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Emily Peone and the Legend of Elk’s Abode at Steptoe Butte

By Richard D. Scheuerman and Clifford E. Trafzer

W e began making regular visits to the Colville Indian Reservation in 1979 through a public school program designed to introduce area teachers and students to tribal elders of the Moses-Columbia, Wenatchi, Nez Perce, and Snake River-Palouse Bands. Through these experiences we met the venerable Isabel Arcasu of Nespelem, a centenarian in Washington’s centennial year of 1989, who told about her early life at Camp Chelan as the daughter of frontier trader Joseph Friedlander and his Moses-Columbia wife, Elizabeth (Skiu-wheulks). During one of these field trips to see Isabel, she excused herself several times to check on someone working in the kitchen nearby, and after the second or third time we overheard Isabel address her guest as “Auntie.” When we asked about the visitor’s identity, Elizabeth laughed and led us into the kitchen where spyr, diminutive elderly Emily Friedlander Peone (1902–1994) was taking a berry pie out of the oven. As we talked about our special interests in the culture of the Columbia Plateau peoples, Emily informed us matter-of-factly that she was a daughter of both Chief Kamiakin and Chief Moses through her mother, Nellie Kamiakin Moses. In this way we were introduced to the marvelous legend of the Star Brothers, from whom Emily safeguarded these stories and her knowledge of the miyawaxpamá families’ complex lineages. Her kind spirit, uncommon knowledge, and berry pies kept us returning to Nespelem for many years and allowed us to host Emily on visits to our classrooms where she memorably shared about the traditions and vitality of her people.

Richard Scheuerman is associate professor of curriculum and instruction at Seattle Pacific University, where he has served since 2004. Clifford Trafzer, who is Rupert Costo Chair of American Indian Affairs at the University of California–Riverside, taught previously at Washington State University. They are coauthors of The Snake River-Palouse and the Invasion of the Inland Northwest (WSU Press, 2016) and River Song: Naxiyamt’ama (Snake River-Palouse) Oral Traditions (WSU Press, 2015), from which this article is excerpted, with the publisher’s permission.

Emily Peone and the Legend of Elk’s Abode at Steptoe Butte

“The Yámuštas—Elk’s Abode at Steptoe Butte” Retold by Emily Peone (1982)

In the time of the Animal People there was a big rack of antlers lying along Snake River. Coyote decided to have a contest of strength, and called for anyone to break them apart. Coyote and Eagle tried but couldn’t do it, and neither could the Wolf Brothers. Coyote tried with all his might but he couldn’t break them either. Finally Elk stepped forward. He grabbed both sides and pulled and pulled, and with a great crack broke them in two! So the Animal People celebrated in honor of Elk’s strength.

Now the Wolf Brothers lived along the river with their beautiful sister. The jealous brothers did not allow her to leave. She wanted to see the country. She saw Elk’s strength and heard his stories of other places. Elk noticed the beautiful Wolf Sister. Her brothers were too busy. The two left to be married upriver. When the Wolf Brothers found that Elk had taken their sister away, they were very angry. “We will kill him!”

Elk’s wife saw her brothers and wanted Elk to hide on an island. He took a pair of fur gloves she made and used his power to make them look like an elk. He went with his wife toward the mountains. The Wolf Brothers found only gloves….

Coyote spread out to hunt Elk, too far to reach the mountains. Elk pushed up the earth and he and his wife hide behind Yámuštas….

Elk’s bones can be found in this place, giant bones near the power mountain, Yámuštas.

SUMMER 2016
There were many battlefields in the war that raged nationally for the soul of the Republican Party from the opening “Goldwater for President” skirmishes in 1964 through Ronald Reagan’s nomination and election as president in 1980. In the state of Washington, one such fight pitted the supporters of liberal Governor Daniel J. Evans against the nascent conservative movement that initially included supporters of Barry Goldwater and later Ronald Reagan. This state parallel of the national GOP conflict fumed for almost 10 years, until conservatives triumphed in 1976.

This story, a small skirmish perhaps, is one that played out in state after state over the span of two decades. Three of the participants—Richard Derham, a delegate to the Washington State Republican Convention in 1968; Edward Lange, attorney for the Washington State Republican Party in 1966; and Fred Van Natta, Ronald Reagan’s western campaign manager in 1968—share their recollections of related events that took place some 45 years ago. This intraparty rivalry ultimately may have determined Richard Nixon’s nomination and election for president over Ronald Reagan in 1968.

In fall 1964 gubernatorial candidate Dan Evans walked a political tightrope as he watched conservative presidential candidate Barry Goldwater campaign. Evans, a direct descendant from a family that settled in Washington Territory in the 1850s, was an Eagle Scout and served in the US Navy after high school. As an engineer, he helped in the design of the Alaskan Way viaduct in his native Seattle. He was a state representative before running for governor in 1964.

Evans favored liberal policies, including instituting a state income tax. Although part of the liberal-moderate wing of the party, he agreed to join Goldwater at a campaign appearance in Spokane. With the aid of a local farmer, Evans was deftly able to position the farmer between Goldwater and himself so that press photographers were unable to get even a single photo of Evans next to Goldwater and thus provide campaign material for the Democrats.

Shortly after being elected governor in one of the few bright spots nationally for Republicans in 1964, Evans declared his intention of being a hands-on head of the party and formulating its direction. The opening round came with the election of King County Republican Party officers in December.

State party officials in Washington are elected by county precinct committee members, who are elected by the voters in each precinct in the general election. They are the grassroots activists, representing Republican voters in each local voting precinct. In King County in 1964, over 1,000 men and women elected the county chairman and elected the county’s two representatives to the state committee. Both the liberal and conservative wings of the party endeavored to have one of their own elected as county chair.

Governor-elect Evans’s choice for county chairman was a 29-year-old Boeing executive who had headed his recent successful campaign in one local Seattle district. The retiring incumbent chairman pushed instead for Ken Rogstad. Thirty-four-year-old Rogstad, also a Boeing engineer, had been active in the 1964 “Draft Goldwater” movement and had served as chairman of one Seattle district party organization. Additional support for Rogstad emanated from the party’s executive secretary, also a staunch conservative.

A December 9, 1964, Seattle Times article reported that the situation was “building up to a bitter fight” at the forthcoming county convention. The Evans group charged that the Rogstad slate was in “open defiance of the governor-elect” and was made up of “Goldwater supporters first and Republicans second.”
The intraparty rivalry climaxied on December 14, 1964, when the state Republican convention delegates voted. Rogstad nixed the Evans candidate by just eight votes, 505–497. Edward Lange—recall that Governor-elect Evans, who had been waiting outside and who heard the next speaker on the evening’s agenda, left abruptly. In victory, Rogstad said in a December 13, 1964, Times article, that control of the party organization should stem from “the grassroots up, not from the top down,” adding that he did not intend his remark as a jab at Evans.

After the 1964 reorganization meetings had been completed in each Washington county, the Republican state committee met to elect the party’s state chairman. While similar conservative victories had occurred in other key counties, Evans was more successful at his own effort; his own candidate was elected. Thus an organizational conflict was set up that continued until the next round of party organization meetings in 1966, setting the precedent for the contest that was to climax at the 1968 state convention.

ogstad and other conservative Republicans, such as Jim Munn—a former World War II pilot and prisoner of war, and new party attorney—continued their party-building activities and efforts to consolidate their victories. At the state level, the Evans forces did the same. By spring 1966, Rogstad’s forces were ascendant in King County, the Republican state party attorney—continued their party-control of the party organization, and was to be the next candidate for the governorship of California, marked his entrance onto the national political stage as a potential future candidate for the presidency. Rogstad then traveled east to Yakima for the state convention, where there was little inhaling. The seeming lack of racism was short-lived, however. In an August 9, 1966, Seattle Times article, Rogstad, still head of the Los Angeles County Republican party, charged that unnamed persons were “spreading false information at the precinct level in an effort to overturn the present county leadership.” Rogstad wanted party unity to make the Republicans the “majority party for the 1966 and future elections,” the article continued. Eyeing the continued attempts of Evans and Evans’s supporters to oust him, Rogstad noted, “None can be successful on behalf of a majority Republican Party without mutual understanding and cooperation. The party itself is larger than the personal ambitions of any of its members.” Any such personal ambitions “must not be made a tool for individuals to further their own ambitions at the expense of Republican unity.”

And whose personal ambitions might Rogstad have hinted at? An August 18, 1966, Seattle Times op-ed article explained that ever since Rogstad had won his county chairmanship in 1964, Governor Evans had been “miffed.” Intraparty fighting was “erupting into smoky ‘James juts’ just at the critical time before the 1966 elections as Evans’s supporters filed ‘hundreds’ of candidacy for precinct committee members in order to seat Rogstad. The Evans group said they wanted to purge their party of John Birch Society members. Governor Evans had been “miffed.” Intraparty fighting was “erupting into smoky ‘James juts’ just at the critical time before the 1966 elections as Evans’s supporters filed ‘hundreds’ of candidacy for precinct committee members in order to seat Rogstad. The Evans group said they wanted to purge their party of John Birch Society members. Governor Evans had been “miffed.” Intraparty fighting was “erupting into smoky ‘James juts’ just at the critical time before the 1966 elections as Evans’s supporters filed ‘hundreds’ of candidacy for precinct committee members in order to seat Rogstad. The Evans group said they wanted to purge their party of John Birch Society members. Governor Evans had been “miffed.” Intraparty fighting was “erupting into smoky ‘James juts’ just at the critical time before the 1966 elections as Evans’s supporters filed ‘hundreds’ of candidacy for precinct committee members in order to seat Rogstad. The Evans group said they wanted to purge their party of John Birch Society members. Governor Evans had been “miffed.”
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for their officers. Unlike the eight-vote margin achieved by Rogstad two years earlier, this time he won by a convincing 778–658 margin, thus handing the victory to the Republican Party. Rogstad’s triumph, reported Herb Robinson in the Seattle Times, had “climaxed a struggle for control of the local GOP apparatus that had its beginning two years ago.” Party workers indeed felt that Rogstad deserved “at least some of the credit” for the party’s recent success and did not want to oust an incumbent party chairman. For Governor Evans, the defeat of his personal choice was another “undenably hard blow.”

Edward Lange, attorney for the Washington State Republican Party at the time, recalled that state rules were subsequently adopted to prohibit any appointed party officers being made delegates automatically, rather than via elections by precinct caucuses. The new rules had major importance for 1968. As the 1968 local, county, and state Republican conventions approached, delegates through a three-level caucus convention process: precinct-level and district-level caucuses, the state convention, and the national convention.

On the first Tuesday of March, tens of thousands of voters statewide gathered to participate in the precinct caucuses of their preferred party. After discussions on issues and the nomination of delegates, the votes were counted to the next level up. At those higher district or county level conventions or conventions, the 24 delegates to the Washington State Republican Convention would be elected. Dick Derham, a Nixon supporter and witness to the events about to unfold, was elected as one of the delegates representing his Seattle precinct.

At Harvard, Derham had been president of Students for Nixon and helped form the Harvard chapter of the conservative group Young Americans for Freedom. After graduating from Columbia Law School, Derham served as an infantry officer in West Germany. There he had limited contact with political developments back home and was only dimly aware of Reagan’s rising popularity. He remained a Nixon supporter, and Nixon was his candidate of choice. On May 5, 1968, the delegates who had been in favor of Nixon to that point were working to name Nixon as their preference. Derham is certain that some would have identified themselves with Rockefeller and some Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference. Derham was elected to the state convention delegation. Nixon the most conservative of the official candidates. Had a district candidate for state delegate announced, “I am for Reagan,” Derham says he felt that the votes of both Rockefeller and many Nixon supporters and risked losing election as a delegate. Everyone was therefore advised to name Nixon as their preference.
The Republican state convention was held June 21–22, 1968, at theSeattle Center Arena. Detham clearly recalls what happened next. At any political convention, the first order of business is to determine who, in fact, is entitled to participate and vote in the convention. That is achieved by adoption of the credentials committee’s report, often a minor formality. In 1968 in Seattle, however, the credentials debate was the central and crucial order of business. How it was resolved would determine whether the convention was dominated by the liberal Evans forces or the conservatives.

In 1968, King, Pierce, Snohomish, and Spokane Counties had in aggregate a majority of the state population and a majority of delegates elected to the state convention. All were under the control of the 1964 conservative activists, thus all four counties elected solid conservative delegations to the state convention. They should have been a majority at the state convention. If some or all were not seated, however, control of the convention was at stake. As it turned out, by carefully structuring the report, the credentials committee transformed an apparent conservative majority into a clear liberal majority. The committee did not place any of the four challenged county delegates on the temporary roll, so none was permitted to participate in the debate or the vote that ensued. Moreover, the credentials committee recommended seating a challenged delegation from King County and placing its members on the temporary roll, enabling them to vote on the challenges to Pierce and Snohomish Counties. Finally, the credentials committee arranged its report so that King County, having one-third of the entire total convention votes, would be voted on last and could not participate in the crucial credentials votes.

The convention then proceeded to adopt the report of the credentials committee, paragraph by paragraph, seeing “alternative” delegations for two of the contested counties and a split delegation for the third. Only after those county delegations had been seated and the credentials committees had thus achieved solid control did the convention reach the recommendations of the credentials committee, whereinop it proceeded to confirm the King County membership on the understanding that the goal had been to control but not exclude King County and Rogstad.

The high drama was not over. Prior to the challenge of Pierce County, the three unseated conservative county delegations from Pierce, Spokane, and Snohomish then teamed with Ken Rogstad and his team to decide what to do next. One option was to just go home. Another idea was to hold a separate renegade party convention—"a rump convention"—just for those four counties, electing delegates to the national convention who would challenge the "official" slate of delegates, contending that they represented the true majority of delegates elected by the grassroots to the state conventions. A separate convention hall had even been arranged for that purpose. However, Ken Rogstad and others from the King County delegation decided to stay in the official convention. That way they could at least send their 6 Reagan delegates to Miami Beach from the two congressional districts located primarily within King County and whose delegates would be returned to the state Republican National Convention or district caucuses rather than by the convention at-large. Reagan’s forces had succeeded in dominating the convention.

As it turned out, the credentials committee transformed an apparent conservative majority into a clear liberal majority. The committee did not place any of the four challenged county delegates on the temporary roll, so none was permitted to participate in the debate or the vote that ensued. Moreover, the credentials committee recommended seating a challenged delegation from King County and placing its members on the temporary roll, enabling them to vote on the challenges to Pierce and Snohomish Counties. Finally, the credentials committee arranged its report so that King County, having one-third of the entire total convention votes, would be voted on last and could not participate in the crucial credentials votes.

The convention then proceeded to adopt the report of the credentials committee, paragraph by paragraph, seeing “alternative” delegations for two of the contested counties and a split delegation for the third. Only after those county delegations had been seated and the credentials committees had thus achieved solid control did the convention reach the recommendations of the credentials committee, whereinop it proceeded to confirm the King County membership on the understanding that the goal had been to control but not exclude King County and Rogstad.

The high drama was not over. Prior to the challenge of Pierce County, the three unseated conservative county delegations from Pierce, Spokane, and Snohomish then teamed with Ken Rogstad and his team to decide what to do next. One option was to just go home. Another idea was to hold a separate renegade party convention—"a rump convention"—just for those four counties, electing delegates to the national convention who would challenge the "official" slate of delegates, contending that they represented the true majority of delegates elected by the grassroots to the state conventions. A separate convention hall had even been arranged for that purpose. However, Ken Rogstad and others from the King County delegation decided to stay in the official convention. That way they could at least send their 6 Reagan delegates to Miami Beach from the two congressional districts located primarily within King County and whose delegates would be returned to the state Republican National Convention or district caucuses rather than by the convention at-large. Reagan’s forces had succeeded in dominating the convention.

As it turned out, the credentials committee transformed an apparent conservative majority into a clear liberal majority.
A Stop in Skokomish

Basket weaver “Skokomish Linner” with two of her creations. The one on the far left is a soft-woven basket traditionally used to store clothing and small household items. On her lap she holds an open-weave basket of the type used to gather foodstuffs. Tourists liked to purchase baskets like these, providing an additional source of income for the local women. Photographer Asahel Curtis noted only the woman’s name and the year the photograph was taken—1905. He was travelling through the Skokomish Reservation in Mason County, along the Skokomish River delta, when he stopped to capture this image.

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 (253/798-5917 or edward.nolan@wshs.wa.gov). To purchase a photo reproduction of an image in the Society’s collection, visit WashingtonHistory.org, then click on Research and Collections.

Fred Shiosaki of Spokane is a veteran of the storied 442nd Regimental Combat Team, one of the most decorated units in US Army history. The all-volunteer unit of Japanese American soldiers received 21 Medals of Honor and nearly 10,000 Purple Hearts during savage combat with Hitler’s most battle-hardened troops.

It was December 7, 1941, a cold, gray Sunday in Spokane. Fred Shiosaki, a high school senior, was doing his homework and listening to the radio. Shortly before noon an announcer broke in with a news bulletin that turned his world upside down. “Hey, Pop,” Fred called out to his father, who ran the laundry below their tiny apartment. “The Japanese have attacked Hawaii!”

Kisaburo Shiosaki was at first skeptical. Then, as more details came in, he predicted, “It’s not going to last long.” By suppertime, however, with the Japanese reportedly advancing everywhere in the Pacific, Fred remembers that his parents were visibly shaken. What would happen to their family now?

ABOVE: Fred Shiosaki as a 19-year-old infantryman in 1943. RIGHT: Fred, now nearing 92, can still fit into his old uniform.
The five Shiosaki children were United States citizens, second-generation Nisei. But Kisaburo and his wife Tori were Issei—immigrants who could not even own real estate. Now they all lived in the face of the enemy in a city that was 99.1 percent white.

“A Jap’s a Jap,” said General John L. DeWitt, commander of the US Army’s Western Defense Command. “It makes no difference whether he’s an American citizen or not. I don’t want any of them here.” Some 120,000 American Japanese were sent to concentration camps.

The Shiosaki, by virtue of living east of the Cascades, were allowed to stay in Spokane, but they sent two sons into combat. Staff Sergeant Fred Akira Shiosaki, whose story this is, won a Bronze Star and Purple Heart with the US Army’s 442nd Regimental Combat Team. Composed of Japanese American volunteers from Hawaii and the mainland, the “Go for Broke” 442nd is one of the most decorated units in American military history. 21 Medals of Honor and nearly 10,000 Purple Hearts. Its rescue of the “Lost Battalion,” an infantry outfit surrounded by Germans, is legendary for good reason. Shiosaki’s outfit pushed ahead through murderous machine-gun and artillery fire. “Chills went up our spines when we saw the Nisei soldiers,” one grateful black GI said. Though their average height was only five feet three inches, “honestly, they looked like giants to us.”

It is said that war is hell. Shiosaki was there and back. Today, nearing 92, Fred is a slightly stooped old infantryman with lovely manners, an infectious laugh, and a good memory, though there are some things he would like to forget. Fred shakes his head over the friends he lost and rails at the “stupid sonofabitch” generals on both sides who saw young men as expendable. “Dogface GIs like us could sympathize with the German soldiers. They were living like animals, just like us. You dig a hole; you’re wet all day, cold all night, then you get up and shoot some kid your own age.”

Shiosaki is such a gentle, well-spoken man that when his jaws clench and profanity emerges like a laugh, you know you’re hearing the authentic voice of the GIs who were doing the dying.

Stories abound in the stories of the Japanese Americans who fought the Nazis and Imperial Japan while back home their fathers, mothers, brothers, and sisters were living in tar paper huts at desolate camps ringed with barbed wire and guard towers. The “relocation center” plan was authorized by a president who in his 1941 State of the Union Address pledged “the preservation of civil liberties for all.” Earl Warren, the California attorney general who pushed for internment, went on to become chief justice of the United States Supreme Court that unanimously struck down state-sanctioned racism—segregated schools.

There were only 276 Japanese in Spokane in 1941. Fifty-five percent were young American-born Nisei like Shiosaki, who was 17 when America entered World War II. Eighty-two percent of Washington’s 14,500 Japanese lived in King and Pierce counties along Puget Sound. Thousands of Issei immigrant elders had left behind a homeland of peasanthood and upheaval only to find themselves tending truck farms on leased land. “My father’s story,” Fred Shiosaki says, “is really an American saga.”

Kisaburo Shiosaki—the “z” was changed to an “s” by mistake in America—left Japan in 1904 when he turned 21. “As the No. 3 son of a tenant farmer, my father stood no chance of inheriting anything,” Fred says, “so he indentured himself to a company that imported thousands of Japanese boys with strong backs and weak minds to lay railroad track in the Northwest.” Nearly 26,000 Japanese came to Washington between 1899 and 1910.

Though his formal education ended with the equivalent of fourth grade, Kisaburo did not have a weak mind. And his ambition was even stronger than his back. When Spokane’s grand Davenport Hotel opened in 1914, Kisaburo landed a full-time job as a busboy. What he needed now, at 31, was a wife. A determined looking young man with a shock of coarse black hair, he sailed home to Japan. “Find me a bride,” he told his family. Soon, in a neighboring village, he was introduced to 18-year-old Tori Iwaii, a classic Japanese beauty.

The newlyweds rented a tiny apartment in Hilliard, the blue-collar rail yard town northeast of downtown Spokane. In 1915, when Shiosaki and two partners opened a hand laundry a half-block from the Great Northern tracks, Hilliard had grown to some 4,000 residents. Kisaburo shortly became sole proprietor of the Hilliard Laundry. He worked 16-hour days to make it thrive. Gallingly, he could not own the property or become a naturalized citizen. Federal exclusion laws targeting Asian immigrants—the “yellow peril” to white jobs and Anglo-Saxon nativism—saw to that.

The first three Shiosaki children arrived in quick succession: George in 1917, Blanche in 1919, and Roy in 1920. Fred was born in 1924—the year Hilliard was annexed to Spokane—and Floyd in 1927. In Hilliard everyone knew the Shiosakis. They starched shirts, laundered bed sheets, and somehow got the grease out of railroad work clothes. The kids helped out after school from an early age, doing homework between chopping wood for the boiler and folding sheets. “You were to do well in school so you could go to college,” Fred says emphatically.

Gloom descended on the Shiosaki apartment as the radio crackled with the news that Pearl Harbor was awash in oily death and destruction. “I didn’t go to school that Monday,” Fred remembers. “My mother insisted that we return on Tuesday. I felt so conspicuous. My friends were still my friends. I was on the
track team at Rogers High School and active in clubs, but some of my classmates were now standoffish. No one beat me up or...
Shelby, Mississippi, undergoing rigorous combat training. The Hawaiians' 100th Infantry Battalion would function as the First Battalion of the 442nd Regimental Combat Team. Fred Akita Shiosaki now had his chance to fight for his country. He enlisted on August 14, 1943, and turned nineteen days later. The next 24 months were the most tumultuous of a long, eventful life.

By late September 1944, after absorbing 1,200 casualties in Italy, the 442nd was in Marseille. The Mediterranean port had been liberated a month earlier in the "second D-Day" invasion of occupied France. From there, by troop truck and French cattle cars, the Nisei soldiers advanced up the Rhone valley. The first objective was Bruyères on the western edge of the Vosges Mountains. Just beyond Bruyères lay Saint-Dié, the gateway to three passes beyond Bruyères on the western edge of the Vosges Mountains. Just before Bruyères lies Saint-Dié, the gateway to three passes. The Texans, who had been in combat for 70 consecutive days, were running low on food, water, plasma, ammunition, and hope.

Shiosaki remembers being rousted out at three in the morning and struggling to advance in a pitch-black night. "Finally, when it broke light there was small arms fire. And then came the artillery!" The fog was so dense there was no hope of air support or supply drops; the roads were too narrow for tanks to traverse, he said:

The Japanese American soldiers were assigned to the 36th "Texas" Division of the US Seventh Army. Their new commander, Major General John E. Dahlquist, was a big Swede from Minnesota who won nothing but their undying loyalty. Nearly fired for foot-dragging earlier in the campaign, "Dahlquist should have been court-martialed," Shiosaki says, eyes glistening with anger, "and if we hadn't saved his ass he would have been!"

Ignoring reconnaissance reports to the contrary, the general insisted the Germans had largely abandoned four strategic hills. When a Nisei battalion radioed it was taking heavy fire as it advanced, Dahlquist purported that they were "a bunch of damn liars." Just get the lead out. Shiosaki remembers, "He kept insisting, 'There are no Krauts up there!'"

So off they went, chanting up slippery hills under withering interlocking fire in the icy October rain. Comrades crumpled right and left, crying out for medics and their mothers as artillery shells burst through the canopy of 60-foot evergreens; machine guns chattered, mortar shells whooshed down; shrapnel and pine-tree splinters as lethal as crossbow bolts slammed into soldiers. Darting from tree to tree, some men stepped on mines or had legs crushed by booby traps in the underbrush. It was a jungle in there, especially when eerie fog smothered the slopes. As the 442nd crested one hill, medics in tow, the Germans opened fire on wounded men on stretchers.

After nine days of relentless combat, Dahlquist granted the Nisei soldiers a 10-day rest break that was canceled less than two days later. The general was in a jam. He had ordered the Texans' First Battalion to advance deeper into the Vosges. The Germans—the ones the general insisted weren't there—sprang a trap. They encircled a company of 215 soldiers on a narrow ridge, felling huge trees to block escape routes. Dahlquist called in the Nisei. Without them, "The Lost Battalion" might have met its Alamo in the primaval mountains along the French-German border. The Texans, who had been in combat for 70 consecutive days, were running low on food, water, plasma, ammunition, and hope.

Shiosaki remembers being rousted out at three in the morning and struggling to advance in a pitch-black night. "Finally, when it broke light there was small arms fire. And then came the artillery!" The fog was so dense there was no hope of air support or supply drops; the roads were too narrow for tanks to traverse, he said:

We'd move about 100 yards, losing men with every yard. We did that for about four days. Every morning the general would come in and jab us. I'd see him up there arguing with our colonel. He'd be yelling, "There's a battalion about to die up there!" I thought it was going to end up in fisticuffs because our colonel was yelling, "We cannot move until you give us more artillery support!"

Lieutenant Colonel Alfred Pursall, the battalion commander, was a blunt Midwesterner who stood 6'5" and weighed at least 250 pounds. Pursall was a fighter. He revered his Nisei soldiers for their courage, and the feeling was mutual.

On October 29, 1944, the third day of the rescue mission, Shiosaki's K Company went into the Vosges with 186 men and came out with 17. "I looked around and said, 'Goddamn, this is all we have left?""

K Company went into the Vosges with 186 men and came out with 17. "I looked around and said, 'Goddamn, this is all we have left? Some of those guys had saved my skin and I'm pretty sure I saved some of theirs," Shiosaki says. "So we were really blood brothers. How do you mourn when you lose five guys in your platoon? You're just numb. I cried inside."

When the shooting suddenly stops, "it's so quiet it's a roar," Shiosaki remembers. "The silence is deafening. He
While the heroism of the 442nd was saluted by President Truman, Japanese American soldiers returned home to indifference at best, outright hostility at worst.

Fred Shiosaki: The Rescue of the Lost Battalion

In January 1890, Dr. Edward H. Latham (1845–1928) accepted the position of surgeon on the Colville Reservation in northeastern Washington. A talented amateur photographer, Latham photographed hundreds of Indians throughout his tenure on the reservation, including Chief Joseph of the Nez Perce and Chief Moses of the Columbia. By the time he retired in 1910, Latham had created a rich legacy of photographs documenting individuals and activities on the Colville Reservation. The Society recently added 42 of Latham’s glass and film negatives to its holdings. To see them all, visit Collections.WashingtonHistory.org and type “Latham” in the search box.

Edward H. Latham on the Colville Reservation

John C. Hughes, author of seven books on Northwest history, is the chief historian for Legacy Washington, the Washington Secretary of State’s oral history program. This article is excerpted from Fred Shiosaki: The Rescue of the Lost Battalion, a profile in the Legacy Washington series.

Fred Shiosaki: The Rescue of the Lost Battalion

While the heroism of the 442nd was saluted by President Truman, Japanese American soldiers returned home to indifference at best, outright hostility at worst.

Fred Shiosaki: The Rescue of the Lost Battalion

While the heroism of the 442nd was saluted by President Truman, Japanese American soldiers returned home to indifference at best, outright hostility at worst.
In 1912, Solomon and Rebecca Beck were among two Seattle-area Wobblies who were targeted and arrested by the IWW. Their involvement in the strike was seen as significant, with the IWW exploiting their weakness. The strike in terms of IWW ideology was part of a larger movement to organize workers by industry, rather than by trade. The slogan also referred to the ideal of a future world completely without power in the hands of the workers.
A Jewish aid society in England had contacted the Council of Jewish Women in New York in March 1912, asking for assistance in tracking down Solomon because his wife and four children had been left destitute in England. They forwarded the request to local Jewish aid society alerting the Department of Commerce and Labor Immigration Services. The initial report accused Solomon not only of abandoning his family in England but also of bringing Beck into the country for immoral purposes. The local authorities then requested warrants for their arrest and proceeded to prosecute them for anarchist beliefs and immoral activities. Under the 1903 Immigration Act, also known as the Anarchist Exclusion Act, the United States Congress prohibited the following groups from admission to the country:

- Aliens, insane persons, epileptics . . .
- Puppets
- Persons likely to become a public charge, professional beggars, persons affected with a loathsome or with a dangerous contagious disease . . .
- Persons who have been convicted of a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude; polygamists, anarchists, or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow of force or violence of the Government of the United States or of all government or of all forms of law, or the assassination of public officials; prostitutes, and persons who procure or attempt to bring in prostitutes or women for the purpose of prostitution . . .

This meant that both Solomon and Beck either had to proclaim during their 1912 testimonies that they were not members of any of these groups or risk being deported.

The Anarchist Exclusion Act applied to persons trying to enter the country as well as those who had made it through the initial screening but were found to belong to one of the listed categories within three years of their arrival. Initially, Seattle's Jewish aid society accused Beck and Solomon of entering the country together in 1911, which would put them within that three-year time frame.

To maintain their innocence, Beck and Solomon had to prove three things: that Beck was not a prostitute, that they had not been involved in any immoral activity, and that they were not anarchists. As the charges were both moral and political, they were questioned along both of those lines. Solomon and Beck denied being anarchists but admitted membership in the IWW.

In her interview with officials Beck denied a belief in the overthrow of the government by violence. After she admitted that she had studied philosophical anarchy, she was questioned about her exact beliefs. She said that, rather than government overthrow by force, she believed in “intelligence and betterment of humanity through the mind.” When asked if she thought it was possible that people could become so intelligent that government would no longer be necessary, she replied, “It is a dream of mine; I don’t know whether it will ever come true, but it is a dream.”

They established early on in the hearings that Beck had entered the country prior to Solomon and therefore he was not guilty of bringing her into the country to prositute. He could, however, still be guilty of violating the Mann Act, which was punishable by a fine of up to $5,000 and/or five years imprisonment. The Mann Act was passed in 1910 to curb what was termed “white slavery,” young girls forced into prostitution against their will. While the intent of the White Slave Traffic Act, it aimed to convict those who took women across state lines to practice prostitution against their will. But the legal wording of the act gave it much broader scope, and it was rare to find cases that actually involved coercion.

Section Two of the law prohibited interstate transport of women for “prostitution or debauchery, or for any other immoral purpose.” “Immoral” is not a legally defined term, which left it to local officials to decide which acts could be considered unlawful. Officials typically deemed immoral any kind of implied sexual activity outside of the bonds of marriage. Whether or not sex actually took place was usually the issue. In the case of Solomon and Beck, who were consenting adults, their immoral activity constituted living together as man and wife when they were not legally defined as such.

The case against Solomon and Beck centered on a move the pair made to Ketchikan, Alaska. Solomon denied that the two had ever lived together as man and wife or been known as Mr. and Mrs. Solomon. He reported that he had lived in the same house as Beck and her brother, but that was all. In order to violate the Mann Act, Solomon would have had to prove for Beck’s transport to Alaska. The evidence supplied to prove this was a money order in the amount of $10, made out to Becky Soloman and signed by Jack Solomon in Alaska in May 1911. Both argued that the check was actually repayment of a loan. While the investigation Solomon during the investigation, the immigration agents asserted that Beck had admitted to living with Solomon as man and wife in her earlier interview. Solomon stated that she had given the wrong answer and that it was never true. In Beck’s second examination she denied ever living with Solomon as his wife in Seattle but said that they “were a ‘pleasure couple’ together but nothing more had happened.”

The other evidence used against Beck was a set of photographs. A few of them were made photos of her taken, she said, around the time she came to the United States. She denied that she had given them to anyone or that they were made to be distributed for profit. When asked why she took them, she explained...
that she wanted to remember what she looked like as a young woman.

In the findings of her examination Beck was described as “of good physique” and “above the average intelligence.” But the agents found her to be morally deficient, as evidenced by “her relations with men, her false statements during the examination, and the fact of her having made rude photographs taken of herself.” This plus her admitted relationship with Saunders and the alleged relationship with Pease was enough to convince the agent that she should be placed “in a class of immoral women generally and commonly known as prostitutes.” Even though several character witnesses testified on her behalf, they “impressed the agent very unfavorably as they are all persons imbued with the same beliefs, ignorant and uneducated . . .”

As evidence of the political nature of the case, Coleman noted that the inspector refused to name the “local source” of the report alleging that Beck and Solomon were involved in anarchism and prostitution. Coleman believed the anonymous informants were the business owners whose workers had struck, and that they filed the report in an effort to remove the two from the center of agitation and strike activity. Further, Beck had testified that the inspector initially questioned her about the strike, which proved to Coleman that he had previous communication with the employers of the striking workers. Coleman was not alone in his belief that the immigration service was being used to agitate and strike leaders. Shortly after Beck and Solomon’s arrest, a petition was filed on their behalf that tied the arrest to their participation in the strike.

The undersigned citizens and residents of Seattle, being convinced that a great wrong is being done to Jack Solomon (accused of immoral purposes and deportable, and Becky Beck by arresting and detaining them for deportation, and being convinced that the Immigration Officers are colored by false information given by interested parties for the purpose of breaking the strike by the B&SS Tamers, which strike they are leading, respectfully petition the Honorable Secretary, to order the immediate release of said Jack Solomon and Becky Beck from custody.

The petition carried over 700 signatures. That and Coleman’s letter worked, and on July 11, 1912, Acting Secretary of Commerce and Labor Benjamin S. Cable informed DeBruler that, after careful review, Cable found that the facts did not justify deportation, though he “regrets that such is the case.” At that point Solomon was released and Beck’s bond was returned. After the accusations by Coleman that the warrant was actually based on involvement in the strike, Cable wrote to Samuel Gompers, president of the AFL, to assure him that the arrest was not related to the strike, and that not enough evidence had been provided to warrant deportation.

For many cases involving women in similar situations, it is difficult to document their subsequent actions. Becky Beck, however, lived a long life and continued to be an activist into the 1970s. In a 1973 interview, Beck referred to Solomon as her first husband and mentioned that she had a child with him in 1912, which died shortly after birth. When the interviewer asked Beck for the date of her marriage to Solomon, she replied that there was a common-law marriage recognized by the State of Washington. Given Beck’s admission, it appears that both Beck and Solomon lied about their relationship in order to avoid deportation based on morality issues.

Jack Solomon became a US citizen in Juneau, Alaska, in 1917. His World War II draft registration card listed his residence as Nome, and in red ink says “deceased, August 3, 1942,” written on it. He was listed as unmarried when he became a citizen. Becky Beck married Benjamin August in Seattle around 1916–17. After about a year they relocated to New York but returned to Seattle to help organize the 1919 general strike. Beck subsequently lived in the Bay Area and then Los Angeles. She left her husband in 1931 and moved to Home Colony. In a 1974 interview she noted that she still belonged to the International League for Peace and Freedom, founded by Jane Addams. She ended the interview by proclaiming her motto: “Down with hatred! Love to all mankind!” Beck, at that time known as Rebecca August, died in 1978.

The frequent references to Solomon and Beck as members of a “free love cult” intimates that not only did they want to transform industrial labor and the relationship between workers and employers, they also wanted to transform familial relationships. The vague wording of morality laws provided one possible means for prosecutors to stifle radical although not illegal activities in the workplace—by attacking the private lives of those involved.

Heather Mayer is a Notary Instructor and Teaching Learning Center coordinator at Portland Community College. She received her PhD in history from Simon Fraser University, with a dissertation focused on women and the Industrial Workers of the World in Oregon and Washington.
I n 1935, in the leftist magazine New Masses, editor Mick Gold called for "proletarian realism" to replace the "bourgeois themes of writers like F. Scott Fitzgerald with "their subtleties, their sentimentality, and their fine-spun fai-
ther. He proclaimed that "proletarian realism deals with the real conflicts of men and women who work for a living . . . that the suffering of hunger, per-
severated, and heroic millions is enough theme for anyone." Over the course of the 1930s, a handful of Northwest au-
thors answered Gold's call with novels that together spanned the progress of organized labor from its early militancy to collective bargaining and union shops. Each of the novels was set in Grays Harbor, the heart of Washington's logging industry. The novel by which these novels has been Lamber (1931) by Louis Colman, who worked in a mill in Aberdeen. It follows Jimmy Logan from childhood, when his father dies in a logging accident, to his own death in a mill three decades later. After drifting about for several years, Jim-
my marries and buys a house. Keeping a steady job and earning enough, though, are dif-
cult in the boom-or-bust economy. So he joins the Industrial Workers of the World, initially believing in their cause. He refuses to work in any strikes, even as he witnesses brutal repri-
sals against fellow workers who do. Then, when personal tragedy strikes, he comes undone, leading to a senseless fight that sends him into the blade of a saw.

Likewise, many novels, Lamber ends fortuitously, with nothing gained. Should Jimmy have gotten more in-
involved, when all he wanted was to keep his family safe and fed! Furthermore, he
worked in his town: "The strikes and groans of saws; the impatience of pickpockets on metal rolls; the rumble of the castgings; the dump sawdust-laden air; the tide
flats under the lumber docks, giving out their salt reek; the odor of pitch in the burners; the continuous rain, and
the everlasting rush to get one more log through before whistle blow—he revolved to
all these." This is a combina-
tion of facts, on top of the hardships of being underemployed and
underpaid, that left him so enraged.

By 1935, when Marching! Marching! appeared, the National Industrial
Recovery Act (NIRA) was in ef-
fect and unions were gaining traction. Author Clara Weatherwax came from a well-to-do family in
Aberdeen that had fallen on hard times. Her novel, which won the New Masses prize for a proletarian novel, combines Modernist tech-
niques and Soviet-style agit-
prop. It depicts union efforts to organize the logging industry from the woods to the waterfront, following a cast of labor activists, including Filipino and Finnish immigrants, fighting for safer working conditions, fair wages, and
workplace dignity.

Many scenes in Marching! Marching! occur in Nick's Place, a dockside tavern where the floor is "pitted by calls and stained with spit, mud, and drink, in the rich brown layer of years." It's the
unsanctioned union hall. Through a collage of dialogue, Weatherwax presents a col-
lectivist view of events, including plans for a mass meeting to call for a general strike. She then adopts a version of John Dos Passos's "Newsreel" tech-
nique, from his U.S.A. trilo-
y, and recounts the strike through clippings, bulletins, and leaflets. Throughout the novel, she graphically de-
describes the "terrorism" used to put down union mem-
ers: slander, beatings, house raids, arrests, andlynchings. The novel closes ominously with a first-person, present-
tense account of unarmed workers marching toward a force of riot police and
private militia.

By 1939, even with the Supreme Court having declared the NIRA un-
constitutional, unions began to solidify their place in the workforce. Nonethe-
less, industry continued its efforts to un-
dermine them. In Duhhlan (1939), co-
author Ben H. Cochrane and William Dean Coldiron, who had also worked in
mills in Aberdeen, portray both sides through union organizer Harry Mooney and
ccompany man Bill Jackson.

Harry is the model organizer: smart, even-
banded, and determined. He's rank-and-file him-
self, so he communicates well with his workers. He keeps their morale up and makes sure the
picket line holds, even under the intimidation of
hit strikebreakers like
the thuggish Tanker Jones. Harry also
understands economies and can break
down the company's annual profits by
stockholder dividends, facility improve-
ments, surplus funds, and worker wages, which makes him a civic negotiator.

Bill is middle management and wants to rise in the company. The exhaus-
tive salary advances he takes to pay the medical expenses of his seriously ill wife
double bind him to the company. So he does everything the bigot-smiling mill superinten-
dent asks him to, including
hiring Tanker Jones and planting agita-
tors among the strikers to justify calling in the National Guard. When these measures fail, the mill owners recruit a new superintendent, who brings with him a German henchman. "Und varet der nub." In other words, German asks a
response to a safety complaint, and then blames the injured worker.

The new superintendent, meanwhile, instructs Bill in the Mohawk Valley Plan (1937), which entails vigilantism against union members and establishing a com-
pany union to rival the real union. After
Bill succeeds in these tactics, however,
the new superintendent suddenly fires him, which forces Bill to seek out his old
nemesis, Harry Moore, for help. Harry
persuades Bill to change sides, and two
weeks later Bill is on the team presenting the union contract to the superinten-
dent, which includes rehiring him. The
superintendent signs it, and the union leaders triumphantly "stepped out into the sunlight."

Mixing politics and art can be a fraught undertaking, and only a few proletarian novels pull it off effectively, including Robert
Cantwell's The Land of Plenty (1939, see Columbia, Winter 2015) and Duhhlan are
propagandistic in their leftist world-
view. They're also vividly realistic in depicting the struggle of workers in the Northwest logging industry between the two
world wars. For both reasons, all three are noteworthy.
Walking Washington's History
Ten Cities
Reviewed by Ronald Scheick.

In Walking Washington’s History: Ten Cities, Judith Bentley argues that to “know” the history of a city requires that one sense the city. Bentley explains that urban knowledge comes from walking its paths, feeling the ground underfoot, and seeing the built environment. To assist readers in truly knowing the history of the region, Bentley has designed guided walking tours of important sections of urban landscapes within 10 of Washington’s most historically significant cities.

Bentley introduces each city with a concise history, explaining its significance to Washington. She then provides maps for central loop walking tours, which not only contain the buildings and sights along the way but also mark convenient amenities such as parking locations and public restrooms. There are physical addresses for those keen on using location devices. After each map, Bentley offers a narrative on the historical elements along the route, with buildings and sights set in bold type. Additional walking tours, not part of the central loop, are included for some of the cities.

As a student of public history, I felt I could not review this book without testing Bentley’s theory. Since I am familiar with Spokane’s history, it appeared the perfect choice for supplementing my understanding of the region while providing a solid background from which to gauge the author’s perception. Skeptical that I would learn anything about Spokane’s past by taking the walking tour, I was pleasantly surprised. Bentley—experienced guide and author of Hiking Washington’s History (2010)—opened my mind.

As I stood at the ground level of the Davenport Hotel—a building I had seen a thousand times before—getting a terra-cotta side and gazing up at the intricate carvings brought years of experience to decipher its past, will enjoy the insights that Bentley offers. With the treks capping at seven miles and most of them being far shorter, the guided tour for any city takes only a few hours. It is helpful to read through the tour before heading off into the wild urban frontier, if for no other reason than safety. However, the book is a fantastic travel companion for exploring Washington’s urban landscape. A companion mobile app would be a welcome addition, as carrying the book may be burdensome; but regardless, Bentley’s work is exquisite.

Ronald Scheick is a public historian from Spokane. His graduate program included work in both history and anthropology at Eastern Washington University.

Ancient Places
People and Landscapes in the Emerging Northwest
Reviewed by Amy Canfield.

In the opening story of the book under review, author Jack Nisbet discusses different perspectives—spawning time, especially a hunter’s space—regarding the “mystery” of the legend of the lights of the aurora in Manitoba. At the end of the chapter, Nisbet writes, “The best any observer can hope for is to hold on and try to take it all in.” No more fitting words can be written about Nisbet’s book as a whole.

Ancient Places is a collection of stories that portrays the diversity of experiences and views in the Northwest. Nisbet’s topics and the way he approaches them reveal an interdisciplinary element that is often lacking in traditional histories. His examination of thwarting ants and their effects on people and places is matched by a study of the region’s geologic history. His story about a meteor ends up shedding light on professionalization in the emerging historic preservation field in the Northwest. Nisbet’s stories often have no right to speed; and for blocking a freight train at a railroad crossing for exactly the same amount of time that the previous train had blocked him.” There is Wins Wehr, an artist and amateur paleobotanist who cultivated friendships with famous composers and explored with them different Northwest destinations. While Ancient Places may not be sufficient for a scholarly analysis of the Northwest’s landscape, Nisbet’s work is a reminder that it is people’s connections to each other and to the land that make for a good, and complete, history.

Amy Canfield earned her doctorate at Washington State University. She is an associate professor of history at Lewis–Clark State College where she teaches courses on women’s, public, and American Indian history.

Address all review copies and related communications to: Robert C. Carricker, Columbia Reviews Editor, 1624 Northwest Boulevard, Spokane, WA 99205.
“The history of progress is written in the blood of men and women who have dared to espouse an unpopular cause, as, for instance, the black man’s right to his body, or woman’s right to her soul.” —Emma Goldman

There’s no time like the present to share Washington history by giving a membership or subscription to a friend or loved one. Call 253-798-5894 or visit WashingtonHistory.org and click on SUPPORT.
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FREE museum admission during the Festival

Wat’sa with a Pearl Earring, Alison Bremner, Tlingit (2015)

1911 Pacific Avenue, Downtown Tacoma
1-888-BE-THERE | InTheSpiritArts.org

In the Spirit 2016 is made possible in part by the Nisqually Indian Tribe, the Tacoma Arts Commission, and Click! Cable TV.