was given a location directly facing Lake Michigan. The central tower reached double the seventy-eight foot height that formed the rest of the building. The Gothic styled building also featured glazed roof tiles, one ornately decorated chapel, bronze water spouts, and interior walls decorated of high class art motifs (see Figure 3). On the other hand, the Sweden Building was styled from the sixteenth century. The entrance was found through a recessed arch, with a balcony overtop surrounding either side by a tower peak. It was constructed of compressed brick that was covered with a terra cotta and cement finish. All these materials were produced at Swedish manufacturing companies. The

\(^\text{24}\) Flinn, 31.
Figure 2: An aerial view of the national buildings at the northern section of the Chicago Columbian Exposition, 1893. Source: *The Columbian Gallery: A Portfolio of Photographs from the World’s Fair, including the Chief Palaces, Interiors, Statuary, Architectural and Science Groups, Characters, Typical Exhibits, and Marvels of the Midway Plaisance* (Chicago: The Werner Company, 1894).
Figure 3: The Norway, Sweden, and Germany Buildings at the 1893 Columbian Exposition. 
hexagonal shaped building had a central hall and fine arts gallery, topped with a multi-level dome roof. Because of the triangular lot allocated for this country, the rooms off the central hall were irregular in shape, but still designed to serve their purpose (see Appendix F, Figure 3).

State Buildings of the Chicago World’s Fair

The state buildings were also located on the northern section of the fairgrounds. These buildings formed a semi-circle between the Palace of Fine Arts and the north pond. The primary purposes for the state buildings were to be used as a headquarters for the state commissioners and a reception and entertainment area for the Fair visitors. It was a chance for visitors to tour the states in which they were from to remind them of home and also to explore places of interest within the United States.²⁵

The Maine State Building was located on a corner lot in front of the Vermont and New Hampshire Buildings (see Figure 8). The New Hampshire Building was constructed in a Colonial style. The Vermont Building was said to be one of the most original on the grounds. Two allegorical statues were found on either side of the façade, representing the two main industries of the state, agriculture and quarrying. In the front court of the Vermont Building there was a centrally located large marble fountain that faced a porch supported by four caryatids. Underneath the porch was a semi-circular Greek window surrounded with reliefs depicting figures representing ‘Freedom’ and ‘Unity.’²⁶

²⁵ Flinn, 158.
²⁶ Ibid., 161.
The Illinois State Building was the largest measuring one hundred sixty feet by four hundred fifty feet long. It was built in the form of a Greek cross with a central dome rising two hundred thirty-four feet above the ground that was topped with a cupola and beacon light (see Appendix F, Figure 6). The expectations for this state building in which the Fair was hosted were extremely high, causing many to critique the building as ‘top heavy’ due to the height being disproportionate to its length. It was located in a very prominent position at the Fair, on a high terrace overlooking the lagoon and wooden island. The second largest structure was the California State Building, which was one hundred forty-four feet by four hundred thirty-five feet long.27

Buildings Still Existing from the Chicago World’s Fair

Of the two hundred original 1893 buildings, four complete buildings remain from the Columbian Exposition. These are the Palace of Fine Arts, the Dutch House, the Norway Building, and the Maine State Building. The Palace of Fine Arts, now the Museum of Science and Industry, is the only one still at its original Chicago location from the Fair. It was designed by Charles Atwood, who also designed the Terminal Station for the fairgrounds. The immense building of Greco-Classical style has three floors, totaling 350,000 square feet. The building’s floor plan consists of a nave and transept intersecting at the center and was located at the northern area of the fairgrounds with the south façade facing the lagoon (see Figure 6). Even though it was constructed of temporary materials, it was deemed fire-proof. The walls were

built of solid brick covered with staff, while the roof, floors, and galleries were of iron. The only light illuminating the interior of the building was from the roof skylights.\textsuperscript{28}

Immediately after the Fair, the Palace of Fine Arts became the Field Columbian Museum. The Field Museum moved out in 1921, leaving the building to deteriorate which was a consequence of its original temporary construction materials. At that time, Julius Rosenwald, owner of Sears, Roebuck, & Co. was inspired by a trip to the Deutsches Museum in Munich. He wanted to have a similar museum in Chicago. Rosenwald, along with concerned members of the American Institute of Architects, had the Palace of Fine Arts building restored between 1928 and 1933, founding the Rosenwald Industrial Museum. The five million dollar project focused on stripping the exterior plaster to the steel frame and reconstructing with limestone and marble.\textsuperscript{29} The \textit{Beaux-Arts} exterior design was retained, while the interior was adapted to house the new industrial museum and changed to an \textit{Art Moderne} stream-lined style. The building’s name was changed to the Museum of Science and Industry in 1933, in time for Chicago’s next World Fair, The Century of Progress Exposition. The building continues to house the Museum of Science and Industry today.\textsuperscript{30} This is the only remaining building still at its original location, while three other surviving buildings were moved from the fairgrounds.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{28} “The Art Palace,” World Columbian Exposition Sketches file, Archives and Special Collections, Bracken Library, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana.


\end{flushleft}
Figure 6: The Palace of Fine Arts during the Columbian Exposition, 1893. Source: The Columbian Gallery: A Portfolio of Photographs from the World’s Fair, including the Chief Palaces, Interiors, Statuary, Architectural and Science Groups, Characters, Typical Exhibits, and Marvels of the Midway Plaisance (Chicago: The Werner Company, 1894).
The second remaining building is the Dutch House, which was relocated to Brookline, Massachusetts, after the 1893 Fair (see Figure 7). At the Columbian Exposition, the Dutch House was located near the northeast end of the Liberal Arts Building and was used by the Van Houten & Zoon Cocoa Company. This company, located in Weesp, Netherlands, hired architect Guillaume Wyüen to base the design of the Dutch House on the Stadthuiz, a 1591 town hall building near Amsterdam. This three and a half story building, an example of high Renaissance Dutch architecture, was constructed of staff in Holland at a cost of $65,000 before being shipped to Chicago. On average, ten thousand people visited the Dutch House every day at the Fair and were “refreshed by its cocoa and its atmosphere of quaintness.” The Dutch House was bought at an auction by C.B. Appleton after the Columbian Exposition. Appleton had the building relocated to Brookline in order to be used as a residence, but fortunately kept its structural design. When it was reconstructed in Massachusetts, the staff material was replaced with cement that imitated stone and brick. Other than this, the only major deteriorations or changes to the building since relocation includes fire damage to part of the roof in 1938, loss of its top knot during a hurricane in 1954, and removal of the front veranda. The building remains a popular tourist attraction in Massachusetts today.

---


Figure 7: The Dutch House in Brookline, Massachusetts, circa 1895.
The Norway Building and the Maine State Building were purchased and moved from the 1893 fairgrounds after the close of the Chicago Exposition. Today they stand as a tribute to the cultural heritage that links us to the wondrous World’s Fairs of the past. I will focus on these two buildings in the following chapters by examining the style of their construction, the roles they played at the Chicago World’s Fair, how they were transported and reconstructed, and why these temporary buildings have survived for over one-hundred and fifteen years.
Figure 8: Aerial map of the 1893 Columbian Exposition in Chicago. Note: The top red box indicates the location of the Maine State Building, while the lower red box is the Norway Building. Source: Boston College, “A Digital Archive of American Architecture: World’s Columbian Exposition of 1893 in Chicago,” http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/cas/fmart/fa267/1893fair.html (accessed March 5, 2009).
Chapter II: The Norway Building

The Norway Building, one of nineteen buildings representing their respective country’s architectural and cultural styles included in the 1893 Columbian Exposition in Chicago, embodied Norway’s national pride. The building was a unique structure that showcased the traditional materials and construction styles of Norway. This building’s particular history, from its construction site to its current location, tells the importance of its historical significance and the public’s appreciation for Norwegian architecture.

Conception

In May 1892, the Norwegians in charge of planning their nation’s structure for the Columbian Exposition decided to create a large building capable of holding numerous exhibitions to display Norwegian culture. The Chicago Committee in charge of the Exposition, however, said the large size desired by the Norwegians was not feasible for the amount of land allocated. In response, the Norwegians adjusted their plans and decided to erect a meeting hall in the style of a Norwegian stave church. They sent requests to architectural firms capable of exporting prefabricated frame houses. Architect W. Hansteen’s sketches were chosen for the design and the firm of M. Thams & Company was selected to construct the building (see Figure 10). A contract was finalized in November 1892, with the M. Thams & Company agreeing to complete the building by February 1893 at the price of 6,000 Kroner, the
national currency at the time. The costs of transporting the building from Norway and reassembling it in Chicago was not included in this estimate.¹

The construction firm of M. Thams & Company was established in 1867 by Wilhelm A. Thams and located in Orkanger, Norway. Within the first couple years of opening, Thams added a wood planing mill and crate factory, the first of its kind in the northern part of Norway. The company soon expanded when the crate business boomed, but an unfortunate fire in 1872 destroyed the company’s compounds. Wilhelm Thams, then sixty years old, rebuilt the mill and turned it and all operations over to his son, Maurentius Thams. Maurentius’s large scale production of crates, used for shipping salmon and tomatoes from the Canary Islands to Europe, soon became nationally prominent.²

Maurentius’s son, Christian Thams, was an architect based in Nice, France. The city’s earthquake in 1888 prompted Christian to begin constructing earthquake-resistant homes. Soon thereafter, he moved his businesses into his father’s crate factory in Norway. The combined family businesses enjoyed great success, employing over three hundred draftsmen by 1900. The M. Thams & Company became internationally renowned, shipping structures throughout Europe, Africa, India, South America, and the United States. Their ability to construct and ship structurally sound buildings convinced the Norwegian committee to choose them to produce the building that would represent their country for the Columbian Exposition.

² Ibid., 14.
M. Thams & Company had previously exhibited work at the World Fair held in Paris in 1889 and would later exhibit designs in Stockholm (1897), Trondheim (1908), and Oslo (1914).³

Albert Waldemar Hansteen had his own architectural practice and also served as architect for the M. Thams & Company. Many of Hansteen’s projects were constructed in Norway’s capital city of Oslo. In the 1880s, he worked on the restoration of the Gol Stave Church, which was likely an inspiration for his Norway Building design representing the church’s cultural symbolism of Norwegian heritage (see Figure 9). Other than the very similar exterior appearance, the Gol Stave Church and Norway Building share other architectural features, including royalty heads carved into the post capitals, St. Andrew’s crosses, trussed roofs that resemble the design of a Viking ship, ornately designed entrance portals, and the signature multi-tiered roofs with carved dragons.⁴

With Hansteen’s newly acquired experience with the Gol Stave Church, his design of the Norway Building was to have, “… adapted an architectural structure and form strongly associated with Norway’s traditional culture to its functions at the fair. In addition to its overt functions as a meeting area and exhibit hall, it was to serve as a symbol of Norway and its culture at the exposition.”⁵ Hansteen’s authentic historical style design of the Norway Building was crafted and assembled at the M. Thams & Company mill between November 1892

³ Bigler, 19.


⁵ National Register Nomination, section 7, pg 33, 1998 (see Appendix B).
Figure 9: The Gol Church, one of the major influences on the Norway Building’s construction style. Source: Brian J. Bigler and Lynn Martinson Mudrey, *The Norway Building of the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair: A Building’s Journey from Norway to America: An Architectural Legacy* (1992), 76.
and early 1893. Upon completion, it was dedicated and opened to the Norwegian public before being shipped to the United States.\(^6\)

**Design and Construction**

There are many reasons why Norway’s Fair Committee decided on the design of a stave church. Nationalism in Norway, like in most other European countries, was on the rise during the latter half of the nineteenth century, with artisans and architects looking for ways to express their Nordic heritage. The *Dragon Style*, associated with the Viking era, was recognized internationally as uniquely Norwegian. This style, dating back to the eleventh century during the transition from pagan to Christian beliefs, represented the form and aesthetic creativity seen in Viking ships, ancient stave churches, archeological finds, and folk art.\(^7\)

Hansteen was already familiar with the stave church style from previous projects such as the 1884 restoration project of the Gol Stave Church, now the Norsk Folk Museum, which gave Hansteen further experience with the *Dragon Style*. This was evident in the design of the Norway Building, where he used the same features and traditional building methods of the earlier stave churches. According to Paul Anker, author of *Art of Scandinavia*, the stave construction found in religious structures has two basic elements: a supporting framework of intercrossed logs (the chassis) and the vertical columns (the staves), “The Norwegian word *stav*, which means a pole, applies to the corner posts and columns which are essential for upholding the entire structure, and for joining the fundamental chassis to the upper braces.”\(^8\)

\(^6\) Bigler, 19.

\(^7\) Ibid., 73.

\(^8\) Ibid., 75.
There are typical architectural features found in the Norwegian stave church. This church style is entirely constructed of a dark colored wood, most commonly Norway pine, and usually has no windows. In addition, multiple gabled roofs of decorative wooden shingles are stacked on top of each other with dragon heads adorning each roof pitch (see Appendix D, Figures 13 – 14). Wood was used as the primary building material for multiple reasons. It is produced in ample abundance throughout the country, construction costs were low because one skilled artisan could supervise a group of local carpenters, and it gave a chance to display Nordic decorative carvings on a large scale. The stave churches did not resemble European Christian churches, but instead were evocative of the Far East. The symbolic dragons and multi-tiered rooftops were reminiscent of the Asian pagoda style, even though there are no known connections between Old Scandinavia and the Orient during the era when the stave design originated.

Those involved with the design of the Norway Building recognized the cultural importance of the Dragon Style and chose the distinctive theme to represent their country at the Columbian Exposition. Hansteen aesthetically and structurally changed a few typical features to fit the needs of the building for the Fair. Those small changes included using prefabricated, smaller timbers for the framing that could be moved and assembled easier. Hansteen also decided not to include the semi-circular chancel or enclosed ambulatory (the area around the alter or shrine) that were characteristic of stave churches since they were not

---


10 Lindholm, 9.
necessary for the function of the building as an exhibition hall. The Norway Building, measuring twenty-six by forty feet in a cruciform arrangement, makes it appear as a two-story building, when in fact the interior has only one story. The chassis of the building is comprised of hewn Norwegian pine logs set into an ashlar stone foundation. Two beams run the length of the building and are joined with intercrossed logs to create a grid. A stave at each intersection of logs is held in place by the framework of self-supporting scissor beams (see Appendix D, Figure 9).

The highest roof reaches thirty-six feet in the center of the building and is buttressed by lower roofs. The multi-level rooflines are sheathed in heavy dragon-scale shingles which were covered with multi-colored paint. Wooden carvings of fire-breathing dragons on the roof peaks and a series of setbacks contribute to the verticality of the building. Latticed gables, a dragon-surmounted tower, and heavy porch posts were elements incorporated to further reference the historical Norse stave church (see Appendix D, Figure 15).

In the Norway Building, four logs combine to create the staves of the building and render it portable. The faces typically carved into the column capitals of the stave represented sets of Norse kings and queens (see Appendix D, Figure 8). The carvings are detailed and charismatic, with no two alike. Norwegian tradition includes a slight flaw in the architecture to fulfill the belief that no human is perfect or above God. To satisfy this tradition, one set of the carved column caps show two male kings instead of a king and queen.

---


12 To read a more detailed description of the architectural features of the building, please refer to the Nissedahle National Register nomination, section 7 pages 32-42, found in Appendix B.

13 Scott Winner interview, Little Norway, Wisconsin, August 2, 2008.
Decorative carvings also included the dragons found in the interior quadrant brackets, similar to those found in the Gol Church. The details around the entrance door, carved by Peder Kvaale of the Thams Company, were given special attention in order to entice visitors to enter the building (see Appendix D, Figure 7). The entrance was described as:

“Heads of great beasts emerge from the lower corners of the doorframe, and their tongues become an elaborate, zoomorphic tangle of serpent bodies, birds' necks and floral designs. Biting heads intermingle with grasping claws with impressive Viking intensity. The style is marvelously pagan and vigorous. Acanthus motifs define the doorposts themselves, and a more formal frieze of acanthus leaves makes up the portal base ... The massive door is ornamented with hand-wrought iron hinges and a ring knocker, and is almost three inches thick.”

The windows of the Norway building were one of the few features that did not follow the typical stave church design. Transoms brought daylight onto the row of St. Andrew’s crosses in the clerestory level of the building (see Appendix D, Figure 17). This interior brightness shows a contrast in this design to the old stave churches, which were almost completely dark. More windows were incorporated in this design since natural light was necessary to make it a public exhibition space. The multi-toned parquet wood floor and creosote-finished walls both represent characteristics of the original stave churches (see Appendix D, Figure 18).

The End of the Stave Church

The Bubonic Plague, beginning in 1348, spread throughout Europe, including Norway, and killed one-third of its citizens. The construction of stave churches ended, in part, by this depletion of the population and loss of many artisans. By the time religion reappeared as a powerful force, the new dominant faith was Lutheran. This belief system was established in Norway when the Danish nobility overpowered the Norwegian leaders in 1536. The Lutherans

---

14 Bigler, 77 and 80.
saw the stave church as ‘too small, dark, and cold’ and erected new buildings, while many of the staves churches were left to decay or were demolished.\textsuperscript{15} A revived interest in Norway’s cultural heritage led to the formation of the Society for the Preservation of Norwegian Ancient Monuments in 1844. This organization was able to save some of the historic stave churches, but by this point most were demolished, heavily modified, or moved from their original location.\textsuperscript{16} Another factor in the depletion of the stave churches was the passing of legislation in 1851 that required all churches to hold at least sixty percent of their congregations. Because of their typically small size, many stave churches were then torn down.

The history of this style represents a significant part of Norwegian heritage. As a result, the Norway Building is important in characterizing a history that has been otherwise lost. Even though the Norway Building cannot be considered a completely “original and authentic” stave church, it includes many of the typical features, construction methods, and materials. In the only text fully dedicated to the Norway Building, it states that this building is “… a representation of Norway’s unique contribution to architectural history, a beautiful building, and a valuable artifact from the 1893 Columbian Exposition.”\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{15} Holan, 105.

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 105 – 106.

\textsuperscript{17} Bigler, 83. The entire quote is as follows, “The Norway Building is neither a church nor a direct copy, but rather an adaptive interpretation of the Stave Church Style. The traditional semicircular chancel and the enclosed ambulatory were not incorporated as part of the design because they were not essential to the building’s use as an exhibition structure. The Norway Building is, however, a representation of Norway’s unique contribution to architectural history, a beautiful building, and a valuable artifact from the 1893 Columbian Exposition.”
From Norway to America

After being available for viewing by the Norwegian public, the Norway Building was carefully disassembled and crated for its journey to America. The building was loaded on a passenger steamship named the *Hekla* along with the Danish pavilion also bound for the Columbian Exposition. The *Hekla*, operated by the Danish Thingvalla Line, set sail on March 15, 1893, enroute from Kristiansand (a seaport in southern Norway) to New York. Already overdue for the February Fair construction deadline, there were further delays. On March 24th, the *Hekla*’s propulsion system broke down causing the engine to stop and stranded the 775 passengers and cargo in the Atlantic Ocean. After making the necessary repairs, the ship finally reached New York at midnight on April 8th, two weeks behind the original schedule. Although the crates containing the Norway building were immediately loaded onto a train bound for Chicago, miscellaneous problems along the train route delayed the building’s arrival in Chicago until the middle of April.18

At the Chicago World’s Fair

The Columbian Exposition’s Director of Works and main architect, Daniel Burnham, protested the late construction of the building. With the Fair scheduled to open May 1st, he argued that “night work must be permitted in order that all possible speed be made with the task of getting the obstruction out of the way.”19 The night work meant paying employees time and a half, resulting in much higher costs than originally anticipated. The extra work paid off and the Norway Building was completely assembled and fully operational by the middle of June,

18 Bigler, 21.

19 Ibid., 25.
1893.\textsuperscript{20} Even with the late opening, much praise for the design was expressed. Writers and reporters described the building as “picturesque” (see Figure 11).\textsuperscript{21}

With a footprint of sixty by twenty-five feet, a third of the interior space was taken up by the Norwegian Commissioner and blocked off from the public by partitions. The remainder of the Norway building displayed objects that reflected the historic culture of the nation. These included a collection dedicated to Professor Rasmus B. Anderson (a guest speaker on Norway Day during the Columbian Exposition), the original manuscript of Edvard Grieg’s \textit{Humoreske} (the composer’s only manuscript located outside of Norway), pieces of Ole Bull (a famous Norwegian violinist’s instrument), and paintings by Emil Bjørn. Other objects included collections of tapestries, pictures, woodcarvings, chests, cupboards, spinning wheels, glassware, and silver. The interior furniture was American, not authentic Norwegian, partially because of the late opening. Also, time restraints did not allow for any of the originally planned exhibits to be in the building, except a large map of Norway, a few banners, and some pictures.\textsuperscript{22}

The Columbian Exposition committee dedicated a day for each nation to celebrate and honor the guests for participating at the Fair. Norway Day was on May 17, 1893, which was the country’s Syttende Mai, a holiday celebrating the signing of the Norwegian Constitution in 1814. To celebrate the seventy-ninth anniversary of the country’s independence, a morning parade consisting of Norse bands, worker’s unions, riflemen, fraternal organizations, women in native attire and carriages containing important guests, made its way through the streets of Chicago

\textsuperscript{20} Bigler, 21.

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 25.

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 21-22.
leading to the Exposition grounds. Thous-ands lined the streets to watch the spectacle, while others celebrated at the Festival Hall, the destination of the parade route. Among the speakers at this celebration were Knute Nelson, governor of Minnesota who also spoke in native tongue to the audience, Congressman Haugan of Wisconsin, and Julius E. Olson, a state university professor.

Not only did Norway erect a government building to represent the country at the Columbian Exposition, but also built a Viking Ship to display at the Fair (see Appendix F, Figures 1 - 2). The Norwegian government decided to build the ship for the Fair to prove that its ancestors, Leif Erickson’s expedition nine centuries earlier, were capable of travelling to the North American continent prior to Columbus. When remnants of a thousand year old Viking vessel were discovered within Norway, funding to build a replica was gathered from villages across the country. The ship was constructed using traditional Viking building techniques and sailed across the Atlantic Ocean to the United States coast, landing in New York on July 12, 1893. Captain Magnus Anderson, a Norwegian Commissioner for the Exposition, was appointed to navigate the ship. The native crew slept on reindeer skins and cooked their food on the edge of the unsheltered bow, as their ancestors would have done. The craft had no deck, little sail, weighed twenty-seven tons, measured seventy feet in length, and had thirty-two oars each

---

23 Hubert Howe Bancroft, The Book of the Fair: An Historical and Descriptive Presentation of the World’s Science, Art, and Industry, as Viewed through the Columbian Exposition at Chicago in 1893 (Chicago: The Bancroft Company, 1893), 909. Note: The native clothes consisted of a blue skirt with bands of red along the bottom, a bright red waist band, white blouse, and a white apron.

24 Bigler, 22.

25 Bancroft, 909.

measuring seventeen feet long. The ship received high praises from the public, even though it seemed to be an attempt by Norway to challenge ‘accepted historical fact’ directly dealing with the theme of the Exposition.

From Exposition to Private Ownership

The official closing day of the Columbian Exposition was Sunday, October 29, 1893. During the following week, ads in the Chicago Tribune and Chicago Times listed auctions and sales for many of the Fair buildings. The Norway Building was sold by closed bid. The Chicago Tribune reported the sale on November 30, 1893 and announced that “The Norwegian Building has been sold to C.K.G. Billings for $1,500, and will be taken apart and reconstructed at his place on Geneva Lake.”

In 1890, Cornelius Kinsland Billings, President of the People’s Gas Light and Coke Company of Chicago, had been elected to be a member of the Board of Directors for the Columbian Exposition. One year prior to the Fair, Billings bought land on the north shore of Lake Geneva in the southwest corner of Wisconsin, a favorite resort area for the wealthy of Chicago. He began expanding and remodeling the existing home on his property and called his estate Green Gables. Billings raised horses, showed off his sixty-five foot steam yacht, and was one of the first residents on the lake to own an automobile. He also thought his professional involvement with the Chicago World’s Fair could be demonstrated by purchasing a building that also connected to his Norwegian heritage.

---

27 Bancroft, 585.
28 Bigler, 29.
29 Ibid., 29-30.
It took eight train car loads to deliver the Norway Building to Lake Geneva in the winter of 1894. The building was soon reassembled and furnished by the Billings family to use for quiet recreation as a sitting and card room. The Norway Building was located just east and slightly behind the main residence on the property. The structure was visible from Lake Geneva to those passing by boat (see Appendix D, Figure 1).\textsuperscript{30} In 1907, Billings and his family moved to Santa Barbara, California. The estate was sold to William H. Mitchell for use as a summer residence. Mitchell, whose fortune was gained through Chicago’s banking business, had only a short time to enjoy the estate before his death in March 1910, at the age of ninety-three years.\textsuperscript{31}

The next owner of Green Gables was William Wrigley Jr., manufacturer of Wrigley gum. Wrigley had been searching for property on Lake Geneva prior to the sale of the Mitchell estate. In 1911, the Wrigley family moved into the estate (see Appendix D, Figure 2). Philip K. Wrigley, son of William, described the use of the Norway Building in a letter to the State Historical Society of Wisconsin on April 20, 1954:

“At that time it was divided roughly into two rooms, one being slightly smaller than the other which was used as a card room by Mr. C.K.G. Billings. The larger of the two rooms, as I remember it, was pretty well filled with Norwegian furniture, including a large swinging bed hung by chains from the ceiling, and there were innumerable albums of pictures from Norway, which I always assumed had been part of the Norwegian Government’s display at the Fair.

Not being a card playing family, and as the building was quite a little removed from the main house, the building was never used, and so after a couple of years it was remodeled into a motion picture theater by moving the central partition back to one

\textsuperscript{30} Bigler, 30-31.

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 31.
end to hide the projecting equipment and the building a stage and screen at the other end.\textsuperscript{32}

With the death of William Wrigley Jr. in 1932, his widow, Ada Wrigley, continued to use the estate as the family's summer home. Since the Norway Building was in some disrepair, the family offered it to several Norwegian societies in hopes that a new owner could preserve the building. The organizations in return wanted the building moved, plus an endowment for maintenance purposes, of which the family did not agree with. No potential buyer emerged until 1932 when Isak Dahle, a Chicago businessman, was willing to share the cost of moving the building. Dahle was creating a private family museum near Mount Horeb, Wisconsin, dedicated to his Norwegian heritage, called \textit{Nissedahle}, or Little Norway.\textsuperscript{33}

\textbf{Little Norway}

Isak Dahle, the son of a Norwegian immigrant, lived in rural Wisconsin most of his life. His main profession was a life insurance agent and his success in this career allowed him to pursue extracurricular activities, such as “numerous societies, business clubs, and charities, including the American Scandinavian Foundation, the Norwegian American Society, the Chicago Norske Klub, and the Adventures Club of Chicago.” In 1926, Dahle was able to take his mother, Anne, on a first class trip around Europe, making a prolonged stay in Norway. Inspirations and experiences from this trip were brought home and used in the creation of Little Norway.\textsuperscript{34}

Isak’s brother, Otto, showed him the land that would later become the site of Little Norway. The Østen Olson Hougan farm, in a valley just west of Mount Horeb, had recently been

\textsuperscript{32} Bigler, 31-32.

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 34-35.

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., 37-38, 46.
put up for sale when the brothers drove by in 1927. The Hougan family had lived there for more than a half century, building three residences on the property for family members in typical Norwegian style, along with numerous outbuildings. The property was filled with Norway maples, and had a freshwater creek running through the middle created by diverting water from nearby wetlands. This setting reminded Isak of his trip to Norway so vividly that he purchased the property immediately to serve as an educational setting for the Norwegian heritage. This was done in southwest Wisconsin because of the large Scandinavian population located in the area. The purchase included all of the buildings and eighty acres of land. After the sale, some of the dilapidated outbuildings were torn down and rebuilt, while others were repaired. Local Norwegian carpenters and painters were hired for their traditional skills, adding to the authenticity of Little Norway.  

The Norway Building at Little Norway

When Isak Dahle’s business travels took him to Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, he understood the Norway Building to be an accurate example of Norwegian architecture. In 1933, he contacted Philip K. Wrigley to discuss the possibility of purchasing the building and by July 1935, final negotiations were completed. W.E. Stone, a Whitewater, Wisconsin contractor, was hired to dismantle and transport the building from Lake Geneva to the site near Mount Horeb, Wisconsin. This was the fourth and final move for the Norway Building (see Appendix D, Figures 3 - 5).  

35 Bigler, 46-47.

36 Ibid., 51.
Figure 12: A group of tourists visiting the Norway Building in Little Norway, c. late 1950s.
Note: increased automobile traffic at the time increased the museum’s attendance to record levels. Source: Brian J. Bigler and Lynn Martinson Mudrey, *The Norway Building of the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair: A Building’s Journey from Norway to America: An Architectural Legacy*
The formal dedication of Little Norway was held on August 1, 1935. The refurbished Norway Building increased the popularity of Little Norway and brought visitors from around the world. The most famous visitors have been members of the Royal Family of Norway, including Crown Prince Olav who visited in 1939 and his son, Crown Prince Harald, who visited in 1965 (see Appendix D, Figure 6).  

The father of Little Norway, Isak Dahle, passed away on November 24, 1937, after a battle with cancer. Before his death, Dahle had his brother-in-law, Professor Asher Hobson, listed as a trustee to maintain and operate the property. Hobson, a professor of Agricultural Economy at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, used his spare time to maintain the grounds and gardens while the remaining Dahle family continued to live and work at the site. Isak’s mother, Anne, died in 1951 leaving Hobson alone to take over management. Eventually, the property passed to Hobson’s children, Merk and Marcelaine. Marcelaine’s son, Scott Winner, took over managing the site in 1982, and continues to do so today. The site currently consists of thirty-four buildings on fifty-three acres of land. At various times, sections of land surrounding the site have been sold to obtain the funds needed to preserve the various buildings and landscape; this accounts for the twenty-seven fewer acres than the initial purchase. Acquisition of donated artifacts along with preservation projects have continued throughout the years. Today, the site contains the largest privately-owned Norwegian-American collection of artifacts in the United States.  

---

37 Bigler, 51 - 53.  
38 Scott Winner, interviewed by Kayte Chadbourn, Little Norway, August 2, 2008.  
39 Bigler, 61-63.
The Norway Building continues to remain in excellent condition, considering its long history and the number of times it has been transported to new locations. The tours given of this building and throughout rest of Little Norway are informative and express the pride the owners have in preserving this building in honor of their Norwegian heritage. The many impressive features of the building, including gabled roofs, dragon-scale shingles, and intricate wood carvings found throughout the interior, attract visitors to the structure.40 Very few large restoration projects have been needed on the building since its relocation to the Little Norway grounds. The dragon-scale shingles were restored in Spring 1992, along with the dragon heads affixed to the tower (see Appendix D, Figures 10 - 12).41 Routine maintenance is a priority, according to Scott Winner, in order to keep the building’s biggest threats at bay, water and weather damage. The winters in southern Wisconsin can be brutal, but the organization has been successful in keeping the presence of the building as awe-inspiring as it was to visitors of the Columbian Exposition in 1893.42

40 Bigler, 66.
41 Ibid., 71.
42 Winner interview, August 2, 2008.
Chapter III: The Maine State Building

The Maine State Building is the only state building from the 1893 Columbian Exposition still intact today. Its current exemplary condition and unique location were made possible by long term preservation efforts and public support since the building’s relocation to Maine. The efforts by the state committee to show the appeal and importance of Maine during the Columbian Exposition were evident through the materials used and exhibits shown in this structure. The building was constructed of materials native to Maine and built by citizens of the state. The structure was returned to Maine after the Fair closed and has remained there ever since.

Conception

All of the forty-four states established at the time of the Chicago World’s Fair built and exhibited a state building for the event. The Exposition gave each state a chance to promote their cultural significance and unique contribution within a relatively new country and enticed citizens to visit, invest, or relocate to its state. Maine was no exception and built a large, romanticized eclectic structure that combined features of Queen Anne and Richardsonian Romanesque architectural styles.

The Maine State building’s designer was Charles Sumner Frost (1856-1931), originally from Lewiston, Maine. Frost began his architectural career as a draftsman in Boston, Massachusetts, and then studied architecture at the Boston Institute of Technology. He moved
to Chicago in 1882, and shortly thereafter, went into a partnership with Henry Ives Cobb. Their firm of Cobb and Frost achieved success from 1881 to 1889. Frost’s first commission after the partnership ended was the design of the Maine State Building. The state government contacted Frost to be the architect on this project for a couple of reasons. First, his exemplary work in the architectural field was already widely recognized. Secondly, he was a citizen of Maine and was located in Chicago, which enabled him to personally supervise the construction of the building in Jackson Park. Along with Frost as the architect, The Grace and Hyde Company of Chicago was responsible for the construction.

After the Fair, Frost partnered with Alfred Hayes Granger. Their firm became known for train station and terminal designs, including the LaSalle Street Station and the Chicago and Northwestern Terminal (later demolished). When this second partnership dissolved with Granger, Frost continued to work on his own by notably designing the Navy Pier Auditorium and Headhouse (1916), both in Chicago.¹

Design and Construction

The design of the Maine State Building was determined by multiple factors. The irregular shaped lot allocated for the Maine State Building determined its octagonal shape. The sixty-five feet in diameter building consists of three floors, topping ninety feet in height. The building’s grey granite foundation along the first floor was treated in multiple ways to show how the stone could be finished. There are three pointed arches along the façade that are supported by pink granite shafted columns. Entrances can be found on the front façade and two perpendicular side walls. The second story is constructed of wood, with large porches.

Figure 13: Section of the Maine State building. Source: Poland Spring Preservation Society archives.
projecting on all sides of the Maine State Building. These porches have detailed carvings of the state’s name along with other intricate designs. The wooden turrets found on the four corners of the building, with their height reaching from the second to the third floor, are topped with conical shaped slate roofs.² A projecting bay over the front entrance resembles that of the bow of a boat, symbolizing the importance of the ship-building industry in Maine.³

The interior of the building consists of an open floor plan with an octagonal rotunda rising from the first to third floors. Throughout the interior of the building is ornamented Colonial Revival woodwork. Reading and reception rooms, men and women’s parlors, and state commissioner’s offices were located on the first floor, while the second floor space was used for displaying exhibits during the 1893 World’s Fair. The third floor, used as an art gallery, is covered by a designed glass ceiling that is lit by skylights (see Appendix E, Figures 4 - 8).⁴

The Maine Building was built mostly of granite and slate to show the quality and abundance of the state’s resources and craftsmanship. The octagonal building’s first floor exterior was constructed with Maine granite from the following cities: Norridgewock, Freeport, Biddeford, Hallowell, Vinelhaven, Addison, and Red Beach. The Monson Slate Company provided the forty tons of slate that were used for the bathrooms and roof. The following is the list of Maine-based companies that provided granite for the final structure:

² National Register Nomination, section 7, pages 2-3, 1973 (see Appendix C).
³ Hubert Howe Bancroft, The Book of the Fair: An Historical and Descriptive Presentation of the World’s Science, Art, and Industry, as Viewed through the Columbian Exposition at Chicago in 1893 (Chicago: The Bancroft Company, 1893), 786.
⁴ National Register Nomination, section 7, pages 2-4, 1973. For a more on the architectural description of the Maine State Building, please see Appendix C.
First course: William A. Roberts and Alfred Goodwin (Biddeford Granite Co.)
Second and Third courses: Colonel I.S. Bangs (Dodlin Granite Co. of Waterville)
Fourth-Seventh courses: Hon. E. B. Mallet of Freeport
Eight and Ninth courses: Hallowell Granite Co.
Tenth course and half of arch stones: Bodwell Granite Co. of Rockland
Eleventh course and half of arch stones: Hurricane Isle Granite Co. of Rockland
Granite steps and buttresses: Payson Tucker, Esq. of Portland (Maine and New Hampshire Granite Co.)
Red polished columns and caps: Maine Red Granite Co. of Red Beach
Black polished columns and caps: Pleasant River Granite Co. of Addison
Four pieces of dark gray granite surmounting caps of the polished columns: Jewell Granite Co. of Bangor5

All the wood used in the construction was cut from Maine’s forests and crafted by resident woodworkers. One example of this craftsmanship was the carved oak fireplace mantel made by Morse and Company of Bangor. Other elements were manufactured by other Maine industries, including The Portland Screen Company and E.T. Borrowes Company of Portland, which worked together to create the doors and window screens, while the portiers (doorway draperies) were supplied by the Sandford Manufacturing Company.6

The Maine State Building’s architectural style is a combination of Queen Anne and Richardsonian Romanesque. The typical features of the Queen Anne style include an asymmetrical façade, dominant gable, patterned shingles, bay windows, and a steeply pitched roof. These characteristics are found on the exterior of the upper levels of the Maine State Building. This style was mostly popular between 1880 and 1910, with the Columbian Exposition occurring during this time frame. The style was not especially common in the northeastern part of the country and was usually only as ornate as the Maine State Building in resort building

designs. Richardsonian Romanesque features are found along the first floor of the building, such as rough-faced masonry walls, heavy disposition, rounded arches over entrances, large windows, and symmetrical fenestration. This style, made popular by architect Henry Hobson Richardson between 1880 and 1900, was expensive to build because of the solid masonry construction. For this reason the style was not very common, thus revealing the pride and importance of the Maine State Building to its designers.8

At the Chicago World’s Fair

The Maine State Building was located along the shore of Lake Michigan in the eastern section of Jackson Park, surrounded by other state buildings during the Exposition (see Appendix E, Figure 1). The small turreted structure served primarily as a reception hall and for the display of paintings, including landscapes, seascapes, and portraits of famous Maine citizens.9 These portraits included James G. Blaine, Governor Cleaves, Madame Nordica, Sarah Orne Jewett, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Neal Dow, among others. Almost three hundred books by Maine authors were shelved throughout the interior as well. The building had a gentlemen’s reception room, containing a stuffed bull moose (one of the largest ever documented in the state) and a stuffed cow. Other original items found within the building included:

Ladies Parlor: Madame Nordica portrait, Georgia Cayvan portrait, Baroness Von Tueffel - formerly Blanche Willis Howard (photograph sent by her from Stuttgart), Sarah Orne Jewett [photograph sent by her], Frances L. Mace portrait, Maine seashore views by John B. Hudson.

8 Ibid., 300-301.
Figure 14: Dedication of the Maine State Building at the World’s Fair on May 24, 1893. Source: Poland Spring Preservation Society archives.
Men's Parlor: Fine painting of a scene on the Saco River, Photographs of Maine scenery sent by Garrity of Bangor, and a stuffed moose loaned by Mr. Gifford of Skowhegan.

Library: Hannibal Hamlin bust (provided by his son Frank Hamlin of Chicago), Henry Wadsworth Longfellow (painted by Cole of Portland), and a Gen. Neal Dow photograph with autographed letter.

Rotunda: Scott Leighton's *A Morning Ride at Poland Spring*, Harrison Bird Brown's *Grand Manan*, Photographs of the then present day Maine senators and members of the House of Representatives (Senators Hale and Frye and Representatives Reed, Dingley, Milliken and Boutelle), large carving of then Governor Henry B. Cleaves, large engraving of Hon. James G. Blaine, and a photograph of former Senator James W. Bradbury.\(^{10}\)

The dedication day for the Maine State Building was May 23, 1893 (see Figure 14). The building was “tastefully decorated with bunting and floral designs, the approaches flanked with flowering plants, the balcony draped with the national colors, below which were pendants of pine-tree cones, while above the doors and windows were the standards of many nations resting on American shields.”\(^{11}\) Thousands of people participated in the dedication, including many ‘Sons of Maine’, a title given to natives of the state who lived in the Chicago area. Those giving speeches that day were Hall C. Burleigh, head of the board of commissioners; Governor H.B. Cleaves, who spoke of the importance of the shipping industry to the state; John J. Jewett, a ‘Son of Maine’; Georgia Cayvan, an actress who performed a scene from *Henry V*; and Madame Nordica, a well known musician and singer. The closing reception consisted of an evening concert held inside the Maine State Building.\(^{12}\)

---


11 Bancroft, 787.

12 Ibid., 787.
After the Fair

By the closing of the Fair, the state had decided to donate the building to remain at its location in Jackson Park, but the park commission denied the offer because all buildings on that section of the fairgrounds were to be removed or destroyed. The building was instead purchased for $30,000 by Hiram Rickers and Sons, the winners of an award medal at the Exposition for their Poland Spring Water. The building was purchased to house a library and art gallery for their resort guests. The structure was dismantled and shipped to Poland Spring, Maine, for $5,000 and used sixteen freight train cars and ox carts in the moving process (see Appendix E, Figures 9 - 10). Rickers oversaw the dismantling project carried out by nineteen specifically chosen men who were under the supervision of Forrest Walker, Poland Spring Resort’s head carpenter and a civil engineer. The dismantling and transportation costs were over $3,000. The reassembly took less than a year; the first stone was laid on August 14, 1894 and the formal dedication at its new location occurred on July 1, 1895 (see Figure 15). This dedication also took place on the first day of the 1895 resort season that celebrated the settling of the Ricker’s family in the Poland Spring area.

The Poland Spring Resort

The Poland Spring Resort was established due to a belief that the spring water from the area would cure medical problems. The story goes that in 1844, Hiram Ricker, who had been suffering with dyspepsia (a stomach ailment) for quite a few years, started drinking water from

---


14 Bolotin & Laing, 155.

Figure 15: The Grand Opening of the Maine State building in Poland, Maine on July 1, 1895. Source: Poland Spring Preservation Society archives.
the property and continued to do so for ten days. He became cured of his illness and credited his recovery to the spring water. The following year, the Ricker family began sharing the spring water with neighbors and made their first commercial sale of the water in 1859. Later, marketing for the Resort was based on the health benefits from the water and recreational activities, such as swimming.\textsuperscript{16}

The Resort grew with the opening of the Poland Spring House in 1876, a hotel containing 350 guest rooms, a barber shop, pool room, music hall, bowling alley, dining facilities, fire sprinkler system, elevators, a dance studio, and photography studio. The Poland Spring House was destroyed by fire in the 1880s, a destruction that drew the attention of Jim Aikman, who later became the founder of the Poland Spring Preservation Society.\textsuperscript{17}

The Resort continued to update its facilities even after the purchase of the Maine Building. A nine-hole golf course was installed in 1895 by Arthur Fenn, who is considered to be the first American-born golfer and course designer. Donald Ross, revered as one of the greatest golf course architects of his time, later expanded the course to include eighteen holes. Additionally, a new bottling plant was built on the property in 1907. This allowed the company to produce 450 cases of water per shift, securing their status as a top producer in the water bottling business. This building was considered modern for the time because it included glass


\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., (accessed January 29, 2009).
and silver piping, non-porous Cararra glass that was easy to clean, and a showering facility for the workers to use prior to their shifts.  

The onset of the Great Depression in the 1930s caused the Ricker family to lose the company and resort, subsequently with several businesses taking their turns at ownership. In 1962, Saul Feldman bought the grounds and had a new inn constructed. Feldman allowed the United States Government to lease all the buildings and grounds for use by the Job Corps, a program of the United States Department of Labor which offers free education and job training to young people. During its leasing phase from 1966-1969, the Job Corps program created the largest women’s training facility in the county at this resort. Unfortunately in 1966, the Job Corps took many of the building’s contents and resources and placed them in storage. Two years later a four day auction was held selling “many art pieces, books, furniture and much more.” Although some of the items have been returned through donation or purchase, only an estimated five percent of the books are back in the library and very few pieces of artwork and furnishings have been returned to the building.  

The Poland Spring House was closed as a hotel because of deterioration from the heavy foot traffic of the Job Corps and tourists. When Mel Robbins came to the resort in 1972, having in mind the idea of constructing condominiums on the property, he instantly recognized the potential historic value and instead leased the buildings from Feldman. A few years later, the Poland Spring House burned down. The remaining Maine State Building and All Souls Chapel

---


were then donated to the Poland Spring Preservation Society in 1977, with the hope to better preserve the structures. Mel and Cyndi Robbins bought the property in 1982, and have been preserving the structures on the site ever since.  

The Poland Spring Preservation Society

The Poland Spring Preservation Society was founded in 1976 by Jim Aikman. At the time, Aikman was a news director for a radio station, WMTW, based in the Presidential Inn building. When the Poland Spring House was destroyed by fire, Aikman became concerned that the other historic properties on the site were not being taken care of properly. He gathered a group of individuals who shared his concerns and convinced Saul Feldman to give the Society the ownership of the Maine State Building and All Souls Chapel in 1977.  

The Preservation Society is a 501(c)(3), non-profit organization, with the mission of “preserving the unique historical architecture of the Maine State Building and the All Souls Chapel.” In addition, the Poland Spring Resort, in Poland Spring, Maine, was designated as a State Landmark and placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1974. The Poland Spring Preservation Society is in charge of restoring and preserving the Maine State Building and All Souls Chapel along with teaching visitors the history of the town.

22 Ibid.
23 Ibid.
24 Bolotin & Laing, 155.
There are fifteen volunteers on the directing board and several other staff members that serve the Poland Spring Preservation Society. Their duties include, “offering educational programming for school children and the general public, preserving the rich heritage of Poland Spring, providing low cost entertainment to the community through their annual summer concert series, art shows and other programming activities as well as creating opportunities for the engagement and collaboration of individuals from various backgrounds and generations.”

The Maine State Building Today

An average of 2,500 to 3,000 people visit the Maine State Building every year. Luckily, only basic maintenance has been needed on the building in recent years. A new heating system was added to ward off the severe cold temperatures, even with the building is completely shut down during the winter months. Some of the regular maintenance items include plumbing, electrical, exterior and interior cleaning, and painting. The funding that is allocated for the preservation of the building consists of grants, fundraising events, museum tours, gift shop sales, membership dues, and other donations.

The Maine State Building holds a museum and gift shop and also functions as a backdrop for various weddings and concerts held at the resort (see Appendix E, Figure 12). The facility and grounds are open to the public during the summer months only. The building’s rich history has been recognized and acknowledged by the regional and local community, helping


the Preservation Society to continue regular maintenance and operation of the structure. Ensuring its availability to visitors during tourist seasons, preservation and restoration projects are conducted during other times of the year. Also, the Poland Spring Preservation Society hosts an open house, “Poland Spring Heritage Day,” annually over Memorial Day weekend. This event gathers an average of 500-750 visitors who are welcome to take free tours of the building and grounds.\footnote{Jason Libby, “Maine State Building Research,” personal email message, April 16, 2009.} With continued support from the community, caretakers, and interested patrons, the future of the Maine State Building will be well preserved for future generations to admire.
Chapter IV: Analysis & Conclusion

After learning the histories of the Norway and Maine State Buildings and what has happened to ensure their survival, the public can appreciate and respect these historical pieces of architecture for multiple reasons. The structures’ inclusion in the most influential World’s Fair held within the United States is the primary reason for preservation of these buildings, but their authentic construction design and old age are also testaments to their significance. Fortunately, these buildings were moved from the fairgrounds and have continued to be cared for by preservation-friendly owners. Originally, it was more by chance and luck that these buildings were bought by those owners willing to save them from demolition. Now we are able to visit these buildings in person, compared than their counterparts that were demolished and can only be viewed through photographs and text.

Architecture of World Expositions

World’s Fairs, like any other type of local or national fair, have the direct intent of being a temporary event, which includes everything the grounds. This means that the buildings constructed are usually dismantled shortly after the close of the fair. Sometimes the buildings are saved through various preservation methods. First, the initially intended temporary buildings are fully saved and preserved as exampled by the Norway and Maine State Buildings, along with the Eiffel Tower. Another possibility is that the building is saved but later reconstructed with more permanent materials. The Palace of Fine Arts and the Dutch House share this same historical background, as does the Palace of Fine Arts from the San Francisco
World’s Fair of 1915. Finally, some structures (mostly from contemporary fairs) have been constructed for short term celebrations but with the initial plans of long term architectural existence. Well known examples of permanent World’s Fair structures include Seattle’s Space Needle and Monorail (1962), Tower of the Americas (San Antonio, 1968), Habitat (Montreal, 1967) and the Atomium in Brussels (1958). Regardless of the building’s temporary or permanent construction, those still existing stand as a testament and reminder of the great events of past World Expositions.

Out of the four remaining buildings from the 1893 Columbian Exposition, the Norway Building and Maine State Building are the only two that are still constructed of their original materials, other than that which has been replaced for maintenance reasons. The other two buildings, the Palace of Fine Arts and the Dutch House, were both rebuilt with more permanent materials after the Fair. The integrity and original designs were not lost when rebuilt, but it then can be concluded that the Norway and Maine State Buildings are the only two remaining authentic structures from the 1893 Exposition. The fact of these two structures still exist with their original materials was an important factor in determining to focus on these two buildings for this study.

State and National Building Design Guidelines

The primary buildings in the Court of Honor had very specific construction guidelines including materials, height restrictions, and the architectural style used. As far as I can tell, the national and state buildings did not pre-determined detailed guidelines, other than the size of lot each was allocated. This allowed for the states and countries to have the freedom to design a building that was most representative of their respective territory. Most of the state buildings
seemed to take on a residential or town hall presence and style. For example, the Virginia State Building was designed to replicate Mount Vernon, the residence of George Washington. This would then promote the historical importance to those who had not visited the state and would hopefully make them want to visit. The state buildings were not as grand as the national buildings, but their modesty made it more welcoming to the visitors. Also, the layout of the state buildings resemble that of a typical American residential neighborhood with yard-like plots of land, setback from the street, more vegetation, wider streets, and sometimes even sidewalks. Since a majority of the Fair attendees were United States citizens, the context and layout of the state buildings made them more comfortable and not so overwhelmed by the size and grandeur found in the rest of the fairgrounds. The national buildings were normally larger in size, had more space in-between each building, and were placed in a city-like context rather than rural or residential. The countries were given larger sized plots to build on and could financially afford to construct more elegantly designed structures.

The Norway and Maine State Buildings

The fact that the Norway and Maine State Buildings are the only two structures remaining from the 1893 Columbian Exposition that have not been rebuilt with different materials is the most important factor in their survival. These were both secondary buildings at the Fair, but significant in representing the national and state buildings that were exhibited. The Norway and Maine State Buildings were unique in their building styles compared to the other fair buildings, but still gave a sense of the average size and presence of the secondary architecture at the Exposition (as opposed to those structures in the Court of Honor). It is not well known that these are two of the four remaining buildings from the Chicago World’s Fair, with many sources not even listing or mentioning either as still existing. The Palace of Fine Arts
(Museum of Science and Industry) in Chicago is a very popular tourist attraction, therefore more people who are interested in its preservation and the general public know of its origins and history. The other three lesser known buildings that have been moved from the fairgrounds are still important structures for understanding and accurately documenting the Chicago World’s Fair.

As a testament to the construction of the Norway and Maine State Buildings, no major rehabilitation projects have been needed throughout all these years, even with the sometimes multiple occurrences of relocation and reconstruction. The designs were very intricate and well planned; the construction and materials were chosen for easy movement from the construction site to the fairgrounds, but were only needed to last the duration of the Exposition. This may be the reason for so few buildings are remaining from the Columbian Exposition.

There are many factors that determined the survival of the Norway and Maine State Buildings. First of all was pure luck. The buildings luckily were not burned down after the Fair or immediately determined to be taken apart for materials salvage. But each has their own survival factors after that. The Norway Building was initially bought by C.K.G. Billings because of his Norwegian national pride to include the structure on his estate in southeast Wisconsin. The resurgence of national heritage pride with immigrated families within the United States was a socially romanticized phenomenon during this time. It was very important to continue the traditions and lifestyles in which their ancestry established, even when those citizens were now part of America’s ‘melting pot’. Each owner of the Norway Building did not purchase it specifically because it was remaining from the 1893 Columbian Exposition, but because it represented Norwegian cultural heritage.
On the other hand, the Maine State Building has survived mainly because of its participation in the Chicago World’s Fair. The materials and labor are all native to the state, but cannot be determined visually by a visitor as strictly representing the state of Maine. The Queen Anne and Richardsonian styles used in this building were common all around the country. The building exhibited its state pride at the Fair and did so afterwards by being returned to the Maine, but what makes it most acknowledged is its inclusion in the Columbian Exposition. This factor has saved the building from destruction since the closing of the Chicago World’s Fair. Whether it is because of national pride or inclusion in an historic event, both the Norway and Maine State Buildings have been recognized and deemed worthy of preserving because of their historical architectural and social significance.

The contexts of these buildings have not been completely lost with their relocations from the Chicago fairgrounds. At the Exposition, the Norway Building was surrounded by other national buildings but enclosed by groupings of trees that set it in a rural, wooded context to show where stave churches in Norway would normally be constructed. Currently, this building at Little Norway is located on a clearing within a valley, but set against a tree line of the surrounding woods. The other buildings of Little Norway, in which a path runs passed each and ends at the Norway Building, do no compare with the size and elegance of the national buildings at the Fair, but are still a spectacle for the visitors of the site.

The Maine State Building does not have the same similarities between the context it had at the Fair and where it is located now. The Maine State Building was closely surrounded by other state buildings at the Exposition in Chicago and did not have as much privacy from trees as the Norway Building did. According to current photographs, the Maine State Building has more trees surrounding it and is located by a road with the All Saints Church nearby. With it now
being at the Poland Spring Resort, the building is not fully intended only to attract tourists and educate (as the Norway Building does) but more for the use to its guests as an art museum and library.

The objective behind building these structures was quite similar. Both the Norway Building and Maine State Building were trying to bring pride and emphasize on its cultural history. This was an opportunity to show the rest of the world the importance of its heritage and impact it could have internationally. The Maine State Building may have been built more as an advertisement for the state than the Norway Building was for its country. The reason for this may be because it would have been easier for Fair attendees to travel to Maine than to Norway, considering the Fair was held within the United States. This gave the states a chance to market their great aspects by attracting potential visitors, tourists, and residents. With all the materials, construction, and even the architect coming from Maine, the Maine State Building took great pride in what the state had to offer. The audience at the Fair had a wide variety of state buildings to visit, especially at a time when leisure travel was not thought of as practical or an essential experience.

Conclusion

After all of my research, there are still a couple of aspects and questions that I could not answer. I did not find a complete list of buildings within the United States that still exist from World Expositions. I realize that the website is not universally accepted and I acknowledge its limitations, but the most thorough list of remaining buildings from World Fairs that I could find was on Wikipedia. I think an overall survey with basic information about each (including Fair, year, location, and current use) would be extremely helpful and informative to the large group
of people who are interested in this subject. This would be a long term project because of the sheer number of buildings that would be included, but also imperative in the study of World Fairs. Additionally, a study of the Fair locations and sites, including why they were chosen, the landscaping done for the fair, and what the land was used for after the close of the fair would be most essential for a full study of World Fairs. The full context of the fair architecture cannot be complete without the necessary attention and creditability given to the fairgrounds. Another aspect that was not clear to me during research was how these buildings were taken apart to be moved and reconstructed at a different location. It was a long, tedious, and expensive feat to move these wooden and stone buildings, but I could not find a step-by-step process or explanation of how it was done. I also could not find a source explaining who owned the buildings once at the Fair, who decided to sell the buildings after the Fair was complete, and who received the money from the sales. I am not sure if the Columbian Exposition Commission was in charge of all buildings once constructed on site, or if the states and nations still had control over their buildings, even after the Fair was over.

As of now, the Columbian Exposition is recognized as the most influential Fair in our nation’s history. Recently, the release of the novel, *The Devil in the White City* by Erik Larson, has exponentially popularized the Chicago World’s Fair for the general public’s knowledge. Since only four buildings remain intact, the public should appreciate and save the Norway Building, Maine State Building, Dutch House, and Palace of Fine Arts. This can be done through the preservation by current owners and their continued maintenance. Also, the public should appreciate and respect the buildings’ presence by visiting and understanding its important history. To date, all of these buildings have been preserved and the current owners are continuing to do so. The only remaining architecture from the most influential World’s Fair held
within the United States are these incredibly intact buildings. We are able to see and experience what the visitors of the Columbian Exposition encountered when they walked through the fairgrounds. The public’s understanding of the impact the Fair had on our nation relies on the buildings’ preservation. Both the Norway Building and Maine State Building are remarkable examples of successful historic preservation projects and will continue to help tell the story of the 1893 Columbian Exposition for future generations.
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Appendix A: List of World’s Fairs held in North America

1853-54 New York: Exhibition of the Industry of all Nations

1876 Philadelphia: Centennial International Exhibition

1881 Atlanta: International Cotton Exposition

1883-84 Boston: The American Exhibition of the Products, Arts and Manufactures of Foreign Nations

1883-87 Louisville: Southern Exposition

1884-85 New Orleans: The World’s Industrial and Cotton Centennial Exposition

1891 Kingston: Jamaica International Exhibition

1893 Chicago: World’s Columbian Exposition

1894 San Francisco: California Midwinter International Exposition

1895 Atlanta: Cotton States and International Exposition

1897 Nashville: Tennessee Centennial and International Exposition

1898 Omaha: Trans-Mississippi Exposition

1901 Buffalo: Pan-American Exposition

1901-02 Charleston: The South Carolina, Inter-State and West Indian Exposition

1904 St. Louis: Louisiana Purchase International Exposition

1905 Portland: The Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair

1907 Jamestown: Jamestown Tercentennial Exposition

1909 Seattle: The Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition

1915 San Francisco: Panama Pacific International Exposition
1915-16 San Diego: The Panama California Exposition
1918 New York: Bronx International Exposition
1926 Philadelphia: Sesqui-Centennial International Exposition
1928 Long Beach: Pacific Southwest Exposition
1933-34 Chicago: A Century of Progress Exposition
1935-36 San Diego: California Pacific International Exposition
1939-40 New York: New York World’s Fair
1939-40 San Francisco: Golden Gate International Exposition
1949-50 Port-Au-Prince: Exposition Internationale Du Bicentenaire De Port-Au-Prince
1962 Seattle: Seattle World’s Fair (Century 21 Exposition)
1968 San Antonio: Hemisfair ’68: A Confluence of Cultures of the Americas
1982 Knoxville: Knoxville International Energy Exposition
1984 New Orleans: Louisiana World Exposition
1986 Vancouver: Expo 86: The 1986 World Exposition

Specialized Fairs (lacking international scope):
1853 Fredericton, New Brunswick: Native Industry Exhibition
1858 New York: American Industry Exhibition
1871 Georgetown: Exhibition of Natural Products
1872 Louisville: Industrial Exhibition
1873 Nashville: Industrial Exposition
1873 Chicago: Interstate Exposition
1874 Cincinnati: Industrial Exhibition
1876 New Orleans: Southern States Agricultural and Industrial Exposition
1884 Charleston: Industrial Exposition
1884 Philadelphia: International Electrical Exhibition
1887 Atlanta: Piedmont Exposition
1888 Minneapolis: Industrial Exposition
1888 Jacksonville: Sub-Tropical Exposition
1888 Richmond: Virginia Agricultural, Mechanical, and Tobacco Exposition
1889 Ocala: Florida Inter-National and Semi-Tropical Exposition
1890 Boston: International Maritime Exhibition
1891-92 Detroit: International Fair and Exposition
1892 Buffalo: International Exposition
1899 Philadelphia: National Export Exhibition
1936 Cleveland: Great Lakes Exposition
1936 Dallas: Texas Centennial Central Exposition
1967 Fairbanks: Alaska 67 Centennial Exposition

---

Appendix B: Norway Building National Register Nomination

Note: Only selections containing information about the Norway Building were included from the original nomination in this appendix for consolidation purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPS Form 10-900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States Department of Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Register of Historic Places Registration Form**

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in *How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form* (National Register Bulletin 16A). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the information requested. If an item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions. Place additional entries and narrative items on continuation sheets (NPS Form 10-900A). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer, to complete all items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Name of Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other names</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street &amp; number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. State/Federal Agency Certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, I hereby certify that this X nomination, if approved by the Secretary of the Interior, meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property X meets the National Register criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant. (See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of certifying official |
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer - WI | 12/22/98 |

State of Federal agency and bureau |
In my opinion, the property X meets, does not meet the National Register criteria. (See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of commenting official/Title | Date |
State of Federal agency and bureau |
4. National Park Service Certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership of Property</th>
<th>Category of Property</th>
<th>Number of Resources within Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(check as many boxes as apply)</td>
<td>(Check only one box)</td>
<td>Do not include previously listed resources in the count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X private</td>
<td>X building(s)</td>
<td>contributing 20 noncontributing 8 buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public-local</td>
<td>district</td>
<td>sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public-State</td>
<td>structure</td>
<td>objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public-Federal</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>3 3 structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>object</td>
<td>23 11 total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of related multiple property listing: None

Number of contributing resources is previously listed in the National Register: 0

5. Classification

6. Function or Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Functions</th>
<th>Current Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION AND CULTURE/Museum</td>
<td>RECREATION AND CULTURE/Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Classification</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LATE VICTORIAN</td>
<td>Foundation: STONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERN MOVEMENT</td>
<td>walls: LOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WEATHERBOARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>roof: SHINGLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative Description

(Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)
### 8. Statement of Significance

**Applicable National Register Criteria**
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for the National Register listing.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X A</td>
<td>Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criteria Considerations**
(Mark "x" in all the boxes that apply.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>removed from its original location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>a birthplace or grave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>a cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>a reconstructed building, object, or structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>a commemoratory property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Areas of Significance**
(Enter categories from instructions)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETHNIC HERITAGE/European</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927-59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Dates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Complete if Criterion B is marked)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cultural Affiliation**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architect/Builder**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haasteen, Albert Waldemar (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nerdrum, Sartley (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 9. Major Bibliographic References

(Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Documentation on File (National Park Service):</th>
<th>Primary location of additional data:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested</td>
<td>X State Historic Preservation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>previously listed in the National Register</td>
<td>Other State Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>previously determined eligible by the National Register</td>
<td>Federal Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated a National Historic landmark</td>
<td>Local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey #____</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recorded by Historic American Engineering Record #____</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of repository:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property 53 acres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTM References (Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Zone Easting Northing 3  Zone Easting Northing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Zone Easting Northing 4  Zone Easting Northing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ See Continuation Sheet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbal Boundary Description** (Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet)

**Boundary Justification** (Explain why the boundaries were selected on a continuation sheet)

## 11. Form Prepared By

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name/title</th>
<th>Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>organization</td>
<td>private consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>street &amp; number</td>
<td>PO Box 258, 21 Fourth St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city or town</td>
<td>Belleville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zip code</td>
<td>33508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date</td>
<td>8/1/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telephone</td>
<td>(608) 424-6315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Property</td>
<td>County and State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Documentation

Submit the following forms with the completed form:

#### Continuation Sheets

**Maps**
- A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.
- A sketch map for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources.

**Photographs**
- Representative black and white photographs of the property.

**Additional Items** (Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items)

### Property Owner

Complete this item at the request of SHPO or FPO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marcelaine H. Winner and Scott Paul Winner</td>
<td>6/20/97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3576 CTH JG</td>
<td>(608) 437-8211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City or Town</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mounds</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>53508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paperwork Reduction Act Statement:** This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

**Estimated Burden Statement:** Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18.1 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 27127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Projects, (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.
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7. Description

Introduction

Nissedahle or Little Norway, a historic Norwegian-American farmstead interpreted to the public as an outdoor museum since 1937, sits in a narrow valley located at the base of Blue Mounds. It lies along a small creek just west of CTH JG between Blue Mounds and Mt. Horeb in the northwest quarter of section 4 in the Town of Blue Mounds (township 6 north, range 6 east), Dane County, Wisconsin. The property contains 34 resources, 23 of which are contributing (20 buildings and three structures), and 11 of which are noncontributing (three structures and eight buildings). These primarily log buildings face the stream along the base of the valley. The boundary of the irregularly-shaped district encloses all the buildings associated with Little Norway. It primarily runs along the crest of the surrounding hillsides at the 1100 foot contour to encompass the setting which contributes heavily to the idyllic feeling of the property.

Established in the 1880s by Osten Olson Haugen, a Norwegian immigrant who Americanized his name to Austin Olson, the original farmstead remained in the family until its June, 1927 purchase by Isak Dahlé (Dane County Title Company 1955-1978). A successful businessman in Chicago, Dahlé was raised in adjacent Mt. Vernon and Mt. Horeb. Beginning in 1927, Isak Dahlé and his family renovated the original farmstead, erected additional buildings, moved the Norway Building which originally stood at the Chicago Columbian Exposition in 1893 onto the property, and collected Norwegian and Norwegian-American artifacts to celebrate and interpret the Norwegian-American life of their ancestors (Howe 1954 [copies of correspondence between Isak Dahlé and Philip Wrigley, 7/1/35]).

Physical Setting

Little Norway refers to the Norwegian community Nissedal, the origin of three of Isak
Dahle's grandparents, and incorporates the family name (Little Norway 1927-91 [file: Little Norway Building, General]). The property began in 1927 as an unoccupied farmstead of approximately eleven deteriorating buildings (Little Norway 1927-91 [1927]; Bigler and Mudrey 1992: 41). Norwegian-American farmsteads tended to include a comparatively large number of outbuildings clustered by specific function (Fapso 1977: 38). The buildings associated with the Olson farmstead were placed in two clusters, a domestic and an agricultural grouping, along the lower portion of a steep, north hillside of the valley. In 1927, the hillsides were covered with grasses (Little Norway 1926-91 [photos. 1927, 1930s]). The spring-fed creek which flowed along the base of the deep valley through a wetland area is a tributary to Bohn Creek. Between 1927 and 1933 (Dahle 1933), many of the extant farm buildings were renovated and the valley was landscaped.

During landscaping, the creek was channeled and the adjacent wetlands drained to create a meandering stream. Stone and concrete retaining walls were erected and tiles laid to contain the stream in the late 1920s. In 1928, small dams were built to create two ponds (Dahle 1933; Little Norway 1927-91 [early 1930s]). One pond remains near the picnic shelter (31). The second pond which once laid northwest of the Hobson House was drained (Little Norway 1927-91 [file: Development: Wisconsin State Journal 1928 [6/7: 1] and photo. files]; Winner, M. 1996; Mt. Horeb Area Historical Society 1927-60s; Dahle 1928-29; Bigler and Mudrey 1992: 48). Timber and stone bridges were constructed across the stream. Lawns were established along the lower sides of the valley. And, trees were planted along the hillsides so that these woodlands now thickly cover the sides of the valley. As early as 1923, Leon Dahle was planting 5,000 fir trees along the valleys and ridges to create a small wildlife sanctuary (Little Norway 1927-91 [file: Development: Wisconsin State Journal 1923 [6/28: 1, 2/2]). Dahle also had many perennials planted in the late 1920s and early 1930s (Winner, S. 1996).

The buildings of Little Norway continue to form a linear pattern along the lower portions of the north and south facing hillsides. Stone retaining walls were constructed to secure the banks of the hillside adjacent to the buildings and along the gardens which continue to characterize the property. Stone walks were gradually established to connect the buildings
as early as 1928 (Little Norway 1927-91 [1936]; Mt. Horeb Area Historical Society 1927-60s; Wisconsin State Journal 1926 [6/28: 1, 2/2]). The main, connecting stone and concrete walk along the base of the north and south hillsides was rebuilt and a semi-circular, stone and concrete seat was added in 1960, primarily by Anton Bluffat (Winner, M. 1998). The walk near the stone seat was extended in 1987 to control erosion (Winner, S. 1996). A white picket fence, now replaced with a similar fence, separated the property from JG (Little Norway 1927-91 [file: Development: Wisconsin State Journal 1928 [6/28: 1, 2/2]). A second fence which was removed after the property was extended to the east defined its east boundary. By the late 1930s, extensive flower and vegetable gardens were placed along the stream and lower terraces of the hillsides. Vegetable gardens remain at both the east and west edges of the building concentrations. Extensive flower gardens continue to adorn the edges of the creek and retaining walls adjacent to the buildings. Then, by the mid-1930s, Isaac Dahle had created an idyllic setting for Little Norway.

**Building Description**

The buildings at Little Norway fall into three groups: the primarily log buildings of the original farmstead which date from the last third of the nineteenth into early twentieth century and were renovated between 1927 and the early 1930s, the log or log-sided buildings erected in the style of the original buildings by the Dahle family between 1927 and the 1981, and buildings erected or moved onto the property between the 1930s and the 1970s whose siding is not log including the Norway Building, Hobson dwelling, a stone bridge, and several utility buildings.

**Log Buildings Erected Prior to 1927**

---

1 Dahle family here refers to Isaac Dahle's extended family and their descendants.
the roof. A wood shingle gable roof whose ridge parallels the road forms the top of the canopy. Since its original construction, one of the uprights and some of the bracing were replaced.

Non-Log Buildings Erected Between the 1930s and 1970

The Dahle family erected within or moved onto the property eight non-log buildings and structures between the 1930s and the 1970s. They include the Norway Building, Hobson dwelling, a masonry bridge, and several service buildings.

Norway Building (23): Contributing/Moved

Isak Dahle had the Norway Building moved from Lake Geneva to its current site at Little Norway in July, 1935 and completed the rebuilding by about October, 1935. He had begun correspondence with Philip K. Wrigley concerning the transfer of the property in 1933 (Howe 1954 [copies of correspondence with Isak Dahle 10/7/33, 7/1/35, 7/3/35, 9/25/35; reference report by Howe, 5/13/54]). Working for M. Thams & Co. of Drammen, Norway, the company which constructed the building, Albert Waldemar Hanstein designed the exposition building in 1892 for the 1893 Columbian Exposition in Chicago. Hanstein modeled his design after Norwegian stave churches, massive timber frame buildings constructed in Norway between the tenth and twelfth centuries. Delays in its erection at Chicago resulted in the placement of displays at other locations. Thus, although the building was intended to function as an exhibit area, its exhibits were limited to illustrations placed along the wall. The building also historically contained the office of the Norwegian commissioner at the fair, and a meeting area for Norwegian citizens (Howe 1954 [reference report by Howe, 5/13/54]).

After the World's Fair which ended October 29, 1893, Cornelius Kinsland Billings purchased the building in November, 1893, and moved it to Lake Geneva where he
reassembled it on his summer estate. Billings used the building as a sitting room and card room. William Mitchell acquired the estate in 1907, and his estate sold the property to William Wrigley, Jr., the manufacturer of Wrigley Chewing Gum, in 1910. In 1913, Wrigley converted the building to a movie theater. At this time, he moved the partition which stood near the center of the building (Bigler and Mudrey 1992: 12 [copy of plans]) toward the current west wall. Dahlie purchased the Norway Building from his estate and disassembled it for the third time prior to its move to Little Norway (Bigler and Mudrey 1992: 13, 19, 21, 29, 31-33, 51, 56; Howe 1954 [letter from Philip K. Wrigley to William Schereck, 4/20/54]). At Little Norway, it continues to display collections of Norwegian and Norwegian-American arts and crafts gathered by Isak Dahlie during the 1930s.

M. Thams & Co. crafted the materials for the Norway Building between November, 1892 and early 1893, erected the building in Norway, disassembled it, transported it in March, 1893 and reassembled it at Chicago in May and June, 1893. Hansteen adapted an architectural structure and form strongly associated with Norway's traditional culture to its functions at the fair. In addition to its overt functions as a meeting area and exhibit hall, it was to serve as a symbol of Norway and its culture at the exposition. Although Hansteen designed the exhibit building using the structural, spatial, and decorative concepts of stave church architecture, he did make several concessions to portability and function in addition to specifying smaller dimensions. Rather than using the massive framing timbers common to this type of structure, he bundled the prefabricated, smaller members together to form large timbers which could be moved and assembled at a site removed from the Thams factory at Orkanger near Trondheim, Norway. Since they were not necessary to the function of the building as an exhibit hall, the architect additionally did not include the semi-circular chancel or enclosed ambulatory characteristic of these churches (Bigler and Mudrey 1992: 13-19).

At Little Norway, the building sits along a lower terrace of the north hillside west of the cluster of buildings associated with the Olson farmstead. Overlooking a broad lawn, the building faces south toward the pond and creek at the base of the hill. The two-story building actually contains just a single story. The exterior measurements of its cruciform
shape are 26 by 40 feet. It rests on a foundation composed primarily of ashlar limestone mortared with cement. Red granite blocks which protrude from the vertical plane of the foundation are placed under the pilasters. At least some of these blocks came with the building from Lake Geneva (Howe 1954 [copy of correspondence with Isak Dahl 7/3/54]). The foundation surrounds a full basement which was probably excavated at the time the building was moved to the property in 1935. Unpainted, horizontal pine siding covers the lower portion of the building while vertical pine siding occurs along the gables and area above the lowest roof of the building as well as near its base. A hewn Norwegian pine, timber frame supports the building (Howe 1954 [reference report by Howe, 5/13/54]). A series of constantly diminishing set-backs which also increase dramatically in height emphasize its vertical dimension. Each section carries its own roof so that each elevation presents a vertical series of roof levels. Bugge compared the form of the stave church to a Gothic cathedral translated into wood (Bugge 1953: 7). Placed at the elevation of the front porch roof, the lowest, hip roof projects from the main wall. The upper two roof levels are covered with steep gable roofs. These multiple roofs along with the gabled wall dormers add to the vertical thrust of the building. The highest roof, a cross-gable roof, covers a cupola. Diamond-shaped or dragon scale wood shingles are placed along the roofs. Although the building maintains strict symmetry, the upwardly diminishing series of gables and roofs provides an irregular, Gothic appearance to the building.

Elevations are opened by a single or a series of two to three fixed windows. A majority are round arch windows detailed with wood keystones and flanked by wood pilasters with modified capitals. The square-headed windows at the east and west side elevations are placed immediately below the triple round-arch windows. A major trefoil arch window is centered along the lower portions of these elevations. The main and rear entrances occur across from one another in the centers of the south and north elevations respectively. The main entrance is surrounded by a round arch lintel and engaged columns with capital and base which are elaborated by intricate wood carving executed by an employee of the Thams Company, Peder Kvaale of Orkdal (Bigler and Mudrey 1982: 77). The tail of a serpent intertwined with birds' necks and vines forms the surround of the main entrance. The serpents' heads occur near the base of the capitals along the adjacent carved panel.
Vines climb the engaged columns. The panels of the heavy, round arch wood door are elaborated with a herringbone design. The iron strap hinge continues the floral motif of the adjacent surround. A heavy iron ring-knocker is attached to the lower part of the door. At the rear entrance, a trefoil-arch overlight occurs above the double, heavy wood entrance doors. Partially fluted pilasters and corner blocks elaborate the door surround.

The facade of the Norway Building displays bilateral symmetry. The front entrance area is recessed from the vertical plane of the wall. The projecting gablet extends outward over a centrally-positioned front entrance porch. The porch is composed of the following elements: stout, turned posts; a projecting gable detailed with lattice work and the carved letters "NORWAY;" a scalloped bargeboard, roof cresting, and a dragon motif at the peak of the gablet; a round arched frieze; a closed rail finished with the vertical wood siding similar to that found along the base of the building; and open wood rails along the wood steps. Along the steps, the turned balusters and heavy, square newels finished with acorn ends support a rail with arched frieze. Along the left porch rail is carved the architect's name: "W. Hansteen, Architect/Chra. Norway." The right porch rail includes the builder's identification: "M. Thams & Co.,/Builders./Droneheim, Norway." A projecting gable roof dormer above the porch echoes the gable composition of the porch. This dormer has two sets of paired, round arch windows surrounded by colonettes and separated by a fluted pilaster. The projecting, hip-roofed, lower portion of the facade rests on a poured concrete watertable, and is clad in both vertical and horizontal wood siding. Fluted pilasters detailed with rosettes near their bases define the exterior edges of the building. Fluted pilasters with corner blocks separate the window areas from the remainder of the wall. Paired, round arch windows with engaged columns flank the entrance and are centrally located along their respective walls. The wall above the lower roof is opened by four sets of triple, round arch windows, each with surrounds composed of engaged colonettes.

The rear of the building is composed in a similar manner to the facade. The variations from the facade occur along the centered, rear entrance. Here, the entrance area projects from the vertical plane of the wall as a vestibule. A gablet elaborated in a similar manner to the gablet of the front porch is positioned over the vestibule. Fluted pilasters define the
corners of this vestibule. Four cusp arches occur along either side of the entrance and along the side of the vestibule. Brackets detail the corners of the vestibule. An exterior entrance to the basement extends from the northeast corner west across the north end of the rear elevation. Covered with wood shingles, the lean-to roof of the addition slants downward from the corner under the east window. The side wall of the entrance is finished with clapboards.

The north and south elevations are also composed in a similar fashion. Similar bands of siding occur along these elevations: vertical siding above the concrete wattertable, horizontal siding on the lower walls, and vertical siding on the upper walls. Each side elevation displays a series of gables: a lower gable placed over several tiers of windows; a recessed, upper gable; and the gable of the cupola. The eaves and gables are widely overhung. Dragon motifs placed at the peak of the gables, cresting along the roof ridges, lattice work along the walls under the gables, and bargeboards under the gables ending with a dragon motif, emphasize this stepped effect. Under the lattice work of the upper roof occurs a band of four round arch windows flanked by colonettes. The area under the lower roof includes round-arched triple window groups with surrounds composed of engaged colonettes with capitals. They are placed over three square-headed windows. A major trefoil-arch window is placed beneath this window series. Two heavy, fluted pilasters divide this window group from single round arch windows that parallel the square-headed windows and single four cusp arches parallel the major window. Fluted pilasters also define the corners of the wall. Along the lowest roof, brackets occur along the eaves above the pilasters.

A square cupola sits in the center of the roof ridge. Double or triple round arch windows flanked by colonettes are placed across the base of each side of the cupola. The peaks of its steep, cross-gable roof carry dragon motifs. Roof cresting with a finial in the center further elaborates the east-west ridge of the cupola’s roof. The north-south gable also supports roof cresting and a dragon motif. All four gables are finished with latticework and bargeboards.
Detailing along the Norway Building's exterior includes both the classical and pre-Christian, perhaps Germanic motifs (Lincoln et al. 1978: 13-14) which were used to elaborate the Norwegian stave churches of the twelfth century. The initial development of the stave church coincided with the introduction of Christianity into Norway. They are believed to symbolically represent the exorcism of the pagan demons (found on the exterior of the church) by Norwegian Christianity (the interior). Nationalistic movements beginning in early nineteenth century Norway led by the 1870s to the development of a national artistic style focusing on a period unique to Norway's history, its Viking past. The stave church became one source of inspiration for these artistic elements. The resulting dragon style incorporated such medieval designs as the acanthus, vine, dragon, and other serpent-like motifs (Lincoln et al. 1978: 20; Nelson 1995: 249-53; Kavli n.d.: 21; Anker 1970). This artistic tradition explains at least in part the choice of representing Norway at the Chicago in 1893 by using a stave church, which had become a symbol of Norwegian traditions. Hansteen had participated in the restoration of the Gol Stave Church in the mid-1880s and was thus familiar with their artistic composition (Bigler and Mudrey 1992: 19).

The Norway Building's fire-breathing dragons atop of the gables, the dragon scale shingles, scalloped roof cresting and bargeboards which may represent the dragon's tail, the latticework under the gables, the saddle roof under the dragons and the cupola, and the elaborate wood carvings representing serpents along the front portal, come in part from this pagan symbolism. The trefoil and four cusp arch are associated with Gothic tradition which appears to have played a role in the design of the stave church. The intertwining plant tendrils, however, derive from Christian motifs. Classical architectural elements characteristic of the Christian era include the symmetry, the colonnettes, pilasters, and arcading (Aune, Sack, and Selberg 1983: 99; Bigler and Mudrey 1992: 76-80).

Although Hansteen designed the framing members by bundling smaller members to permit portability, the structure principles employed in the Norway Building follow those of the twelfth century, Norwegian stave church. Stave church construction evolved rapidly between the middle of the tenth and twelfth centuries and remained in use into the fourteenth century.
The spatial arrangement of the twelfth century stave church included the large, rectangular nave which provided room for the congregation who stood during service. Aisles constructed on either side and along the rear of the nave were separated from the nave by columns and extended the width and length of the nave. Reflecting the exterior setbacks, the center portion of the nave was raised considerably higher than the aisles along the sides. The comparatively much smaller chancel which contained the altar and clergy was placed at the east end of the stave church. This end of the church was usually narrower than the nave. It occasionally included a semi-circular apse along the exterior end wall. The basilicas being constructed elsewhere in Europe strongly influenced this spatial arrangement. The twelfth century stave church became the wooden interpretation of this form in Norway. In the Norway Building, the nave is represented by the high center portion while the aisles are contained under the lower roofs. It lacks the chancel at the east end. Instead, the Norway Building includes an aisle along the east side of the nave. And by contrast, the building was divided into two areas: the smaller, west room serving as the office of the Norway commissioner during the 1893 fair and the east room containing the exhibit hall.

The Norway Building incorporated many although not all of the structural elements of the Norwegian stave church. In the twelfth century model, four timber raft beams which rested on a low stone foundation were laid to form a rectangle with their ends extending beyond the mortise joint or meshing notches. This arrangement resembles the number symbol (#). The sill beams are laid horizontally across the ends of this configuration to enclose it in a large rectangle. Attached by a mortise and tenon joint, the vertical, timber columns, the interior staves, were secured along the raft beams which stood between the aisle and the nave. Three to five staves were placed along each side aisle and several stood at the ends of the aisle. The wall plates rested on top of the interior rectangular compartment formed by the staves. Composed of two parallel beams, the wall plates supported the upper roof of the church. The horizontal bressummers joined the staves at right angles to provide lateral support about 4.5 to 6.5 feet below and parallel with the wall plate. Collectively termed arcading, solid, curved wood brackets fit directly below each bressummer, extending with it between each pair of interior staves. Intended to provide
additional horizontal support, St. Andrews crosses also connect each pair of staves and occurred a short distance below the arcing. Two intersecting, carved, wood diagonal members composed the crosses. Both the arcing and St. Andrews crosses are attached to the staves with long wood pegs and wedges driven into the exterior end. To open the nave area, permitting a better view of the chancel, some of the staves were shortened. The short staves rested on a wood arch formed by a pair of brackets within the arcing rather than on the raft beam. The corner stave always remained full length. In later forms of the stave church, every other stave was shortened or all but the corner staves were shortened. Thus, this stave and bracket construction formed the structure of the inner compartment or the nave.

The center compartment supports the steeply pitched roof. Resting on the wall plate at the top of the staves, each set of rafters are secured by a pair of scissor braces which cross underneath the rafters and a horizontal collar beam which attached both to the rafters and the scissor braces. Purlins, a ridge pole, and diagonal braces provided bracing underneath the plane of the roof. Light wood planks were laid on top of this assembly between the ridge and the eaves, and a second layer of roof planks positioned parallel to the roof ridge rested on them. Both were secured with wood pins. Wood shakes were then laid on this surface.

The surrounding aisles supported the lower roofs, giving the center compartment a strong vertical emphasis. The wall plate along the exterior of the aisle was supported by the short, exterior staves. These staves rested on the ground sills placed at the ends of the raft beams. Wood pegs attached the rafters of the aisle roof to each stave. The lower end of the rafter fit into a notch along the wall plate of the exterior aisle wall. The aisle roof planking was placed over purlins along the aisle roof. Also connecting the stave to the wall plate, the lower aisle strut is placed under and at a smaller inclined angle than the rafter. The curved quadrant bracing runs between the aisle struts and the aisle plate. This system of braces provides additional support to the aisle's structure and resists horizontal forces along the nave. The aisle walls were composed of vertical planks inserted into grooves along the ground sill and the aisle wall plate. The individual boards were secured vertically.
by a tongue and groove join or battens. The stave churches, then, rested on a
combination of beams and trusses to provide both vertical and horizontal strength to these
tall buildings (Aune, Sack, and Selberg 1983: 96-104; Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign

In addition to its smaller scale, the stave structure of the Norway Building varies somewhat
from this scheme. As noted, the staves themselves are composed of a bundle or cluster
of four rounded smaller components to permit portability. As in the original construction,
every other or every two staves are shortened. A series of three arches similar in
appearance to the window series rather than the single brackets composes the arcading.
Along the last set of interior staves at the west end of the Norway Building, horizontal wood
paneling closes the area between the outer two staves and replaces the arcading. Where
the interior compartment intersects the recessed entrances in the center of the north and
south walls, windows replace the arcading. Some of the taller, twelfth century stave
churches also placed arcading under as well as over the St. Andrews crosses. In the
Norway Building, curved braces occur between the base of the St. Andrews crosses and
the staves to support the shortened staves. As noted, the chancel is absent from the east
end of the building. The vertical, exterior walls planks along the aisle walls are replaced
with horizontal wood paneling and molded baseboards along the interior and clapboards
along the exterior. Rather than being a single, open space, the Norway Building is divided
into three spaces, the exhibit hall, office at the west end, and a contemporary bathroom in
the northwest corner.

Interior qualities and elements of the Norway Building incorporate an interpretation of
motifs found in the interiors of twelfth century stave churches. The application of a
cresceto finish to the interior of the building was a practice shared by both the Norway
Building and the twelfth century stave churches. Much of the interior elaboration
is achieved by carvings on the structural members in both cases. These elements include
St. Andrews crosses, modified arcading, four-part carved staves columns with their capitals
at the base of the lower brackets, the faces carved at the base or top of the upper portion of
the staves, the arcading of the windows, and the dragon-heads carved at the ends of
the lower brackets along the staves. The traditional stave church carried a single carved face along the stave. Because the staves in the Norway Building bundled four timbers, a pair of similar caricature-like faces believed to represent the kings and queens of Norse sagas were placed along the exposed sides of a pair of staves (Bigler and Mudrey 1992: 77). Along two staves, a member of one pair was interchanged with a member of the other pair. Also, most traditional stave churches did not include carved dragons along the interior of the building. The stave churches were built in the early Christian era, and their symbolism represents the struggle between the forces of Christianity and paganism. The vestiges of paganism were reserved for the exterior. The inclusion of this element as an interior design may relate to the revival of the dragon motif in the late nineteenth century as Norwegians began to explore their cultural and specifically Viking heritage. Also, the Norway Building contains more windows than most stave churches whose interiors were quite dark (Bigler 1992: 77). The additional natural light admitted by the windows was a concession to the building’s function as an exhibit hall. Although contributing to the overall aesthetic appearance of the building, its intricate parquet floor belonged to the 1890s rather than the twelfth century.

A small number of alterations have been made to the building since its location at Little Norway (see Little Norway 1940-77 [file: Norway Building, 1966-67]). In the interior, the wall separating the office from the exhibit hall was moved toward the west wall by one set of staves while the building was located at Lake Geneva and remains in that location. During the 1935 reassembling of the building, all but two pairs of faces were removed from the top of the staves to the base of the short staves. Those along the full staves remain at their original position. An interchange between two pairs of faces also occurred at this time. The excavation of the full cellar in 1935 necessitated the addition of the frame rear entrance at the northeast corner of the building at this time (Bigler 1996; Little Norway 1940-92). Some of the wood detailing along the building has been replaced more than once. Removal of the yellow and brown paint applied at Lake Geneva during Billing’s ownership occurred in 1976 (Mt. Horeb Mail 1976 [7/29: 12]). In 1987-1988, the rotten porch newels and railings were replaced in-kind. The building underwent restoration in 1991-1992. Along the exterior, the expense of replacing the deteriorating diagonal wood
shakes necessitated the use of thinner diagonal wood shingles. Because the color of the original painted details along the shakes had not been reproduced on replacement shakes and could not be reconstructed (Little Norway 1927-91 [file: Little Norway Building General]), these details were not restored in 1992. The exterior red and green dragon heads were replaced in-kind. Those along the cupola were absent prior to the building's relocation to Nissedahle (Bigler and Mudrey 1992: 89). They were also replaced. Woodlife, a wood preservative, was applied to the exterior.

Masonry Bridge (6): Contributing/Original Location

Less permanent, birch footbridges initially crossed the creek. As they deteriorated and all-weather vehicle access to both portions of the property became necessary after it officially opened to the public, these bridges were replaced with log footbridges and a masonry vehicle bridge. The concrete slab, masonry bridge (6) provides vehicle access to the occupant of the sod roof cabin and for property maintenance. The Dahle family probably constructed the bridge in the late 1930s and definitely before 1945 (Mt. Horeb Area Historical Society 1927-60s; Wisconsin Visual and Sound Archives 1927-91, n.d. [ca. 1945]; Bigler n.d.). It sits just north of the small animal shed (4) and south of the sod roof cabin (7). The bridge travels across the creek from southeast to northwest. The concrete slab bridge forms the roadbed and lower portion of the rails of the bridge. Random ashlar limestone forms the solid balustrades. Random rubble limestone also composes the short wing walls which are intended to prevent erosion along the upper portion of the creek's banks. The bridge does not appear to have undergone alteration since its construction.

4 This file includes a translation of the Teknisk UgeBlad/Norwegian Technical Weekly dated 6/1/93 translated by Hans Jacob Hansteen, 1/16/81 and sent to the Art Institute of Chicago.
Wick Co. Storage Building (28): Noncontributing/Original Location

The Wick Co. storage building was erected by Buechler Construction in 1979 to accommodate additional machinery and object storage and provide additional shop space (Winner, S. 1986; Little Norway 1940-92: 27). Because its construction post-dates the period of significance, the Wick building is considered a noncontributing building. It stands adjacent to a cluster of service buildings along the south edge of a clearing west of the Norway Building (23) and south of the machine shed (28). Measuring 24.5' by 54.5', the rectangular, balloon frame and metal-sided building is placed on a concrete slab and is covered with a gently pitched gable roof. The building contains no subdivisions but includes several storage lofts for large historical objects. The interior is unfinished. The building does not appear to have undergone alterations since its construction.

Property Alterations

During the period between 1927 and 1935 shortly after Isak Dahle acquired the Olson farmstead, the property and its buildings underwent major alterations to accommodate Dahle’s vision of a family retreat and a Norwegian farmstead dedicated to the celebration of his Norwegian-American heritage. But, Dahle’s vision was not intended as an accurate restoration. His treatment was an interpretation of a concept just emerging in the United States at such properties as Greenfield Village and for the most part belonged to the future. The property was intended to recognize his cultural heritage. Dahle created in the landscape and buildings of the valley he named Little Norway a composite rustic scene idealized from the Norwegian and southern Wisconsin landscapes.

The original farmstead buildings and those erected under the direction of Isak Dahle which
were extant by 1936 have for the most part undergone relatively little significant change since that date. In 1957 when the building was moved a short distance, the granary or cabin (2) lost the chimney added during the building’s renovation. Some of therotting logs along the base of the pony shed (4) were replaced in-kind in 1993. The first or south section of the sod roof cabin (7) gained one of its two additions in 1947 during the period of significance prior to 1959. Erected using similar materials, the north wing was constructed in 1960-62. Except for the interior remodeling of bathroom facilities and the addition of a wood patio between the rear elevation and the hillside, this building has undergone no additional alteration. One tool shed (8) was moved from a position northeast of the adjacent of the main cabin (10) to a location northeast of the sod roof cabin sometime during the period of significance. Its corners may have been reinforced with corner boards. In the main cabin (10), boxcar siding replaced the deteriorating wall board in 1936. Except for some of the stonework along the bank adjacent to the building, the Olson house (18) has undergone little alteration. The summer kitchen/woodshed or caretaker’s cabin (21) received its rear addition in 1940 during the period of significance. Renovation of the Norway Building (23) since 1936 has almost wholly involved replacement of deteriorated or missing elements in-kind. The exterior, rear entrance was added at the time of its move to the property. Insufficient evidence did not allow reproduction of the highlighting along the roof shingles during the 1992 restoration. Although the hunting lodge has undergone considerable deterioration since 1936, it has not been altered.

The Dahle family periodically added buildings and structures to accommodate the dual purpose of the property between the late 1940s and 1959, the end-date of significance. These resources are in the style of the original buildings; function as small, inconspicuous outbuildings; and/or possess architectural significance of their own. The entrance building (1), woodshed (22), lumber lean-to (24), book building (25), and garden building (26) have not undergone alteration. The pheasant and peacock house was moved, placed on piles, and reinterpreted as a stabbur (16) in the early 1950s. The function of the pump house (19) has been altered to that of a tool shed, but its exterior appearance remains the same. One entrance door along the machine shed (28) was widened. Not only is the picnic
shelter quite intact, but the building represents a late example of the Rustic Style. The Hobson house (3) stands as an example of the minimal traditional design of the Modern Movement in architecture. Modification has been limited to the remodeling of the north basement rooms and the enclosure of the adjacent porch.

Most of the buildings constructed after the end-date of significance are either inconspicuous because of size, materials, and/or location. The property is large enough that with three exceptions they are not overly visible. The large garage (22) and latrine building (23) which are placed near the entrance and the Wick Co. storage building (28) near the Norway Building do intrude into the setting. However, the remainder, the two canopies (5, 12), a tool shed (9), privy (12), stabbur (17), gasoline building (19), and entrance canopy (24), have limited visual impact on the setting.

The idyllic setting has inevitably altered. Trees and shrubs have grown, covering the once sparsely planted hillaides and providing timber for the construction of some of the later buildings. The pond near the Hobson house was drained. Fragile birch timber footbridges were replaced with those of more durable timber and dimension lumber. More permanent walks were constructed, and additional retaining walls and associated steps were built to accommodate the visitation at the property. Yet, these modifications are extensions of the existing setting with concessions to public use and safety.

Thus, alterations to the property after the period of significance, 1959, are, for the most part, inconspicuous. Because of the placement of these buildings and/or their neutral materials and the large size of the property, alterations generally do not disrupt the view of the idyllic scene created by Dahle to celebrate the Norwegian-American heritage.
8. Significance

Significance Statement

Little Norway gains significance under National Register criterion A in the area of European ethnic heritage and within the Wisconsin settlement theme, the topic of Norwegian settlement. Purchased just two years after the centennial celebration of the first recognized Norwegian immigration to America in 1825 (Lovoll 1984: 7), the property represents a celebration of Norwegian-American heritage. This property and the Norwegian-American ethnic organizations and movements were emerging in the early twentieth century. This trend was a response by second and later generations of this ethnic group to the loss of their cultural identity as they became absorbed into the fabric of American life. The property was also developed at a time when Americans had begun to celebrate their past through the collection and interpretation of material culture. The first major American outdoor museums began to appear during the 1920s.

The period of significance occurs between 1927 and 1959. The beginning date of 1927 represents the initial year of the renovation of the Osten Olson Haugen farmstead (Sigler and Mudrey 1992: 42, 46-48; Dahle 1928-29). The property's end-date of 1959 closes the period of construction at the property in a manner sympathetic to the existing buildings. Since this date is less than fifty years the district must therefore gain significance under criterion exception G. After the death of Isak Dahle in 1937, the Dahle family continued to gradually develop the historic site within the same thematic framework established by its founder. The primary purpose of Little Norway has remained the celebration of Norwegian-American heritage. Buildings erected at the site between 1946 and 1959 were built in a size, material, and design that is compatible with those which pre-date 1948. The specific end-date of 1959 also represents the construction date of an important architectural component of the property, the Asher Hobson House (Nerdrum 1956; date block; Winner, M. 1996; Little Norway 1940-92 [1956-59]). Its design appropriately incorporates references to past stylistic elements, a trend characteristic of contemporary European rather than American architectural treatments in the late 1950s. The buildings
which post-date 1959 generally do not parallel the use of natural materials and the theme of the overall property and are therefore viewed as noncontributing.

The four moved properties achieve significance under criterion exception B. All four relocated properties were moved prior to the end-date of the period of significance. Three of the moved properties were relocated within the boundaries of the district. The Norway Building represents one of the few surviving buildings from the 1899 Columbian Exposition, contributes considerably to the Norwegian character of the property, and gains significance after its arrival at Little Norway.

Little Norway is located in a broad area of Norwegian settlement in south, central Wisconsin. Its conception grew from Isak Dahle’s awareness of his Norwegian-American heritage gained as a member of this cultural subgroup. From this perspective, Little Norway represents an expression of this subgroup at the local level.

Historical Background of Little Norway

Isak Dahle, founder of Little Norway, was raised in Mt. Vernon and Mt. Horeb, Dane County, Wisconsin. The pockets of Norwegian-America settlement in this area maintained strong ties with its cultural heritage into the early decades of the twentieth century. This clear cultural identity as well as his strong family ties heavily shaped the manner in which Dahle developed Little Norway.

With the exception of the Irish, no other European country contributed as high a percentage of its population to American immigration as Norway. Between 1825, the first documented arrival, and 1915, a total 750,000 Norwegians came to the United States. Norwegians left primarily for economic reasons. They began to immigrate in significant numbers after 1840, and their arrival rose sharply between 1866 and 1873. Initial settlement in the Midwest began in 1825 along the Fox Valley in northcentral Illinois. In Wisconsin, the Muskego settlement in Waukesha county became a major, early location
for this immigrant group by 1838. The focus of settlement shifted from Muskego to Koshkonong in east Dane County by 1840. By 1850, Koshkonong and areas in Jefferson and Rock counties had become an important point from which Norwegian settlement moved to the west and north. Beginning in 1838-1840, settlement from mines at Galena, Illinois and from the Rock County area also expanded into southcentral Wisconsin across a forty mile area adjacent to Grant in Lafayette County and Black Earth in Dane County. The north settlement in this larger area occurred adjacent to Mt. Horeb, Blue Mounds, and Black Earth in west Dane County. This area served as a later focus of settlement which spread from Dane and Crawford counties north to Barron and Polk counties. Tightly knit Norwegian rural communities located along one or two valleys characterized the 1850-65 settlement. By 1860, nearly one-half of the Norwegian immigrants in the United States had located in Wisconsin, a total of 44,000 individuals. The influx of Norwegian settlers continued at a high level until 1900 except for periods of economic depression between 1873 and 1879 and in the early 1890s. By 1900, 25% of the Norwegian population in the United States continued to live in Wisconsin (Fepso 1977: 38-39; Lovoll 1984: 7-8; Legreid 1986 [5]: 1-4).

In June, 1855, Bernhard Linzing patented the SE1/4 of the NW1/4 of section 4, township 6 north, range 6 east in the Town of Blue Mounds. This area is the portion of the property on which most of the buildings at Little Norway are located. A map of 1861 indicates his ownership but does not show a dwelling within the quarter section. Since William Lange acquired title to the property through a tax deed in January, 1860, Linzing may have never settled there. For the period of his ownership, tax records indicate no improvement to the property by comparison to others which surrounded it.

In March, 1866, Lange sold the 40 acres to Osten Olson Hangen and his wife, Bergrit, both immigrants from Tinn, Telemarken, Norway. The Oisons had emigrated from Norway in 1861. They initially settled in the Town of Springdale, Dane County and lived briefly in Iowa before buying the Little Norway property. In 1865 and 1867, Olson's personal property is listed as being in section 35 of township 6 north, range 6 east rather than section 4. But, by 1868 it is recorded in section 4, and 1867-1868 is probably the date of
actual settlement on the property. An 1873 map illustrates a dwelling, presumably the Olson House (18), in the approximate position of Little Norway. As indicated, the form of this dwelling suggests that it was erected one or two years after initial settlement, ca. 1868-1869. Olson was farming the property by 1870. By 1880, about one-half of the tract was improved as pasture or fields. By this period, Olson pursued a mixed livestock and grain agriculture. He raised a small number of milk cows, cattle, sheep, swine, and chickens, and hay, potatoes, corn, and oats. Corresponding buildings sheltered these animals within the farmstead. This small dairy farm supported a family of six which included four children, Julia Tolland, Amelia Opsal, Carrie Thompson, and Lena Olson (Bigler n.d.; Dane County Title Company 1855-78; Mt. Horeb Times 1920 [11/26]; Ligowski 1861; Harrison and Warner 1873: 25; C.M. Foote & Co. 1890: 40; Gay 1899: 15; U.S. Bureau of the Census 1870-1910 [population, 1880, 1900, 1920; agriculture, 1870, 1880]; Dane County Treasurer 1855-68).

At the death of Osten Olson Haugen in November, 1905, the 40-acre farmstead was left to Bergit Olson for her lifetime and was then to be divided between their four daughters. Lena Olson served as trustee of the property in this period. Bergit Olson managed the farm with the assistance of her daughter, Lena, and brother-in-law listed as Helleck Olson. Helleck immigrated from Norway in 1872, spoke only Norwegian, and worked as a laborer. He appears only in the 1910 population census as a member of the household. In 1908, Bergit Olson purchased the SW1/4 of the NW1/4 of section 4, the location of the hunting lodge (30). This property remained in her ownership and in her estate through 1927. By 1904, Carrie and her husband, Theodore Thompson, farmed in Dane County, and may have occupied this adjacent farmstead (Mt. Horeb Mail 1935 [8/6]). In 1920, Bergit and Lena remained in the household. After her death in November, 1920, the farm, now the south half of the northeast quarter of section 4, was divided among the four heirs. Julia Tolland and Amelia Opsal sold their portion to Lena Olson in May, 1921. Lena Olson died in June, 1927. The heirs of Lena Olson sold the 80 acre farm, which had remained unoccupied since about 1921, to Isak Daale on June 1, 1927 (Bigler n.d.; Dane County Title Company 1855-78; Mt. Horeb Times 1920 [11/26]; U.S. Bureau of the Census 1870-1910 [population, 1880, 1900, 1910, 1920]; Cantwell Printing Company 1911; Kenyon
Born in 1883, Isak James Dahle resided in Mt. Vernon, seven miles southwest of Mt. Horeb, Wisconsin, until 1887. His grandfather, Onun B. Dahle, emigrated from Nissedal, Telemark, in southern Norway in 1848. He lived primarily in the Koshkonong area until he opened a mercantile store in what became Daleyville in 1855. Isak's parents, Herman B. and Anne Marie Kittleson Dahle, operated a mercantile store in Mt. Vernon. In 1887, Herman B. Dahle and his brother, J. Theodore Dahle, built and began the operation of the Dahle Brothers Store, now Dick's Grocery, at 201 E. Main Street in Mt. Horeb. Until the turn of the century, Mt. Horeb was predominately a Norwegian community. In 1907, Herman Dahle erected a Georgian Revival dwelling at 200 North Second Street in Mt. Horeb. Isak Dahle received his degree from the University of Wisconsin in 1904. After working for a Minnesota flour company for three years, he entered the life insurance business in Milwaukee. Beginning in 1923, he worked as an insurance salesman for Equitable Life Insurance Company in Chicago. By the 1920s, Dahle had become a wealthy businessman. Isak Dahle belonged to a number of Norwegian-American organizations including the American Scandinavian Foundation, the Norwegian-American Society, the Chicago Norske Klub, Adventurers Club, and Memorial of Lief Erikson in America. In January, 1928, Isak and his mother, Anne Marie Dahle, toured Norway, an event which inspired him to purchase the Olson farmstead in June, 1927. Isak Dahle visited the Olson property with his brother Otto in January, 1927. He died in November, 1937 (Mt. Horeb Historical Society 1986: 18, 22; Little Norway 1927-1991 [file: Onun Dahle, Little Norway Buildings-General, Dahle Family Genealogy]; Bigler and Mudrey 1992: 37-38, 48; Winner, M. 1996; Mt. Horeb Area Historical Society n.d. [Dahle-Kittleson genealogy]; Bigler and Mudrey 1992: 38, 46-47).

Isak Dahle was thoroughly familiar with the rural areas adjacent to Mt. Horeb. In the 1890s, his grandfather, Onun Dahle, held a mortgage to the west 40 acres which Bergit Olson purchased in 1908 (Dane County Title Company 1855-1978). Isak Dahle and his brothers had hiked and fished in the area in their youth (Bigler and Mudrey 1992: 46). Dahle was thus raised in a Norwegian-American family and spent his early life in
visitors during the family's absence. The purchase of the Norway Building increased the property's public popularity. Perhaps influenced by the opening of contemporary outdoor museums, Isaac Dahle's vision for the property had expanded to incorporate both its use as a retreat and its role in the preservation of objects, buildings, and landscapes related to his Norwegian heritage which should be enjoyed by a broader public. The property opened to the public summer of 1937 (Bigler 1987; Mt. Horeb Area Historical Society n.d.; Little Norway 1927-91 [file: Little Norway Buildings, General]).

Brought to the property in 1935, the Norway Building (23) provided exhibit space for collections representing important Norwegians and Norwegian-Americans. And, the design of the stave building immensely enhanced the Norwegian character of the property (Bigler n.d.; Bigler and Mudrey 1992: 51-53).

The Norway Building was originally constructed under commission to the Norwegian government as an exhibition building for the 1893 Columbian Exposition in Chicago. This exposition was the second American and fifteenth world exposition. The scope of the international exposition was considerably greater than its predecessors which had included primarily if not exclusively western European and North American countries. It was intended to be an extravagant celebration of the world's industrial, technical, and artistic advancements in the late nineteenth century. The exposition marked America's rapid transition from a rural, agricultural to an urban, industrial nation whose directions now had considerable political and economic impact on other nations. It thus highlighted "...America's coming of age..." (Burg 1976: xxi) among the industrial nations of the world.

Planning for the exhibit, which coincided with the 400th anniversary of Columbus's voyage, began in 1889. The United State Congress passed the legislation necessary to hold and support the world's fair in 1888. A joint resolution selected Chicago as the host of the exposition in February, 1890, and President Harrison approved this resolution in April, 1890. By June, 1890, the 1037-acre property in Jackson Park along Lake Michigan and six miles from downtown Chicago was chosen. Rather than the park setting created for earlier expositions, the scale of the Columbian Exposition resembled a small city. The
organization of the fair was guided by an umbrella organization known as the World's Columbian Exposition Corporation which created committees to oversee various aspects of its development.

Eventually, 51 foreign nations and 39 colonies participated in the exposition. President Harrison issued an invitation to foreign nations to attend the exposition in January, 1891, the date when construction at the exhibit site began. Although most countries responded to the invitation relatively quickly, they remained unable to proceed until the Exposition Corporation created the necessary organization, the Department of Foreign Affairs, formed on July 5, 1891. This agency did not become operative until September, 1891. At the exposition, states and some of the participating nations erected their own exhibit halls which contained displays of the arts, trade goods, examples of scientific advancements, and industrial achievements. The exhibit halls were to be erected using a form, design, and craftsmanship characteristic of each nation. These and other countries also placed exhibits in the fourteen main exhibit halls erected by the American government along the midway. The exposition remained open between May 1 and October 29, 1893 (Bigler and Mudrey 1992: 7-10; Campbell 1894 [1]: 166; Burg 1976: xii-xv, 75, 84; Bolotin and Laing 1992: 2, 8, 11, 14).

The Norwegian government formed an official committee to plan its exhibit at the Columbian Exposition in May, 1892. The building stood with the eighteen other foreign pavilions in the northeast end of Jackson Park north of North Pond between the Ceylon and German buildings. Without sufficient time or ground at the exposition to construct a hall large enough to display its exhibits, the committee elected to build a meeting hall for Norwegian visitors and an office for its commissioner.

The pavilion's form was to be based on a twelfth-century Norwegian stave church, one considered distinctively Norwegian at the time of its construction. With the end of Denmark's 400 year domination of Norway in 1814 came a revival of national pride in Norway as the nation began to expand economically toward the middle of the nineteenth century. Erected prior to this long period of domination, the stave churches were closely
associated with the early Norwegian Viking culture which pre-dated Danish domination. Because the Nordic culture had also undergone a period of rapid social and economic development and florescence beginning with the rule of Harold I in 872 A.D. into the thirteenth century, it served as a logical period on which to focus a revival of Norwegian nationalism. The remaining stave churches were first recorded and brought to the public's attention in 1836-37 by Johan Christian Dahl, an early Norwegian Romantic painter. In 1844, the Society for the Preservation of Ancient Monuments in Norway was founded to preserve the remaining churches. It is estimated that the Norwegians erected 500 to 600 stave churches between the tenth and twelfth centuries. By 1800, about one hundred remained standing.

The motifs found on the portals and other areas of the exterior of the stave church as well as Viking ships, finds in Viking burials, and designs in the surviving rural folk art such as the dragon, snake, fanciful animals, and acanthus leaf became symbols of Norwegian independence in the nineteenth century. By the mid-1870s, these motifs were incorporated into what became known as the dragon style, which was a free interpretation of the plastic medieval art form. The stave church became a form which was viewed as typically Norwegian, and new building designs began to incorporate elements from this architecture. Hence, the stave church design chosen by the government committee was closely associated with Norwegian national identity in the late nineteenth century (Aune, Sack, and Selberg 1983: 105; Lincoln [editor] 1978: 13-20, 22, 175; Nelson 1995: 249-253; Bigler and Mudrey 1992: 73-74; Ellassen 1950: 12).

The government committee requested quotations and initial plans from companies who exported prefabricated, frame buildings. In November, 1892, it selected drawings submitted by Albert Waldemar Hansteen, who was associated with M. Thams and Company. The company erected the building at its factory in Orkanger near Trondheim between November, 1892, the date of the contract, and February, 1893. Wilhelm A. Thams established the company in 1867 and erected its planing mill and crate factory in 1869. In 1872, after rebuilding his mill to produce crates on a large scale, Thams turned the business over to his son, Maurentius Thams. Thams's grandson, Christian Thams was
trained as an architect at the Polytechnikum in Zurich, Switzerland, and established an office in Nice, France, during the 1880s. He developed designs for the construction of earthquake-resistant buildings after the earthquake in Nice, France in 1888. These portable buildings were manufactured in the Orkanger factory. C. Thams also designed the exhibit at the World’s Fair in Paris in 1889. He took over the operation of M. Thams and Company with his brother in 1893 and expanded the Orkanger factory so that it became Norway’s largest manufacturer of wood products in the 1889s period. Thus, M. Thams and Company was a logical choice for the production of the exposition building at the Columbian Exposition.

Albert Waldemar Hansteen who submitted the initial drawings of the Norway Building for M. Thams and Company received training at the Von Hannes School for Architects and Cement Work between 1875 and 1877. He later studied with Wilhelm Hase in the late 1870s. By 1884, he had established a practice as an architect in Skien, Norway, and served as headmaster of the evening technical school in Skien and Oslo. Hansteen eventually designed large architectural projects including churches and government and institutional buildings. As well as maintaining his own practice, he worked as an assistant architect to Christian Thams. He functioned as the lead architect during the restoration of the Gol Stave Church when it was moved in 1884 to the Royal Estate at Bygdøy, now the Norsk Folk Museum. During the project, Hansteen had examined other stave churches such as the Borgund stave church. The elements selected in the design for the Norway Building indicate his familiarity with these two examples.

On March 15, 1893, after the dedication of the Norway Building in Norway, it was disassembled and shipped to the United States with the Danish Pavilion on the Hekla. Arriving late, in mid-April, Thams and Co. did not complete the assemblage of the pavilion for the opening of fair, but it was standing by May 17 when Norway celebrated its national day, Syttende Mai, at the fair. It was fully open by mid-June. The Norwegian Commission occupied about one-third of the building. A partition separated this office from the public area which composed the remainder. This area exhibited only pictorial materials along the walls. Rather than furnishing the building with furniture reminiscent of the Norwegian past,
the hurried preparations required the purchase of American furniture. The remainder of the Norwegian exhibits were placed in the Women's, Arts, and Fisheries buildings. However, because of its exterior ornamentation which was likened by contemporaries to those which adorned Viking ships, the building gained recognition as one of the more distinctive pavilions at the exposition (Bigler and Mudrey 1992: 11-14, 19, 21-25, 74-75; Campbell 1894 [2]: 330, 613; Howe 1954; Burg 1976: 81, 84, 212; Bolotin and Laing 1992: 21; Little Norway 1927-91 [files: Thams, Christian-Thams and Company; Hansieen, Waldemar]).

After the exposition closed on October 29, 1893, most of its buildings were removed over a period of two and a half years. Many of the state and national pavilions at Jackson Park were sold at public auction and eventually dismantled or burned in a fire which occurred several months after the closing of the fair. By November 30, 1893, Cornelius Kinsland Garrison Billings, a member of the Board of Directors of the exposition since 1890, purchased the Norway Building through a closed bid for $1500. He had the building disassembled and moved to his summer property along the north shore of Lake Geneva in Wisconsin near the Illinois border. Lake Geneva had become a resort area for wealthy Chicago residents. Of Norwegian heritage, Billings had become president of the People's Gas Light and Coke Company of Chicago in 1887 and maintained a reputation as "Chicago's millionaire sportsmen" (Lake Geneva Historical Society 1976 [1]: 41). He had purchased the estate along the north side of Lake Geneva and began to remodel and expand its buildings in 1892. Shipping the building to Lake Geneva by train in February, 1894, Billings placed the Norway Building on a low rise east of the main house. During its ownership, its two rooms were used for family recreation. The smaller room functioned as a card room and the larger one contained Norwegian furniture.

When Billings moved to Santa Barbara in early 1907, he sold the estate to William H. Mitchell, a Chicago banker. The estate remained his summer home until his death in March, 1910. His son, John J. Mitchell had purchased the Ceylon Building and placed it along the south shore of the lake. The Norway Building's new owner, William Wrigley, Jr., had established a Chicago soap company in 1891 and by 1911 began the manufacture of chewing gum on a commercial level. The estate became Wrigley's summer home and
stock farm. Between 1911, the beginning date of the family's occupancy, and 1913, the Norway Building was not used. In 1913, Wrigley remodeled the building into a motion picture theater. At this date, the building received its yellow and brown paint. The partition was moved to its current location from a location nearer the center of the building to hide the projection equipment. A small stage and screen which were later removed was placed at opposite end or what is currently the east end of the building. After William Wrigley's death in 1932, his wife Ada continued to use the Lake Geneva property as a summer residence until her death in 1947. By 1932, the building had begun to deteriorate, and the family sought an organization to purchase, move, and renovate the building. With the exception of the Norway Building, the estate remained in the Wrigley family. Known as Green Gables, the dwelling was removed in 1965 (Bigler and Mudrey 1992: 25, 29-34; Howe 1954 [letter to William J. Schereck from Philip Wrigley, 4/20/54]; Burg 1976: 288; Lake Geneva Historical Society 1976 [1]: 39-41; Bolotin and Laing 1992: 154).

Isak Dahle began to examine the possibility of acquiring the Norway Building in July, 1933 and completed the purchase from the Wrigley Estate in July, 1935. Dahle's deep interest in the building stemmed from its association with Norway and hence with his own Norwegian heritage. This model of the twelfth century stave church had been chosen by Norway as an architecture appropriate to represent the country's traditions. In his contract with the Wrigley estate, the estate paid up to $700 to dismantle the building, and Isak Dahle supported its transportation to Little Norway and its rebuilding and renovation. The agreement included any of the existing granite foundation stones desired and the Norwegian furnishings, which had been placed in the building after its move to Lake Geneva. Dahle was to add the building to his historical collection at Little Norway. The relocation and reassembly of the building was completed by W.E. Stone, a building contractor from Whitewater. During its reassembly at Little Norway, Dahle noted that the exterior of the building had become badly deteriorated, and it underwent some measure of restoration. This problem delayed the completion of its erection at Little Norway until at least October, 1935 (Howe 1954 [correspondence between Isak Dahle and W.E. Stone, 10/7/33; Isak Dahle and Philip Wrigley, 7/1/35, 7/3/35, 9/25/35]; Bigler and Mudrey 1992: 35, 51).
## Appendix C: Maine State Building National Register Nomination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>Maine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>Androscoggin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Name (Common)

Maine State Building

### 2. Location

- **Streets and Names:**
  - Poland Spring
  - Poland

- **Congressional District:**
  - Maine

### 3. Classification

#### Category (Check One)

- Building
- Structure
- Object

#### Ownership

- Public
- Private

#### Status

- In Process
- Being Considered

#### Accessible to the Public

- Restricted
- Unrestricted

#### Present Use

- Commercial
- Industrial
- Private Residence

#### Year

- 001

### 4. Owner of Property

- Owners Name: Hiram Nicker & Sons, Inc., Saul Feldman, President and Owner

### 5. Location of Legal Description

#### Courthouse, Registry of Deeds, Etc.

- Androscoggin County Registry of Deeds

#### City or Town

- Auburn
- Maine

### 6. Representation in Existing Surveys

- Style of Survey: None

- Date of Survey: None

- Place Search for Survey Records: None

#### City or Town

- Auburn
- Maine
**DESCRIPTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>(Check One)</th>
<th>Unaltered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe the present and original (if known) physical appearance.

The Maine State Building from the Columbian Exposition in Chicago now stands on the grounds of the famed Poland Spring House summer resort. Designed in 1891 by Charles S. Frost, the pavilion is a decorative example of the Queen Anne style.

The building is octagonal. It has a gray granite foundation and first storey which are executed in rough stone. Like the other materials in the structure, the granite is native to Maine. It came from several quarries and was treated in different ways to exhibit how it could be dressed. The first storey facade is approached by a short, broad finished granite stairway. Across the front is a series of three pointed arches supported by two freestanding columns in center and a semi-detached column at either side. The columns have gray granite bases, polished pink granite shafts, and ornamental carved gray granite capitals. Beyond the arched columns are an open loggia. The wall behind the loggia is divided into five bays, all of which display richly paneled wood. The central bay has a double entrance door with sidelights. On either side is an arched plaque giving the building’s history and at either end is a window enframed in paneled wood.

The two granite walls at either side of the facade are identical. The base is made of cobblestones, while the remainder of the wall is comprised of rough granite blocks. Into each of these walls is set four identical windows, each having a large rectangular section at the bottom and a small rectangular section at the top divided by a course of granite.

Beyond the two walls immediately at either side of the facade are two walls which contain side entrances. Each entrance has a central doorway with a semi-detached column and a larger rectangular window on either side. Above the door and each of the two windows is a small rectangular window. The two walls beyond the side entrances are identical to that at either side of the facade. The rear wall is identical to the side entrance walls.

The second story of the Maine Building is constructed of wood. The facade and sections over the side and rear entrances are comprised of large projecting open porches with a series of windows on the back wall of each. The porch balconies are ornamented with decorative carved panels. The central panel on the facade bears the name “Maine”, while the other panels display a diamond design surrounded by foliage. At each of the four corners of the building is a projecting wooden turret which is part of both the second and third stories. Each turret has two windows on the second story and three on the third. The turrets also share the characteristic of being ornamented with bands of wooden paneled, some of which have a half timbered effect found in Queen Anne style architecture. The turrets have cone shaped roofs which are slate covered.

The third story is contained within the large slate covered octagonal.

(See Continuation Sheet)
7. DESCRIPTION

roof. A dormer window is found on the front, side and rear sections of the roof, while the corner sections contain large glass skylights. At the peak of the roof is a small wooden octagonal tower supported by brackets and open on all sides. Its slate covered octagonal roof ends in a peak with a flag pole.

The interior of the Maine Building is centrally planned with an open octagonal rotunda which extends from the first to the third floors. On the first floor, entrance halls come from the front, sides, and rear of the building, while reading and reception rooms are located at the corners. The space on the second floor is open and was used at the World's Fair for displays about Maine. The space on the third floor is also open and functioned as an art gallery with an elaborate glass ceiling lighted by the skylights in the roof. Highly ornamental Colonial Revival woodwork is found throughout the building.

The Maine State Building is a rare surviving example of a pavilion from one of the great nineteenth century expositions. Its unusual design and its rich materials suggested that it be preserved in the 1890's, and it has been treasured in the ensuing decades.
### SIGNIFICANCE

**PERIOD**
- Pre-Columbian
- 16th Century
- 18th Century
- 20th Century

**SPECIFIC DATE**
- 1893: Novated, reconstructed 1895.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>Check One or More as Appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Religion/Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Musical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE**

In 1893, an International Exposition was opened in Chicago to celebrate the 400th anniversary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus. Maine's response to the Columbian Exposition was an irregularly shaped Queen Anne type structure, the shape of which was dictated by the irregular lot assigned to it on the far eastern end of the exposition.

The architect chosen for the building was a Lewiston, Maine native by the name of Charles Sumner Frost who had achieved a national reputation for his buildings in Chicago.

When its role as the Maine Exposition building had ended it was decided that it would be an advantage to the granite and slate industries of Maine to donate the building as a permanent fixture to the city of Chicago. The Park Commission subsequently informed the Maine representatives that all buildings in that section of the park were to be removed.

At this point several parties made offers to purchase the building. The committee considered all proposals and decided to sell the building to William Ricker and Sons who were the owners of the celebrated Poland Spring summer resort at Poland Springs, Maine. The Rickers paid $30,000 for the building and it cost them approximately $5,000 to move it to Poland Springs. A sixteen car train was hired and the building was loaded piece by piece. It was finally reconstructed in front of an oak grove beside the Grand Hotel at Poland Spring. On July 1, 1895, the building was dedicated as a library and arts building and thereafter advertised as an additional attraction to this famous watering place of the turn of the century leisure class.

The building stands empty today although still in its original condition. With the great Poland Spring House and the rolling hills of Androscoggin County as a background, the Maine State Building is a rare survivor because it was brought back to Maine for a second life as a cultural center for those who took the waters at Poland Spring. It is ironic that its second career would be cut short by the technological advance it was built to commemorate, for the development of the automobile would eventually spell the doom of Poland Springs itself.

Poland Spring, Centennial Souvenir, 1895.

10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORNER</th>
<th>LATITUDE DEGREES MINUTES SECONDS</th>
<th>LONGITUDE DEGREES MINUTES SECONDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>44° 01' 38&quot;</td>
<td>70° 21' 44&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>44° 01' 38&quot;</td>
<td>70° 21' 44&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>44° 01' 38&quot;</td>
<td>70° 21' 44&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>44° 01' 38&quot;</td>
<td>70° 21' 44&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPROXIMATE ACREAGE OF NOMINATED PROPERTY: One acre
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Appendix D: Norway Building Photographs

Figure 2: The Norway Building on the William Wrigley Jr. property, c. 1933. Notice the addition of lattice portico, while the building received a yellow ochre and brown paint job, c. 1933. Source: Brian J. Bigler and Lynn Martinson Mudrey, *The Norway Building of the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair: A Building’s Journey from Norway to America: An Architectural Legacy* (1992), 35.
Figure 3: Reconstruction of the Norway Building at Little Norway in Mount Horeb, Wisconsin. Source: Brian J. Bigler and Lynn Martinson Mudrey, The Norway Building of the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair: A Building’s Journey from Norway to America: An Architectural Legacy (1992), 54.
Figure 5: The Norway Building reconstruction at Little Norway, Mount Horeb, Wisconsin, 1935.
Figure 6: Crown Prince Harold of Norway (left) with Professor Hobson during the leader’s visit to Little Norway, October 3, 1965. Source: Brian J. Bigler and Lynn Martinson Mudrey, The Norway Building of the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair: A Building’s Journey from Norway to America: An Architectural Legacy (1992), 68.
Figure 7: The Norway Building’s front entrance with intricate carvings. Source: Brian J. Bigler and Lynn Martinson Mudrey, The Norway Building of the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair: A Building’s Journey from Norway to America: An Architectural Legacy (1992), 81.
Figure 8: One of the seventeen pairs of carved faces, found on the interior stave capitals, representing Norse kings and queens, c. 1990. Source: Brian J. Bigler and Lynn Martinson Mudrey, *The Norway Building of the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair: A Building’s Journey from Norway to America: An Architectural Legacy* (1992), 79.
Figure 9: The scissor-bracing which makes up the Norway Building’s roof construction. Also, the nave posts connect the roof to the staves, c. 1990. Source: Brian J. Bigler and Lynn Martinson Mudrey, The Norway Building of the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair: A Building’s Journey from Norway to America: An Architectural Legacy (1992), 78.
Figure 12: The Norway Building after restorations were complete. This focused on returning the structure to its 1893 appearance, such as restoring the dragon-scale shingles and decorative details, along with returning the dragon ornaments on the roof peaks. Source: Brian J. Bigler and Lynn Martinson Mudrey, *The Norway Building of the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair: A Building’s Journey from Norway to America: An Architectural Legacy* (1992), 84.
Figure 13: The Norway Building in its current location and condition. Source: Photography by Kayte Chadburn, August 2, 2008.
Figure 14: A view of the central tower and dragon-scale shingles. Source: Photography by Kayte Chadbourn, August 2, 2008.
Figure 15: A detail of the exterior front porch leading to the entrance of the Norway Building. Source: Photography by Kayte Chadbourn, August 2, 2008.
Figure 16: A side elevation of the Norway Building. Source: Photography by Kayte Chadbourn, August 2, 2008.
Figure 17: Interior view of the Norway Building’s nave with clerestory windows and St. Andrew’s crosses. Source: Photography by Kayte Chadbourn, August 2, 2008.
Figure 18: A detail of the original parquet floor inside the Norway Building. Source: Photography by Kayte Chadbourn, August 2, 2008.
Figure 19: An example of the labeling still existing used for the deconstruction and reconstruction of the Norway Building, found on an interior ceiling beam. Source: Photography by Kayte Chadbourn, August 2, 2008.
Appendix E: Maine State Building Photographs

Figure 1: Construction of the Maine State building at the Chicago site, 1892-1893. Source: Poland Spring Preservation Society archives.
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Figure 3: The Maine State building. Source: New England Magazine 10 (May 1894), pg 295.
Figure 4: First floor plan of Maine State building. Source: Poland Spring Preservation Society archives.
Figure 5: Second floor plan of Maine State building. Source: Poland Spring Preservation Society archives.
Figure 6: Third Floor Plan of Maine State building. Source: Poland Spring Preservation Society archives.
Figure 7: Rotunda ceiling design of the Maine State building. Source: Poland Spring Preservation Society archives.
Figure 8: Interior finish design of the Maine State building. Source: Poland Spring Preservation Society archives.
Figure 9: Dismantling of the Maine State building after the completion of the World’s Fair in Chicago, 1894. Source: Poland Spring Preservation Society archives.
Figure 10: One of the trains used to ship the Maine State building from its location in Chicago to Maine. Source: Cyndi Robbins, Poland Spring Preservation Society, “Maine State Building,” http://www.polandspringps.org/msb3.html (accessed January 10, 2009).
Appendix F: Miscellaneous Photographs of the 1893 Columbian Exposition

Figure 3: The Sweden Building at the Chicago World’s Fair, 1893. Source: The Columbian Gallery: A Portfolio of Photographs from the World’s Fair, including the Chief Palaces, Interiors, Statuary, Architectural and Science Groups, Characters, Typical Exhibits, and Marvels of the Midway Plaisance (Chicago: The Werner Company, 1894).
Figure 5: The Buildings of France, Spain, and Turkey at the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair. Source: The Columbian Gallery: A Portfolio of Photographs from the World’s Fair, including the Chief Palaces, Interiors, Statuary, Architectural and Science Groups, Characters, Typical Exhibits, and Marvels of the Midway Plaisance (Chicago: The Werner Company, 1894).
Figure 6: A view of the Illinois State Building, the host state of the 1893 Columbian Exposition. Source: The Columbian Gallery: A Portfolio of Photographs from the World’s Fair, including the Chief Palaces, Interiors, Statuary, Architectural and Science Groups, Characters, Typical Exhibits, and Marvels of the Midway Plaisance (Chicago: The Werner Company, 1894).
Figure 8: The Ohio, Michigan, Virginia, and West Virginia State Buildings at the 1893 Columbian Exposition in Chicago. Source: The Columbian Gallery: A Portfolio of Photographs from the World’s Fair, including the Chief Palaces, Interiors, Statuary, Architectural and Science Groups, Characters, Typical Exhibits, and Marvels of the Midway Plaisance (Chicago: The Werner Company, 1894).
Figure 10: The Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska State Buildings at the Chicago World’s Fair, 1893. Source: The Columbian Gallery: A Portfolio of Photographs from the World’s Fair, including the Chief Palaces, Interiors, Statuary, Architectural and Science Groups, Characters, Typical Exhibits, and Marvels of the Midway Plaisance (Chicago: The Werner Company, 1894).
Figure 12: The State Buildings of Texas and Louisiana, along with the United States Territories Building at the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair. Source: *The Columbian Gallery: A Portfolio of Photographs from the World’s Fair, including the Chief Palaces, Interiors, Statuary, Architectural and Science Groups, Characters, Typical Exhibits, and Marvels of the Midway Plaisance* (Chicago: The Werner Company, 1894).