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Parrish v. West Coast Hotel Company: A Chelan County Chambermaid Makes History

By Gerry L. Alexander

In the fall of 2001 I participated as a presenter at a continuing legal education seminar sponsored by the Washington Courts Historical Society. The event focused on a number of landmark cases that over the years have gone from Washington's trial courts to the state supreme court and, in a few instances, to the United States Supreme Court.

I had the honor of presenting on a Chelan County case. It is a favorite of mine for a couple of reasons. First, it is an important part of the legal history of our state and nation. Just as significantly, though, it arose out of a lawsuit maintained by an ordinary Washingtonian of modest means who was not, by any measure, in a position of influence in her community. This person was simply seeking what most litigants want—to have the court fairly apply the law. Even though the amount of controversy in that case was not great, the plaintiffs were fortunate to find excellent attorneys who were willing to represent her throughout the entire course of the litigation. I have a strong sense that the lawyers who handled her case from beginning to end were doing so pro bono because they believed their client had been wronged and that resort to the litigation was a path worth taking.

What makes this case particularly notable is that the result achieved by this ordinary Washington citizen benefited millions of other low-income Americans who were unknown to him. Indeed, the impact of the final decision in the case was felt at the highest levels of our nation’s government, up to the Office of the President of the United States. The case I am referring to is Parrish v. West Coast Hotel Company (185 Wash. 581, 55 P.2d 1083 (1936), aff’d, 274 U.S. 398 (1927)), a case that started out in 1935 in the Chelan County Courthouse in Wenatchee.

Some readers may know a bit about the Parrish case, but for those who are unfamiliar with it, here are a few of the facts that led to the lawsuit. From 1933 to 1935 Elsie Parrish worked as a chambermaid. Her place of employment was the Cascadian Hotel in downtown Wenatchee, a building that still stands on Wenatchee’s main street.

Parrish commenced her lawsuit in Chelan County Superior Court against the operator of the Cascadian, the West Coast Hotel Company. She claimed that the wage she was paid by the hotel was less than the minimum wage as fixed by our state’s Industrial Welfare Commission. That commission, pursuant to state law, set the wage for women and children at $14.50. That was not $14.50 per hour, or even $14.50 per day. Rather, it was $14.50 per week, for 48 hours of work. Although that wage seems shockingly low, we must remember that in 1935 our nation was in the midst of the Great Depression. In her complaint, Parrish sought back wages totaling $216.96—a small claims court matter these days. In her complaint, Parrish stated that she had always been paid the minimum wage.

The then-judge of the Chelan County Superior Court, Judge W. O. Parr, presided at the trial. Relying on a 1923 decision of the United States Supreme Court, Adkins v. Children’s Hospital, he concluded that Washington’s statute, which authorized the Industrial Welfare Commission to establish a minimum wage for women, was unconstitutional as an interference with freedom to contract. Judge Parr, therefore, awarded Elsie Parrish only $17, that sum being the product of sum being the product of dividing her hourly wage by the number of days she worked during the period covered by her complaint.

Parrish appealed the trial court’s decision to the Washington Supreme Court. On April 2, 1936, the court reversed Judge Parr, sustained our state’s minimum wage, and directed judgment for Parrish. In doing so, the court did not distinguish the Adkins decision, hanging its ruling largely on the fact that the Adkins case dealt with an act of Congress that applied only to the District of Columbia. Our court said, “The United States Supreme Court has not yet held that a state statute such as one at the case at bar is unconstitutional and until such time Adkins v. Children’s Hospital is not controlling.” Frankly, this statement was rather slim support for the decision, but it was about all the Washington Supreme Court had going for it.

Happily for the hotel, at least, the U.S. Supreme Court granted its petition to review the decision of the Washington Supreme Court. Argument was thereafter held in Washington, D.C., in December 1936, in the relatively new U.S. Supreme Court Building. It was virtually certain, however, that things moved fast in those days—a little over one year from trial in Wenatchee to a hearing at the U.S. Supreme Court, with a stop in between at the Washington Supreme Court in Olympia. The arguments of counsel at the U.S. Supreme Court focused primarily on the continued viability of the above-mentioned Adkins decision.

Although Wetenich attorney C. B. Conner represented Parrish at trial and on appeal to the Washington Supreme Court, at the U.S. Supreme Court she was represented by Sun Driver of Wenatchee, an attorney who later served as a justice of the state supreme court. W. A. Toner, an assistant attorney general of the State of Washington, also appeared and argued in support of the constitutionality of Washington’s minimum-wage law. The West Coast Hotel Company was represented by Seattle attorneys E. L. Skel and John Roberts. They replaced Wetenich attorney Fred Grolland, who represented the hotel company at trial and on appeal to the Washington Supreme Court.

Before I tell you what the U.S. Supreme Court did in this case, let me introduce you to the four horsemen. Before I get to them, I first want to offer a word about some of the political and judicial currents swirling around the other Washington at this time. In 1936 the U.S. Supreme Court was precisely balanced between conservative and liberal justices—not unlike today. In the early days of Franklin Roosevelt’s long tenure as president, which had commenced in 1913, a group of unyielding conservatives, commonly known as the “four horsemen,” had the upper hand on the Supreme Court. The four horsemen were Justices Sutherland, Van Devanter, Butler, and McReynolds, the latter justice generally being considered the most curmudgeonly member of the Court. These decisions by the court’s “old guard” left little room for the future. The New Deal was on the horizon, and the Court was beginning to face the political realities posed by the onset of a national economic crisis.

In the early days of his presidency, Franklin Roosevelt was elected on a platform promising “a New Deal” for the nation. In 1934, while still governor of New York, he outlined his New Deal priorities in a speech to the Supreme Court. Roosevelt focused primarily on the continued viability of the above-mentioned Adkins decision. Whether one liked them or not, it was a fact that the members of the court were being considered the most curmudgeonly person ever to sit on that court. These four horsemen, who possessed an unfavorable view of conservative judicial philosophy, were wards of the Supreme Court. This was a tremendous contrast to the Adkins case.

The four horsemen were Justices Sutherland, Van Devanter, Butler, and McReynolds, the latter justice generally being considered the most curmudgeonly member of the court. These decisions by the court’s “old guard” left little room for the future. The New Deal was on the horizon, and the Court was beginning to face the political realities posed by the onset of a national economic crisis. Roosevelt focused primarily on the continued viability of the above-mentioned Adkins decision. Whether one liked them or not, it was a fact that the members of the court were being considered the most curmudgeonly person ever to sit on that court. These decisions by the court’s “old guard” left little room for the future. The New Deal was on the horizon, and the Court was beginning to face the political realities posed by the onset of a national economic crisis.
presidential election of November 1936. Very likely it emboldened him early in 1937 to unveil his famous “court-packing plan.” The plan called for a constitutional amendment that would allow the president to appoint another judge for every federal judge who was over 70 and not retired. Based on the age of the justices at the time the president hatched this plan, he could have added six new Supreme Court justices. Many believe that the specter of the plan put the fear of God into some members of the court, particularly its swingman, Owen Roberts. Whether or not Roosevelt’s ploy had in

Although Roosevelt’s court-packing plan eventually died in Congress, historians have pondered whether its specter caused Justice Roberts to desert the four horsemen. We will never know for certain because Justice Roberts was a private man who was quite dismouthing about his thinking in the matter for the remainder of his life. The closest he came to revealing his thoughts was in a memorandum he drafted after he stepped down from the bench in 1945. He did this at the request of Justice Felix Frankfurter, and it was published after Justice Roberts’s death in 1955. In the memorandum, his change of heart from Morehead to Parrish was attributed to what he called the “timidity” of the New York lawyers in Morehead to request that the court overturn the Adams decision. Actually, this after-the-fact explanation is not really accurate because the petition for review in Morehead indicates that the New Yorkers wanted Adams overturned.

Regardless of what caused Roberts to vote in favor of Elsie Parrish’s position and overturn Adams and Morehead, there is no question that the opinion in Parrish v. West Coast Hotel Company has had enduring significance. Not only did it give the green light to the states to pass minimum-wage laws, which are ubiquitous today, but it quickly opened the floodgates to other New Deal legislation, such as the Social Security Act, which has had a huge effect on just about everyone in our nation.

It is the view of some that the court’s decision to grant review of the Parrish case had nothing to do with the court-packing plan because the plan was not unveiled by President Roosevelt until after review was granted. It may well be that the liberals on the court granted review in Parrish because they were looking for a case that would allow them to override the Adams opinion—which even the chief justice at that time, the conservative former president Howard T. Van, disdained and disowned. It takes only four votes to grant review at the U.S. Supreme Court and it is possible that the liberals thought they might pick up one more vote to overturn Adams. As it turned out, they picked up the vote of Justice Roberts.

Did the court-packing plan influence the court? Although that will forever remain a mystery, we do know that the Parrish case made history. But it is history that was made only because a woman from our state, Elsie Parrish, sought to assert her right to court and found attorneys who were willing to handle her case without any expectations of financial gain. The client and her attorneys did rise to the challenge, and the rest is history. It is my hope that the many Washington lawyers who provide legal services at no cost to the economically disadvantaged will be cognizant of this important part of our state’s legal history and be inspired by it to carry on the great tradition of Washington lawyers to, as the oath of attorney says, “never forsake the cause of the defenseless or oppressed.”
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The U.S. Supreme Court justices, c. 1937–38. Sitting, from left to right: justices Sutherland and Medina, Chief Justice Hughes, justices Brandeis and Butler. Standing, left to right: justices Cardozo, Stone, Roberts, and Black.

fluence, it is a historical fact that slightly less than two months after the court-packing plan was broached by the president, on March 29, 1937, the court ruled in West Coast Hotel Company v. Parrish that Washington’s minimum-wage law was constitutional. In doing so, it specifically overruled the Adkins decision as well as its decision in the New York case Morehead v. New York ex rel. Tipaldi, handed down just a year earlier.

The Parrish decision was written by Chief Justice Hughes, who was not too surprising since he sometimes joined the liberal wing. It was Justice Roberts, though, who stunned a lot of people by providing the deciding vote in the court’s 5-4 decision. Two weeks later, Justice Roberts again joined the liberals in upholding the Wagner Labor Act, and six weeks later he was with them again when the Social Security Act passed constitutional muster. Although the president’s court-packing plan soon faded, Justice Roberts’s conversion from conservative to liberal engendered a bit of Washington, D.C., humor based on Benjamin Franklin’s famous maxim of thrift, “a stitch in time saves nine.” The new post-Parrish version was “a switch in time saves nine.”

W

Laura Belle Downey Bartlett, who crossed the Oregon Trail at the age of two, became a mining engineer, Chinook Jargon translator, author, musician, and playwright. Another critique noted, “Local singers who are students of Indian customs and language enact the role. Good vocals, good acting, and splendid staging assist in making Mrs. Bartlett’s Indian work a triumph.”

Bartlett was 63 when she wrote Wah-Mah-Whah-Lah, which could be

Laura Belle Downey Bartlett was given at the Tacoma Theatre on May 16, 1916, in the Tacoma Theatre.

“Wah-mah-whah-lah” means “beautiful mountains, lovely valleys, and crystal streams” in Chinook Jargon, according to the playwright, who was something of an expert in the trade language. The playwright described the production as a “dramatic, musical Indian Character Play.” The audiences liked what they saw, and the play continued its run. In June the production triumphed in Portland, a review in The Morning Oregonian reported that it was “full of music seldom heard…. Pers...
Bartlett’s connection with Pacific Northwest Indians began during her early childhood. Less than two years after her birth in Clark County, Missouri, on August 18, 1851, her family embarked on the trip to come to Oregon. Just about then, I shall never forget how frightened I was, as was everyone, when a shot was fired by our guard, which all thought was the beginning of the attack, but proved, by daylight, to be a large fat hog. However, the Indians never made an attack on Steilacoom, as there were two or more companies of soldiers stationed at the garrison.

The Downeys returned to Roy in 1850. When the “Indian Trouble” arose, the Downeys left their home for the safety of Fort Steilacoom, which was, as was everyone, when a shot was heard, the beginning of the attack. However, it was, as was everyone, when a shot was heard, for the safety of Fort Steilacoom, when the “Indian Trouble” began, the Downeys left their home for the safety of Fort Steilacoom.

In 1975 Bartlett’s descendants do not have a copy of the Chinook Jargon, but they have a copy of the Chinook Jargon that was published in 1916 by the J. K. Gill Company. In 1916 Bartlett prepared a book of Chinook Jargon translations of folk songs. The book was published by the J. K. Gill Company and is still used by researchers. Bartlett’s other written works include a book of Chinook Jargon translations of folk songs. The book was published by the J. K. Gill Company and is still used by researchers.
In the summer of 1838, the United States government sent troops into the Cherokee Nation, rounded up every Cherokee they could find, and interned them in cramped and dirty camps. Over the following fall and winter, the United States forced over 15,000 Cherokees to migrate from their homeland to what is now Oklahoma. Somewhere between 4,000 and 8,000 Cherokees died as a direct consequence of their internment and relocation.
a promise from the federal government to eliminate Indian land issues, and today as the tribes could be acquired “peaceably” and “on reasonable terms.” At the time, the Cherokee and the Creeks possessed much of what is now central and western Georgia. In 1826 the Creeks ceded their remaining land to the state, leaving the Cherokees to bear the full brunt of Georgia’s intimidation. Pro-removal politicians in Georgia demanded that the federal government extinguish the Cherokees’ rights to their land and open up the lands to white constituents wishing to join the burgeoning cotton economy. By the mid 1820s, calls for the expulsion of the Cherokees dominated political discussions in the state. Throughout this period the Cherokees continued to make adjustments to their legal and political institutions. They established a court system with trial and appellate levels, formally aban-
doned their traditional law of blood revenge, and adopted a republican form of government. Many, but not most, converted to Christianity at the be-
hest of Protestant missionaries residing among them and read the Bible and other spiritual tracts published in their own language. All of their efforts toward acculturation were in vain. Despite the Cherokees’ accommodations to the civ-
dilization process, white men in Georgia refused to accept them as social equals and urged their political representatives to seize the Cherokees’ land and kick them out of the state. In February 1826, the Cherokee Nation Council informed the United States that it would refuse future cession requests and enacted a law prohibiting Cherokee individuals from sell-
ing tribal land upon penalty of death. In 1827 the Cherokees adopted a written republican constitution, reasserting to the federal government the Cherokee nation’s right to form a national government and to govern themselves and acculturate at their own pace. His recommendation for a removal destination was gen-

eral in nature, but a logical place at the time was Arkansas, where some of the nation’s tribal members had immigrated between 1806 and 1819. However, that region became Arkansas Territory in 1819, and by 1826 the U.S. government wanted the southeastern tribes pushed even farther west. At that point the “Old Settler” Cherokees who had immigrated 10 to 20 years earlier exchanged their land in Arkansas for 7 million acres in the northeastern corner of what is now Oklahoma. The nation directly west of Arkansas thus became a primary terminus for archi-
tects of the federal Indian removal policy, and the government began planning to relocate the southeastern tribes to the areas north, south, and west of the Old Settler Cherokees, calling it the “Indian Territory.” In the brief interval between the passage of the Indian Removal Act and the government’s decision to remove the southeastern tribes (including the Cherokees) to the Indian Territory, El-
isha W. Chester attempted to persuade the federal government to move the Chero-
kees to the area near present-day Atlanta, Georgia, where the Columbia River flows into the Pacific Ocean.

Ishia W. Chester was born in 1795 in Groton, Con-

necticut, and graduated from Congregationalist Middlebury (Vermont) College in 1818. After com-
pleting his college studies, Chester began studying for the bar. By 1825 he had moved to Georgia and opened a law office, in which he developed into such a lucrative practice that he could afford to own two slaves.

In the late 1820s the Georgia legislature extended the state’s jurisdiction over Cherokee territory and purported to seize the Cherokees’ land and distribute it to white Georgians in a lottery. The Cherokee nation had immigrated between 1806 and 1819. However, by 1826 the U.S. government wanted the southeastern tribes pushed even further west. At that point the “Old Settler” Cherokees who had immigrated 10 to 20 years earlier exchanged their land in Arkansas for 7 million acres in the northeastern corner of what is now Oklahoma. The land directly west of Arkansas thus became a primary terminus for architects of the federal Indian removal policy, and the government began planning to relocate the southeastern tribes to the areas north, south, and west of the Old Settler Cherokees, calling it the “Indian Territory.” In the brief interval between the passage of the Indian Removal Act and the government’s decision to remove the southeastern tribes (including the Cherokees) to the Indian Territory, Elisha W. Chester attempted to persuade the federal government to move the Cherokees to an area near present-day Atlanta, Georgia, where the Columbia River flows into the Pacific Ocean.

Chester achieved a measure of historical notoriety when he served as Samuel Worcester’s counsel in Worcester v. Georgia. Two important cases in the modern conception of tribal sovereignty.

Chester achieved a measure of historical notoriety when he served as Samuel Worcester’s counsel in Worcester v. Georgia. Two important cases in the modern conception of tribal sovereignty.

N ot long after making his unsuccessful plea to the president, Chester began to express an interest in serving as a U.S. government agent in removal ne-
gotiations with Cherokee leaders. In the spring of 1827 he embarked on a trip to Boston to meet the Ameri-
can Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions on their removal negotiations in Georgia. On the way, he stopped in Washington and met with Secretary of War Lewis Cass and other war department officials. Chester told them he held the confidence of influential Cherokee leaders and could assist in the conclusion of a removal treaty. Persuaded by his argument, Cass appointed Chester as a special agent to deliver a removal proposal to the Cherokee government. Chester attempted to persuade prin-
cipal chief John Ross to reconsider his entrenched position for the sake of his people, arguing as had many before him that removal was the only solution to the conflict. The lawyer met with determined resistance and an-
tagism from the chief, who believed that Chester had betrayed the Chero-
kees’ trust. Ross called Chester’s ar-
 rangement to act as a U.S. government agent “unsatisfactory” because the lawyer had represented the missionaries and prepared a memorial to President Andrew Jackson, asking him to intervene on the missionaries’ behalf.

In February 1832, Chester traveled to Washington, D.C., and sat in for the U.S. Supreme Court oral arguments before the U.S. Supreme Court with George Washington, D.C., and sat in for the U.S. Supreme Court oral arguments before the U.S. Supreme Court with Justice John Marshall, arguing for the Cherokee nation’s right to remain independent. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of the Cherokee nation, declaring that the Cherokee Nation, Chief Justice John Marshall, writing for the majority, declared that the Cherokee Nation re-
tained significant powers of sovereignty and that Georgia’s removal policy was unconstitutional. The decision was a landmark in the development of Indian law and service to the Cherokees and the United States.

When on March 5, 1832, the Supre-
mec Court ruled in favor of the Cherokee Nation, it reversed its decision and freed the missionaries, it was Ches-
ter who carried the document from Washing-
ton, D.C., to the Georgia state capital. The Geor-
gia court refused to reverse the convictions and kept the missionaries in jail. Chester informed the Supreme Court that the state court judge had refused to acknowledge its jurisdiction in the latter matter, and the lawyer’s motives in representing the Cherokee Nation.

In the early 1830s Chester achieved a measure of histori-
cal notoriety when he served as Samuel Worcester’s counsel in Worcester v. Georgia, an important case in the modern conception of tribal sovereignty. In 1830 the state

principal men about removing to the mouth of the Oregon on the Pacific. I am inclined to think "[I]n my last, I mentioned that willingness to contemplate a kee Phoenix to join the Ridges and Elias Andrew Ross (John's broth Georgia had induced more the Worcester decision against appointment over the U.S. gov October council meeting. By ter wrote that he expected this popular consensus people demands a removal; but they cannot and I trying to secure permission from the war depart ment to press his own removal idea on the tribe.

In a July 10 letter to the war department, Chester expanded on his removal scheme, adding that the "intellig[ent] men" in the Cherokee Nation admitted that "the interest of their people demands a removal; but they cannot and dare not enter upon, until a like conviction is produced in the minds of the populace." Chester wrote that he expected this popular consensus to develop at the upcoming October council meeting. By the summer of 1832, disappointment over the U.S. gov ernment’s failure to enforce the Worcester decision against Georgia had induced more influential Cherokees such as Andrew Ross (John's broth er), William Hicks, Rogers, and William Shorry Coosdey to join the Biggers and Elias Boudinot, editor of the Cherokee Phoenix newspaper, in their willingness to contemplate a removal treaty.

In the same letter he wrote: "[I]n my last, I mentioned that there had been suggestions made by some of the Cherokees, about a removal to the Pacific. I am inclined to think that there was a possibility, not so bad an opinion as to be more agreeable to many of them, than a removal to the Arkansas." Chester admitted, I have little information about the country on the Pacific, and no books with me, and such an affair being a affair. From a map before me, it would seem that the country between the Pacific and Mula tonah, and extending from the Mexican boundary to the Columbia, was about 200,000 acres. This would be sufficiently large to accommodate the three tribes [presumably, the Cherokees and the neighboring Creeks and Choc tows]."

This letter suggests that the plan may have been more of Chester's idea than that of the unidentified Cherokees. It has long been a question with me, what is eventually to be done with the country west of the Rocky Mountains. It is too remote ever to be formed into a State, or States of the Union; unless rail roads, and the power of steam, are hither for to make neighbors of the whites. Besides, the Columbia River and north and south of the Columbia Mountains and the States there is a large extent of country, which must for ages be unsettled by civil ized man.

Chester asserted in his let ter that a general removal of all the southeastern tribes to the region would be benefi cial to their populations for it would separate them by a wide distance from white Ameri cans. Would not removal to the region, Chester asked, en able the Indians to avoid "all the jealousies and ill blood, so apt to arise between the white and the red men"? The Cherokees, he added, would also be able to influence the other removed tribes and the peoples already living in the region along the path toward "civilization." "Or," he wondered, "would the expense, or difficulty of transporting so large a number of people to so great a distance, constitute an insuperable obstacle?"

If the government found that it could afford to remove the tribes to the region, Chester's question was "What shall be the nature of the relations between the United States?" He proposed that such a colony of Cherokees would have to be established near the mouth of the Columbia River. "If that project does not seem to have been well considered," he went on, "countering that the territory was surrounded and named over by numer ous tribes, fierce in their disposition, unlike in their habits, unacquainted with the advantages and desiring the restraints of civilization... What could the Cherokees do, unaccustomed as they are to war, with wealth sufficient to attract these roaming savages, in an encounter with enemies, superior in number, familiar with the country and habitual to its climate? Obviously they must fall before the invaders."

Robb is either representing an exaggerated view of the threat pos ed by Pacific Northwest Indians or exposing his lack of knowledge. In actual fact, the many distinct Indian tribes living along the Columbia River and north and south of the great waterway varied in the nature of their culture and in the degree of their hostility toward intruders. Robb then turned to the future of settlement in the region. He too thought it probable that "[w]hite settlement will soon be made upon the Columbia river." When that happened, Robb asked, would they not, as almost all new colonies so formed have been, composed of men of low character and bad principles, of that class whose association has always been fatal to the Indians? In other words, Robb argued, the Cherokees would soon be facing in the Pacific Northwest the same ailments and trespasses they were experiencing in the Southeast.

Robb then turned to the future of settlement in the region. He too thought it probable that "[w]hite settlement will soon be made upon the Columbia river." When that happened, Robb asked, would they not, as almost all new colonies so formed have been, composed of men of low character and bad principles, of that class whose association has always been fatal to the Indians? In other words, Robb argued, the Cherokees would soon be facing in the Pacific Northwest the same ailments and trespasses they were experiencing in the Southeast.

Robb then turned to the future of settlement in the region. He too thought it probable that "[w]hite settlement will soon be made upon the Columbia river." When that happened, Robb asked, would they not, as almost all new colonies so formed have been, composed of men of low character and bad principles, of that class whose association has always been fatal to the Indians? In other words, Robb argued, the Cherokees would soon be facing in the Pacific Northwest the same ailments and trespasses they were experiencing in the Southeast.

Robb then turned to the future of settlement in the region. He too thought it probable that "[w]hite settlement will soon be made upon the Columbia river." When that happened, Robb asked, would they not, as almost all new colonies so formed have been, composed of men of low character and bad principles, of that class whose association has always been fatal to the Indians? In other words, Robb argued, the Cherokees would soon be facing in the Pacific Northwest the same ailments and trespasses they were experiencing in the Southeast. Apparently, Chester gave up on the Columbia scheme at that point, but the question remains: who had the idea, Chester or the "intelligent men" among the Cherokees? Evidence of Cherokee contemplation of the Columbia proposal does not appear among the papers of the Cherokee leadership or the federal agency to the tribe. Robb's papers, for instance, make no mention of the Oregon territory or the rivers in the region. Chester's immediate abandonment of the idea suggests that he had conceived it himself. Fearing, perhaps, that it might meet with disapproval in the war department, he suggested from the Cherokees. In a letter to Edward Everett in late August, Chester noted, somewhat wistfully, that the war department had "discourage[d] all thoughts on the subject." Abandonment of the Columbia idea, however, did not end his responsibilities with the Cherokees. For a few months
An early edition of the Cherokee Phoenix (above), founded and edited by Elias Boudinot (right), a member of the pro-removal Treaty Party and a signatory of the removal treaty negotiated with Elias Chester’s replacement as agent for the United States government.

thereafter, Chester continued as the federal government’s agent and tried unsuccessfully to convince the Cherokees to agree to a removal treaty. The Cherokee Nation rejected all of his proposals. According to one source, John Ross “barely listened” whenever Chester spoke to the Cherokee council. Although Chester remained involved with the Cherokee at some time thereafter, attending council meetings and working to persuade the Cherokees that removal was a necessity, he made no headway and finally gave up. The removal opponents among the Cherokees, who numbered all but a few of the tribe’s population, were disgusted with the lawyer and ready for him to leave. On February 2, 1833, Cass wrote to Ross and the rest of the Cherokee delegation to inform them that the president was disappointed in their refusal to sign a removal treaty. Cass briefly mentioned Chester’s futile role in the negotiations. The war department, he said, had appointed Chester to “communicate the wishes of the department.” “The result,” Cass wrote, “was fruitless.” Thus ended Chester’s role in the Cherokee removal negotiations.

As Georgia and the United States continued to increase the pressure to remove, the Cherokees became divided between the thousands who wanted to continue their opposition and the smaller group that wanted to surrender and depart for the West. On December 29, 1835, the latter group, led by Major Ridge, John Ridge, and Elias Boudinot, signed a removal treaty with the Reverend Jacob Schermerhorn—Chester’s replacement as government agent—at the Cherokee capital of New Echota, without seeking the authority of principal chief John Ross or the Cherokee government. The Treaty of New Echota required the Cherokee Nation to exchange its national lands for a parcel in the recently established “Indian Territory” west of Arkansas. The federal government promised to remit $5 million to the Cherokee Nation, compensate individuals for the loss of their buildings and fixtures, and pay for the costs of the Cherokees’ relocation and acclimation. The United States also promised to honor the title of the Cherokee Nation’s new land, respect its political autonomy, and protect it from future trespasses—all promises it subsequently abandoned. Even though the treaty was written without the sanction of the Cherokee national government, the U.S. Senate ratified it by a single vote.

The treaty required the nation’s departure from Georgia within two years. When the Cherokees—most of whom signed a petition protesting the treaty—refused to prepare for removal, President Martin Van Buren sent federal troops to force them into internment camps, where they remained while preparations were made for their departure. Over the brutally hot, dry summer of 1838 thousands of Cherokees in the camps died from disease, malnutrition, and heartbreak. When it was time for them to depart, John Ross requested that the tribe be allowed to supervise its own trek to the West. General Winfield Scott consented to the arrangement, and the Cherokees migrated 800 miles to the Indian Territory over the terrible winter of 1838–39. There they joined those who had moved there in previous migrations; and after a tumultuous civil war that raged between the adherents of the “Ross” and “Treaty” parties, the Cherokees resurrected their nation, restored their national institutions, and rebuilt their economy. Today, these resilient people are thriving as a vibrant, sovereign nation in eastern Oklahoma.

Ironically, even without Elisha Chester’s Oregon removal plan, many Cherokees did ultimately make it to the Pacific Northwest. Today, Cherokees in numbers greater than the nation’s entire 1832 population now live in the region. In the 2000 U.S. Census, over 32,000 residents of Oregon and Washington claimed Cherokee ancestry; this number will likely be in the range of 40,000 when the final 2010 census surveys are tabulated. While many Cherokees are residents of Oregon and Washington, hundreds of miles from the Cherokee Nation proper, they are enrolled citizens who vote in tribal elections and stay abreast of tribal issues and news. Doubtless, few of them realize that they are living exactly where an idiosyncratic lawyer would have placed their forebears 175 years ago.

Ten Alan Carnes is a professor of history at Portland State University and has served as director of the university’s Native American Studies program. He is author of The Legal Ideology of Removal: The Southern Judiciary and the Sovereignty of Native American Nations (University of Georgia Press) and several shorter pieces on Indian removal policies and repercussions.

To donate prints or negatives of regional historical interest to the Washington State Historical Society’s photograph collection, please contact Ed Nolan, special collections curator (253/798-5911 or enolan@wshs.wa.gov). To peruse a photo reproduction of an image in this Society’s collection visit WashingtonHistory.org and click on Collections, or contact Fred Poyner IV, digital collections curator (253/798-5911 or fpoyner@wshs.wa.gov).
Hunting for Treasures in the Numerous Historical Archives around the State

By Lorraine McConaghy

Our shared history from 1853—the creation of Washington Territory—until today is documented by a rich paper trail held in the state’s historical archives. Our shared inheritance resides in repositories all over Washington in archival boxes, file folders and microfilm reels containing treaties and scrapbooks, mug shots and paper dolls, menus and political cartoons, postcards and FBI files, newspapers and maps, personal correspondence and business records, patents and poems. The lengthy list of these repositories encompasses federal, state, county and municipal archives; corporate archives; college and university special collections; public libraries; and historical museums and societies, large and small.

A representative selection of primary documents from Washington’s varied archives has been published in anthology form, functioning as a historical exhibit between book covers: New Land, North of the Columbia: Historic Documents that Tell the Story of Washington State from Territory to Today. In this article you will find a sampling of these documents. The project was undertaken to call wide popular attention to Washington’s rich and abundant archival resources, which for the separation of “northern Oregon” from Oregon Territory. The Columbia’s campaign was successful, and Congress created Washington Territory on February 8, 1853. Once the territory was established, federal appointees arrived in the Far West to govern the huge expanse of land, and they began to create the bureaucratic paper trail housed by the Washington State Archives. The territorial seal shown here adopted the Chinook trade jargon phrase “al-ki,” or “in a little while,” to demonstrate confidence in Washington Territory’s rapid transition from prairie schooner and log cabin to steamships and shining cities. In the center of the seal is the goddess Hope. Behind her is the everyday reality of the territory, and before her is the future; the anchor at her feet symbolizes the great harbors of Washington’s Pacific and Puget Sound coasts.

Three Great Fires

Three devastating fires swept through cities in Washington Territory in the statehood summer. On June 7, 1889, Seattle’s entire business and commercial district—32 square blocks—burned to the ground. On the night of July 4, a fire began in a grocery store that consumed the town of Ellensburg. A month later, on August 5, 40 blocks of Spokane—again, at the city’s heart—went up in flames. In all three cases, the particularly hot, dry summer, combined with strong winds, was largely to blame. A spark was all it took. Low water levels hindered the efforts of volunteer firemen to douse the flames. Newspaper accounts make clear that these dense cities of wooden buildings, dry as tinder in the summer heat, burned so fiercely that the fires did not stop until they ran out of fuel. In the boom decade of the 1880s, Seattle, Ellensburg, and Spokane had grown too fast, without good building codes, professional fire departments, or adequate fire-fighting equipment. These three city sites, swept clean by fire, constructed new, better designed urban centers with modern infrastructure.

Irrigating the Okanogan

This political cartoon by Charles Lovejoy appeared in the Okanogan Record on August 25, 1905. Lovejoy frequently drew this caricature of a local settler—“the Okanogan farmer”—with his characteristic gangly frame, seedy clothing, and crafty, somewhat dissipated, expression. Spread behind him is the rich cornucopia of fruit, grain, vegetables, hay and livestock that would be made possible by the long-anticipated federal irrigation project. Authorized by the Newlands Act, the Reclamation Service— as the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation was then called—began to study irrigation potential in the Okanogan in 1902. The service organized the Okanogan Irrigation District in December 1905 to bring water to nearly 10,000 acres of farmland—the first federal reclamation project in Washington. When Lovejoy drew his cartoon, the project was still under study but was expected to be approved promptly. The cartoonist has left us an artful caricature through the cynicism, optimism, and opportunism that pervade this image.
provide a mirror of who we have been and who we are, and suggest who we might become. Our archives comprise our collective memory. They document Washington as a place and Washingtonians as a people; the portrait is not always flattering, but it is always revealing and instructive.

Research for New Land, North of the Columbia started at the Washington State Archives in Olympia and went on to the Washington State History Research Center in Tacoma, then outward to Bellingham to Walls Walls, Kelso to Newport, and dozens of sites in between. The documents selected for the book had to meet several criteria: they had to be powerful, fit on a page of the book, and express a great deal in a small space. The project’s first questions to many archivists were: What do you have in the collection that’s especially provocative? Beautiful? Frightening? Beautiful! Frightening! Fundamental! The archivists worked hard to answer these open-ended questions, eager to share their collections with the public.

The project was obliged to consider certain events and topics that are central to Washington’s distinctive experience of economic, political, and social history—Native treaties, federal relations, anti-Chinese violence, and wartime home front activities, for example. But our shared collections offered delightful surprises as well, such as patent medicine labels, an advertising brochure for Longview’s Twin Tepees Restaurant, and a cover from Spokane’s counterculture newspaper, The Spokane Natural.

As in any research project, there were many long days and plenty of disappointments. Why did so many correspondents write their letters in pencil on pale blue paper? When their correspondence was legible, why did it take the writer so many lines to get to the point! And why was there so much material on one topic and so little on another? For instance, resources are relatively abundant on the life and work of Washington’s Governor Albert Mead.

Chinook Jargon Dictionary

This copy of a 1909 dictionary of the Chinook trade language at the Cowlitz County Historical Society has been much used. It demonstrates that well after its publication in 1909, Chinook jargon was used as a common language between nonnatives and Native Americans in the surrounding region. At some point the cover became detached and was mended at home—reinforced with a heavy flower-print fabric impregnated with paste and then rebound with two thick strips of black twine—perhaps shoelaces—threaded through holes drilled into the book. Someone wrote a list of Chinook words and phrases on the inner cover, and it fell open easily to sections that dealt with economic transactions in the mixed society of the early 20th century.

The Columbia Basin Project

The Columbia Basin Project was a mammoth program of land reclamation, irrigation and production of hydroelectricity—a New Deal project designed to reinvent agriculture and industry in Washington. The construction of Grand Coulee Dam, key to the Columbia Basin Project, began in 1933 and reached completion in 1942; creating Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake and Banks Lake. Starting in 1937, the federal government organized the Bonneville Power Administration to manage the hydropower generated by the Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and other dams on the Columbia River. This cheap electricity revolutionized industry in the state, powering the World War II home front production of aluminum, bombers, and plutonium. The Columbia Basin Project is the largest federally-run irrigation project in the United States, bringing water to nearly 700,000 acres in Grant, Lincoln, Adams, Franklin, and Douglas Counties. Additionally, Grand Coulee Dam generates an average annual net of about 21.2 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity. This 1934 map clearly shows the regional integration of the Columbia Basin Project as its impacts spread throughout the Pacific Northwest—to Idaho, Oregon, and British Columbia, as well as Washington. This remarkable map is also interesting for what did not exist in 1934—there is no North Cascades Highway and no Hanford Nuclear Reservation; Mount St. Helens is still whole.
in comparison with those of his contemporary, Luella Boyer, an African-American hairdresser and civil rights activist in Everett. Nevertheless, our shared archives are comprehensive in their scope. Materials surfaced on Wobblies in Pend Oreille County, Klansmen in King County, a fugitive slave from Olympia, a prostitute from Spokane, a political cartoonist from Conconully, an inventor from Mercer Island, and a U.S. senator from Everett.

All told, the project gathered nearly 2,000 images of great documents from collections throughout the state and could have turned up more. For practical reasons related to book publishing, the research simply had to end, although it was by no means complete. The selection process was an enormous challenge—from 2,000 down to 400–500. To provide an inkling of what awaits the diligent researcher in Washington’s archives, here is a tiny sampling of documents from the book. There are many possible pathways through Washington’s magnificent shared archival collection—in women’s history, ethnic history, labor history, political history—the list is endless. These government agencies, libraries, museums, and research centers are open to all of us, and their exploration and interpretation is the our shared opportunity. The archives are our public treasure and our public trust; use and cherish them.

One last word: collecting, preserving, and providing public access to our archives are vital functions performed by dedicated men and women working in repositories throughout the state—they deserve our gratitude and respect.

Lorraine McConaghy is a public historian devoted to researching and teaching Pacific Northwest history in a museum setting. At Seattle’s Museum of History & Industry, she was responsible for the curation of the core exhibit, True Northwest, and is currently working on the Washington State Historical Society’s statewide Civil War Read-In project and preparing to curate Civil War Pathways, a Historical Society exhibition opening in 2014.

1962 Model Technology in 2005 Seattle

The Alweg monorail was a model technology at Century 21, the 1962 Seattle World’s Fair, connecting the fairgrounds with the downtown core in mere 95 seconds. A demonstration of single-rail, high-speed public transportation, the monorail seemed to point the way to the future. In the Washington State Pavilion, visitors marveled at a huge model of central Puget Sound in the 21st century, threaded by hundreds of miles of monorail. Fast forward to the 21st century: ambitious plans for a citywide monorail in Seattle failed to garner citizen support—mainly due to cost. Voters rejected even a modified version in 2005, and the monorail project died. The Seattle Center Monorail has continued its service, despite occasional glitches, completing its millionth mile in 2008.

Without a Trace

On November 24, 1971, a passenger who had identified himself to the ticket agent as “Dan Cooper” hijacked a Boeing 727 while en route from Portland to Seattle. Cooper handed a flight attendant a note that read, in part, “I have a bomb in my briefcase. I will use it if necessary. I want you to sit next to me. You are being hijacked,” and demanded parachutes and $200,000. He insisted that the plane not land at Sea-Tac Airport until the money and parachutes were ready and waiting. There, the passengers and some crew members were released, and an airline employee made the delivery to the plane. After refueling the 727, Cooper ordered the pilot to fly to Mexico, and told all on-board crew members to stay in the cockpit, leaving him alone in the unpressurized cabin. At some point, Dan Cooper opened the aft cabin door and jumped from the plane, with one of the parachutes and the money. Cooper’s true identity and what became of him remain a mystery. Cooper” hijacked a Boeing 727 while en route from Portland to Seattle. Cooper handed a flight attendant a note that read, in part, “I have a bomb in my briefcase. I will use it if necessary. I want you to sit next to me. You are being hijacked,” and demanded parachutes and $200,000. He insisted that the plane not land at Sea-Tac Airport until the money and parachutes were ready and waiting. There, the passengers and some crew members were released, and an airline employee made the delivery to the plane. After refueling the 727, Cooper ordered the pilot to fly to Mexico, and told all on-board crew members to stay in the cockpit, leaving him alone in the unpressurized cabin. At some point, Dan Cooper opened the aft cabin door and jumped from the plane, with one of the parachutes and the money. Cooper’s true identity and what became of him remain a mystery.

True Northwest

The Society acquired the Tissot collection as part of an effort to obtain, preserve, and make available the correspondence of Washingtonians who served in all wars, as well as letters from the home front written to service members. Here just a few days after the devastation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

DEAR MOM AND DAD

August 21, 1945

Dear Mom and Dad,

I’m sorry I didn’t write for a few months. I hope you can imagine how few things are over here. Every day is waiting for the big news. We get all kinds of letters.

In 1945, Dan Cooper deployed as a bomber pilot to Tinian Island, which served as a primary air base for attacks on the Japanese homeland. After the Japanese surrender, Tissot served in Mindanao, The Philippines, until his discharge in July 1946. He was a diligent correspondent, writing home frequently and describing much of his daily life from the time of his induction until his discharge. Tissot (above right and bottom left in group shot) wrote the letter included here just a few days after the devastation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The Society acquired the Tissot collection as part of an effort to obtain, preserve, and make available the correspondence of Washingtonians who served in all wars, as well as letters from the home front written to service members. If you have material you would like to donate, contact Ed Nolan, head of Special Collections, at 253/798-5917.

August 21, 1945

Dear Mom and Dad,

I’m sorry I didn’t write for a few months. I hope you can imagine how few things are over here. Every day is waiting for the big news. We get all kinds of letters.

In 1945, Dan Cooper deployed as a bomber pilot to Tinian Island, which served as a primary air base for attacks on the Japanese homeland. After the Japanese surrender, Tissot served in Mindanao, The Philippines, until his discharge in July 1946. He was a diligent correspondent, writing home frequently and describing much of his daily life from the time of his induction until his discharge. Tissot (above right and bottom left in group shot) wrote the letter included here just a few days after the devastation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The Society acquired the Tissot collection as part of an effort to obtain, preserve, and make available the correspondence of Washingtonians who served in all wars, as well as letters from the home front written to service members. If you have material you would like to donate, contact Ed Nolan, head of Special Collections, at 253/798-5917.

August 21, 1945

Dear Mom and Dad,

I’m sorry I didn’t write for a few months. I hope you can imagine how few things are over here. Every day is waiting for the big news. We get all kinds of letters.

In 1945, Dan Cooper deployed as a bomber pilot to Tinian Island, which served as a primary air base for attacks on the Japanese homeland. After the Japanese surrender, Tissot served in Mindanao, The Philippines, until his discharge in July 1946. He was a diligent correspondent, writing home frequently and describing much of his daily life from the time of his induction until his discharge. Tissot (above right and bottom left in group shot) wrote the letter included here just a few days after the devastation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The Society acquired the Tissot collection as part of an effort to obtain, preserve, and make available the correspondence of Washingtonians who served in all wars, as well as letters from the home front written to service members. If you have material you would like to donate, contact Ed Nolan, head of Special Collections, at 253/798-5917. 
When Hal Sylvester ranged the Snoqualmie and Wenatchee National Forests in the early 1900s, one of his most important jobs was putting names on maps. In his 23 years as Forest Service supervisor, he named more than 3,000 uncharted ridges, mountains, lakes, streams, and rivers. Sylvester was respectful of names given by those who had ranged before him—Native Americans, miners, sheepherders, and settlers—but he also pulled names out of the proverbial hat. “Farm bred and university trained,” Sylvester drew names from nature, classical mythology, the Bible, and his many friends. In some of the monikers he came up with, his wit and sense of humor are evident.

Albert Hale Sylvester—known as Hal—was born on a farm in Woodside, California, and educated at Berkeley, where he earned a degree in civil engineering. He came to the Northwest in 1897 as an assistant topographer for the United States Geological Survey (USGS), which was conducting an official mapping of every wilderness mile in the country. “I think it was from no particular merit of my own that I was selected for this job,” he wrote in his memoirs.

One of his early field trips as a “young fellow out on his first big job” was a ride to Snoqualmie Pass to place survey cairns and establish a triangulation network along the Cascade Range. That ride imprinted Sylvester with the beauty of the region whose every mile he would soon know. From the pass “we retraced our steps to Gold Creek, which flows into Lake Keechelus at its head. By good luck and a miner’s trail we made our way up this stream. Its valley is glacial and U-shaped. Over its walls the snow water was pouring in a hundred glittering falls and cascades. It was at that time the most wonderful scenery I had ever seen…”

Sylvester established his reputation as a jokester on that trip. “Back in camp I undressed and plunged into the icy pond. Ugh! But it was cold. But I managed to stay in long enough to persuade John that the water was fine. When he hit the water
Sylvester tended to name lakes after women. About 150 lakes and ponds bear the names of wives, sisters, sweethearts, mothers, and daughters of the Forest Service.

The most recent version of the USGS 1908 to 1931. Operating supervisor, a job he held from 1908 to 1931.

Sylvester became an advocate for retaining some of the Indian names. He was not successful with Icicle Creek and Icicle Ridge, but he did retain the original spelling for Na-sik’elt Caynon. He also persuaded the Board of Geographic Names to change the name of the White River back to Moxapqua. (Both names appear in his writings), reestablishing the old name that meant “white or muddy water.”

Sylvester noted with satisfaction that the Wenatchee Indians used the syllable -qua in their stream names, too, so his chosen name had even more resonance.

The chief ranger also made use of the names settlers, prospectors, and sheepmen had given to landscape features. Tumax Mountain, for example, is named after two Macs—McDuff and McAdam. “Toward the summit of the Cascades in the Carlton Pass area there stands a fine example of a volcanic cinder cone rising some 1,520 feet above the general level of the terrain,” Sylvester wrote. “I asked a sheepherder its name. He said, ‘Oh, it hasn’t any real name,’ then rather hesitantly, ‘We call it the ‘Two Macs Mountain.’” He then told of two Scottish sheepherders, McDuff and McAdam, who used to race their bands to try and be first to get the pasturage on this mountain. I spelled two ‘Tu’ and added the ‘mac’ to it for Tumac, which makes an fine looking Indian name as I will ask you to find anywhere.”

Although Sylvester generally respected sheepherders, he found some of their names—such as Ass Hole—unsuitable. He discreetly renamed that particular hollow Cultus Hole, found some of their names—such as Ass Hole—unusable.

If there was no known name for a feature, Sylvester was free to use his imagination. He tended to name lakes after women. About 150 lakes and ponds bear the names of wives, sisters, sweethearts, mothers, and daughters of the Forest Service. On a single horseback trip along Icicle Ridge in 1909, he named nine lakes in two days, all of them for women he knew: Mary and Margaret, the two sisters of his companion, Burne Canby; Florence, a friend of Margaret and Mary’s; Alice, after Mrs. Sylvester; Flora, another ranger’s wife; Edna, “Burne’s best girl”; Augusta, Sylvester’s mother; Ida, his wife’s sister; and Victoria, the queen of England. The pass above Lake Florence he labeled Ladies Pass. This trip in 1909 marked the beginning of Sylvester’s habit of naming lakes after women; other forest rangers followed suit.

Sylvester preferred variety in names. He never liked to name tributaries as forks of another river: “Any name...is better than calling a stream a fork.” He grew tired of the many Cougar Creeks in the Chiwaukum drainage system and so poured over the map one winter in the office, renaming the creeks with synonyms like painter, panther, lion, and puma. Of the many Trout Lakes, he wrote: “Such names appear more or less out of thin air by a sort of common consent and practice.”

His knowledge of animal names served him well. Marmots gathered in Whistling Pig Meadow. Foalhead Creek then ran out of names of friends and family, he picked whatever was at hand. Index Creek was named because it forms the index to a map, Renesting the name as Tumac, which made an fine looking Indian name as I will ask you to find anywhere.”

Toward the summit of the Cascades in the Carlton Pass area there stands a fine example of a volcanic cinder cone rising some 1,520 feet above the general level of the terrain,” Sylvester wrote. “I asked a sheepherder its name. He said, ‘Oh, it hasn’t any real name,’ then rather hesitantly, ‘We call it the ‘Two Macs Mountain.’” He then told of two Scottish sheepherders, McDuff and McAdam, who used to race their bands to try and be first to get the pasturage on this mountain. I spelled two ‘Tu’ and added the ‘mac’ to it for Tumac, which makes an fine looking Indian name as I will ask you to find anywhere.”

Although Sylvester generally respected sheepherders, he found some of their names—such as Ass Hole—unsuitable. He discreetly renamed that particular hollow Cultus Hole, cultus being Chinook for anything bad, mean, and disgusting. Sheepherders had chosen Ass Point as the name for a finger of tableland over which they had hard going trailing their sheep. He changed it to the German “Asel” Point, “which at least looks better to the average American.”

If there was no known name for a feature, Sylvester was free to use his imagination. He tended to name lakes after women. About 150 lakes and ponds bear the names of wives, sisters, sweethearts, mothers, and daughters of the Forest Service. On a single horseback trip along Icicle Ridge in 1909, he named nine lakes in two days, all of them for women he knew: Mary and Margaret, the two sisters of his companion, Burne Canby; Florence, a friend of Margaret and Mary’s; Alice, after Mrs. Sylvester; Flora, another ranger’s wife; Edna, “Burne’s best girl”; Augusta, Sylvester’s mother; Ida, his wife’s sister; and Victoria, the queen of England. The pass above Lake Florence he labeled Ladies Pass. This trip in 1909 marked the beginning of Sylvester’s habit of naming lakes after women; other forest rangers followed suit.

Sylvester preferred variety in names. He never liked to name tributaries as forks of another river: “Any name...is better than calling a stream a fork.” He grew tired of the many Cougar Creeks in the Chiwaukum drainage system and so poured over the map one winter in the office, renaming the creeks with synonyms like painter, panther, lion, and puma. Of the many Trout Lakes, he wrote: “Such names appear more or less out of thin air by a sort of common consent and practice.”

His knowledge of animal names served him well. Marmots gathered in Whistling Pig Meadow. Foalhead Creek then ran...
Mountain. When Harry Reid carved a life-size figure of a woman, minus legs, from a tree trunk, a sheepherder named the nearby watercourse Grandma Creek.

Other names reflected Sylvester’s classical education. Lake Volhalba, named after a Viking paradise, lies just north of Stevens Pass. Studying a topographical map of Chelan County, he noticed contour lines so close together that they resembled a maze. This inspired him to name that mountain Labyrinth and two lakes nearby Lakes Theesus and Minotaur, thinking of Theseus entering the labyrinth to kill the Minotaur. He also used Biblical names: Mount David, Mount Jonathan, Mount Saul. He named Poets Ridge peaks after Washington Irving, Edgar Allan Poe, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, William Cullen Bryant, and John Greenleaf Whittier.

Sylvester recounts camping between two fine lakes in the Mount Stuart Range, the origin of Dishpan Gap, Saucer Lake, Cup of McKenzie, I would not change Jim’s in the name Pomas itself, and for the love correct the mistake. “Because of pleasure pumice blown out by Glacier Peak, which ing districts of the world.” Then he real Wenatchee is one of the great apple grow no apples up in that territory, even though for apples. ‘‘Apple?’ I pondered. There are location had to do with the French word names were slight mistakes. My guess is that it takes humor

Less imagination is required to guess the Spring 2013

In conflicts between agriculture and forestry, Sylvester

took the unpopular view that some land claimed by homesteaders in the upper Wenatchee River drainage was not suitable for farming.

Besides his responsibilities as a topographer, Sylvester embraced the conservation practices introduced by Pinchot and Roosevelt. In conflicts between agriculture and forestry, he took the unpopular view that some land claimed by homesteaders in the upper Wenatchee River drainage was not suitable for farming. However, he encouraged a conservative approach to timber harvesting on federal lands, preferring to hold off until private forest reserves were diminished.

Sylvester also made efforts to rehabilitate erosion-damaged soil caused by over-grazing of sheep and wildlife. In the early 1900’s sheep numbering in the hundreds of thousands were driven into the mountains each summer to graze. Soon, some of the mountain meadows were overgrazed and grizzly bears disappeared from the forest, shot by sheepherders. French Ridge, he noted, “formerly had a good sheep range on it, but it was bit terly used.” Sylvester set aside areas for limited use, including an unpopular closure of Buck Creek Pass to grazing.

In negotiations of the Blaney Pass Highway, Sylvester aided the causes of forest recreation and forestry access. One of the keys to his success, he claimed, was that he was more interested in human relationships than in trees alone. He moved key personnel to towns and cities to have contact with shepmen and cattlemen, sawmill operators, timber purchasers, and homesteaders.

Needless to say, the head ranger was an avid outdoorsmen, leading a pack trip to the summit of Mount Stuart, the high est peak in Chelan County, in the summer of 1916. He had a number of first ascents: Mount Baring, White Chuck Mountain, Columbia Peak, Overcoat Peak, Sahale Peak, Snoqualmie Mountain, Gardner Mountain, Star Peak, and Reynolds Peak.

After his retirement in 1931, he wrote his memoirs and articles continued to visit remote terrain, especially the circle of lakes he had found in 1909. In September 1934 he invited three friends on a trip back to Ladies Pass. With four saddle horses and two pack horses, they approached the pass from the northeast, following a trail up Chiwaukum Creek. They spent the first night at Lake Chiwaukum, then proceeded up through the valley to Larch Lake, switchbacked steeply on a granite talus slope, and followed a very rough trail. One of the packhorses slipped and fell end over end to its death at Deadhorse Pass. When the group started out again, they sidehilled below Lake Grace and camped under Snowgrass Mountain at Lake Mary.

The next day the five-horse caravan set out, with Sylvester guiding the pack horse, its lead rope thrown around the horn of his saddle. They traversed the saw-tooth ridge between Lake Mary and Lake Florence on a steep switchback trail. Just after crossing the ridge, with Lake Florence in view below, Sylvester paused to point out Snowgrass Mountain, which had been named by shepherders for the grass that grows through the snow in the spring.

The horses hunched up so the group could talk more easily, but as they did, the lead rope caught under the tail of Sylvester’s horse. His horse went off the trail, bucking, and lost its footing. Sylvester was trapped in the saddle with his leg pinned down by the rope. Both horses were over the side into a jagged rock slide area. Sylvester could not fall free and was pinned under the horse. In sleet and snow, he was carried out on a stretcher with relays organized by the Forest Service. Rescue efforts notwithstanding, Sylvester died a week later.

Six years after his death, 500 people signed a petition to rename Snowgrass Mountain in his honor. The U.S. Board of Geographic Names refused, however, citing the picturesque origin of the name. Instead, the board named one of the highest peaks in the Cascades after him, Lake Sylvester. Located straight south of Ladies Pass at the head of Grindstone Creek, Lake Sylvester overlooks Ladies Alice, which he had named for his wife in 1909.

Judy Bentley is a writer and historian whose book Hiking Washington’s History, published in 2010 by the University of Washington Press, includes Sylvester’s two-day naming spree near Ladies Pass.
Bartering with the Bones of Their Dead
The Colville Confederated Tribes and Termination
By Laurie Arnold. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2012; 208 pp., $56.00 hardcover, $24.95 paper.
Reviewed by Eleanor Carriere.

House Concurrent Resolution 108 passed both houses of Congress in 1953, but it never gained the widespread acceptance beyond the Washington, D.C., Beltway. Considered yet another “new approach” to the management (or mismanagement!) of federal–tribal affairs, HCR 108 called for the termination of federal–Indian stewardship, thereby allowing Native Americans to be held to the same laws and responsibilities as all American citizens while foregoing any perceived privileges they might have had. Under terms of the law, reservation land would be given a value and a lump sum payment would be paid to tribal members on a per capita basis. Congress made it sound simple, but it was not. Approximately 100 tribes were terminated under HCR 28, and each case was complicated and contentious. By 1958 most of the momentum for termination bills had vanished. But 1958 was too late for the Colville Confederated Tribes of Washington. Two years earlier they had received their notice to begin the process of termination. More than a century earlier the federal government had arbitrarily assembled a dozen tribes into the confederation and placed them on the Colville Reservation. Suddenly these disimilar peoples were supposed to work together to dissolve their status with the federal government? It would take until 1972. And that double-decade struggle is the story told by Laurie Arnold in the book under review. Here’s a member of the Arrow Lakes band of the Colville Tribes, Arnold objectively presents the arguments of the tribal members who aggressively sought termination. Status as a ward of the federal government, they said, held them back from success in white society. Moreover, the confederated tribes had been pushed together and had no genuine unity. Some Colvilles already lived “off the rez.”

The whole package, then, is one of unbiased scholarship in a readable format. The literature on termination as an Indian policy has been significantly enriched with this publication. Leaders from the National Congress of American Indians also weighed in with advice and a critique.

Nurturing their way through these difficult opinions could not have been easy for Arnold. Yet, at all times she is respectful of the tribal politicians who had to make decisions, while still relying on documentary evidence. Research for this book was completed at the National Archives and Records Commission in both Seattle and Washington, D.C., at the Newberry Library in Chicago, at the Huntington Library in San Marino, California, and in the special collections of Washington State University and Spokane Public Library. Among those who assisted Arnold, and thereby strengthened her conclusions, are well-known historians Robert Trennert and Peter Irons. The foreword consists of three sentences: “It is said Chief Joseph was allowed to preside over his daughter’s funeral and burial at Spalding. He returned to Nespelem and died three years later on September 21, 1904. The Apotheor doctor there said he probably ‘died of a broken heart.’”

Current & Noteworthy
By Robert Carriere, COLUMBIA Reviews Editor.

Twice nominated for the Pulitzer Prize for excellence in news photography, Associated Press cameraman Barry Sweet has pulled together his favorite images in Split Seconds: Four Decades of News Photography from the Pacific Northwest and Beyond (Kensmore, Wash.: Seattle Post-Intelligencer, 2012; 104 pp., $13.95 paper). The chapters are divided chronologically into decades (the 1960s, 1970s, and so on) and then subdivided into topics like Trial of the Seattle Seven, Pike Place Market, WTO Protests, etc. Outside the Pacific Northwest Sweet’s portfolio is a visual history textbook for the region. Sweet is adept at writing pithy sidebars for his photographs as he is at tripping a shutter. He thinks he did his best work in one-on-one situations. Photographing Dan Evans, Dey Lee Ray, and Gary Locke, he writes, was easy because there was a relationship between them in the days before they became state governors. The same is true of subjects like Dale Chihuly, Bill Gates, and Jacob Lawrence; Sweet knew them and photographed them before they became famous. In the foreword, he believes, people act differently. But sometimes groups are more fun because of the varied expressions.

At the beginning of his career, Sweet favored black and white photography. After the mid 1980s he began to use more color film. On some subjects he used both, carrying one camera loaded with color film and one with black and white. Pop singer Madonna, for example, was photographed in both mediums when Sweet covered the first stop—at Seattle’s Paramount Theatre—on her career-making Virgin Tour. Among other historic photographs is a mock-up of the proposed Boeing SST. Jimi Hendrix’s funeral in Renton, Mount St. Helens, the sinking floating bridge, the “Teapot Dome” gasoline station at Zillah, the troll under the Aurora Bridge, etc. Among other notable events. For most of his career, however, Sweet was based in Seattle and his portfolio is a visual history textbook for the region.

Sweet self-published Split Seconds, naming Seattle Post-Intelligencer, Raley Press after his wife, Raley Sweet. Ironically, all of the images in the book belong to Associated Press, so he had to buy the rights to publish them!
in the 1950s when testosterone-driven authors like James Jones and Norman Mailer dominated American fiction, it was difficult for a novelist like Patricia Campbell (1901–1976), author of seven historical novels set on the Olympic Peninsula and Puget Sound, to garner critical attention. Since then our views on gender, genre, and region have evolved, and it’s time to begin a critical reappraisal of Campbell’s work.

In The Dove and the Dart (1930), the matriarch of a wealthy New York family relocates her son and four daughters to a mansion she’s built on an island in Puget Sound. Her sense of position and refinement, however, is immediately challenged by island inhabitants, most pointedly by the captain of the Dart, one of two steamboats (based on the Mosquito Fleet) that serve the island. As the novel proceeds, Madame McIntosh exerts her influence on the island by plotting to bring ferry service to its shores. She also campaigns for a highway to connect the north and south ends of the island. She thereby ensures that even though “the rickish and windsworn lines of the Sound steamers...looked at home on the water, graceful as the gulls that followed them,” ferries like the Island Queen, “squarer ponde...
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Those who don’t know history are destined to repeat it.

—Edmund Burke
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