I n the spirit of President John Kennedy's "pay any price, bear any burden" philosophy, I am fond of saying to anyone who will listen that the Washington State Historical Society will do all it can to increase its stature as a preeminent cultural institution in the Northwest. The Society is moving at a new pace in that direction, as evidenced by the recent, highly successful "Magnificent Voyagers" exhibit in Tacoma; by this magazine, now in its second year, which gives the Society a more widespread audience; and by the progressive efforts of the Pierce County legislative delegation, led by Representative Dan Grimm, which have catapulted the Society into a position where a new exhibition facility, co-located with a restored Union Station in downtown Tacoma, is a realistic hope for the early 1990s.

These initiatives have addressed large and popular audiences and will continue to do so. That's as it should be. No one wants the state historical society to be the private preserve of a particular or select class of people. Nevertheless, the Historical Society also interfaces with a discrete, small, yet vital constituency that many of whom will be coming to Tacoma this year and next for the annual conclaves of the early community of professional historians, Pacific Northwest Historians and the Western History Association, respectively.
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This year, I had the pleasure of cochairing the committee for the Northwest Conference with Jeanne Engermann, formerly on the Society's staff and now with the Washington State Library. This regional conference is permanently sponsored by the Society, although the meeting frequency is held in Oregon, Montana or Idaho. Next year, Pacific Lutheran University professor Art Martinson and I will spearhead the local arrangements for "The Western" (as it is called), one of the historical profession's major national conventions.

Though scholarly history has fallen on hard times in some respects, the Washington State Historical Society as a learned institution in its own right must lend its support to the researchers whose work provides the foundation for what we and others do in museums, and in these very pages. Conferences are the proven grounds of new historical understand-
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WILL WASHINGTON REALLY GET WARMED UP TO ITS CENTENNIAL?

One hundred is a number with majestic qualities that calls out a command for celebration when applied to age. And so it is that Washington is compelled to do the honors for its centennial of statehood in 1989. We hope those honors will be adequate. If they are not, it will be understandable, though not entirely forgivable.

This will not be Washington's first centennial. The beginning of Washington in its original form as a territory, described in some detail in this issue of Columbia (see page 3), reached its centennial in 1953 and then, as now, a command for a performance of observance went forth from the legislative hilltop in Olympia, and it was directed to the Washington State Historical Society. Under the leadership of J. P. Weyerhaeuser, Jr., then the president, the Society, with only token state funding provided, did what it could to stir up enthusiasm for the occasion. Success was not great. A highlight was a pageant, with many covered wagons and a lot of horses. It played twice, in Aberdeen and Vancouver, as we recall, before closing due to lack of attendance. A book of history was commissioned. It turned out so badly it was not published. The territorial centennial year went by, not ignored, but given little more than polite attention.

When Pacific Celebration '89, a private nonprofit organization formed to engage in various Centennial enterprises, announced at the end of 1986 that it was too discouraged to carry on, the dismal thought occurred that the state Centennial observance may be no more of a success than the first one 35 years ago. That must not be. It would be shameful if Washington could not muster enough pride, imagination and energy to do what is right on this once-in-its-history occasion.

And why? For fear other states having the same birth year would do better and look upon us with scorn? Or because older states, already past their 200th anniversaries, would say our indifference confirms their opposition about the Northwest corner? No, because other states are not likely even to notice, much less care. A birthday, even of a state, is a private affair of little interest outside the family.

So if the observance of the Centennial is done more out of a sense of duty than an enthusiastic and spontaneous desire to shout out pride in what Washington has accomplished in its first century as a state, it will be only ourselves who need be concerned. What is wrong with us? we could ask. Why don’t we have stronger feelings about our home state?

Some may be tempted to offer the excuse that Washington is still so young—so recently settled and developed—that most of us don’t yet have deep roots here. Many were born elsewhere. Our parents came from some other states which retained their loyalty. Families of Washingtonians going back several generations are not numerous.

The reason why Washingtonians are not eagerly awaiting a chance to celebrate their state’s centennial may not, however, be so much the lack of a deep sense of this being home as the prevalence of indifference that stems from ignorance—in this case about the Northwest’s past. Ignorance is the unfortunate state of the untaught, and regional history has never been much or adequately taught in our schools, with a few exceptions. Some older citizens in southwest Washington remember Lew Williams, who insisted on teaching regional history in his Kelso high-school classes in such a way that the students were intrigued and even excited by his accounts of what had gone before. There have not been many like him.

Emphasis on the teaching of world and national history to the neglect of close-to-home history can be no more justified than the teaching of French and German on the West Coast rather than Japanese and Spanish. Such misplaced emphasis is educational lag.

This state of affairs cannot be quickly amended with the Centennial only a half-year away. The party must go on even if those who show up at numerous events with the name “Centennial” attached are concerned mainly with being entertained and are feeling no great sense of celebration.

The Centennial will get its best due, we expect, in the several counties and towns which have held local history in high regard and can look back with appreciation at the long and always difficult way the forefathers had to come before this state was handed over to those now living. In many small ways, rather than with one grand gesture, Washington will do some measure of justice to an anniversary that comes but once.

—John McClelland, Jr.
Almost Columbia, Triumphanty Washington

Prelude to statehood — the remarkable beginnings of Washington Territory.

By John McClelland, Jr.

The northern part of what once was the Oregon Country is a state that will mature soon to the centenary point and can look back, not just to the year when statehood was achieved, but all the way to the beginnings in the mid-19th century when Oregon was divided and what almost became Columbia was created. How and why that division was achieved constitutes the remarkable initial chapter of Washington’s history. It tells of a group of mostly young families who decided, very soon after becoming the first white Americans to establish homes north of the Columbia, that it was their destiny to be the founders of a new state. And so, almost as soon as the roofs were on their log houses, they launched a secessionist movement, demanding that what lay north of the great river be cut off from Oregon and made into a separate territory, to be named, quite naturally, Columbia.

Courage was common on the frontier, but political audacity was less so, and it is that quality which led this group of wagon-train pioneers, newly arrived from the Middle West, to conclude that it was not unreasonable to ask Congress to split a territory that had been established only three years previously.

If they had not been as audacious, and had not been cheered on by the region’s one newspaper, itself just born, there would likely be no state of Washington, but instead just one huge state of Oregon. If they had remained a part of Oregon Territory for only six years longer, they would have become citizens of the new state of Oregon. After that there would have been little possibility of a division.

The beginnings of Washington seem all the more extraordinary when it is remembered that in 1851, when the push for a new territory began, the area involved had been a part of the United States only seven years. The British flag had been flying prior to 1846.

It was not happenstance that those who came first to what is now Washington were late in coming. Many Americans came west to Oregon in the 1840s, but until a treaty with Britain was made in 1846, ending a long period of joint occupancy by the two nations, they came to a political no-man’s-land where there were no laws to be enforced and no one to enforce laws if there had been any. The British Hudson’s Bay Company was doing almost nothing to bring in British citizens. Those with such desires were nearly all Americans, and they were weary after a months-long journey ending at the mouth of the Willamette River. Southward along that river extended the rich bottomlands, easily reached. To the north were only swift rivers and dense forests through which ran only a few trails made by Indians and wild game. The Hudson’s Bay Company encouraged the earliest pioneers to go south into the valleys of the Willamette and its tributaries and that, plus the region’s accessibility and fertility, is why they went there, ignoring the unknown north.

Then in 1844 came a wagon train led by Michael Simmons which included one George Washington Bush, part black. Blacks were not allowed by the provisional government in the Willamette Valley because they might get Oregon involved in the slavery question and delay territorial ambitions.

People traveling together, on shipboard or across the plains, develop friendships. Simmons would not abandon his friend Bush. After a winter at the fort, Simmons explored north and found what he was looking for where the Deschutes River drops into Puget Sound with enough force to turn the wheels of grist mills and sawmills. There the first American settlers in what was to become Wash-
ington established themselves. They called it Newmarket, later changed to the more euphonious Tumwater.

The "Oregon fever" that led so many to make the long trip west became even more prevalent after 1846. More families followed Simmons and went north to settle. They didn't tarry at Fort Vancouver or visit the Willamette. They were emigrants directly from the Midwest to the Cowlitz or to Puget Sound. They were the first there, on their own, with no one to answer to.

So it was a band of highly independent citizens, with no allegiance to Oregon, who scattered through what is now Western Washington, and even though they were busy in every daylight hour with the tasks of settlement, they found time to discuss their mutual dissatisfaction with their plight as citizens of Oregon Territory. The seat of government, far down in the Willamette Valley at Salem, was too far away. What little federal funding was made available was spent in the south. Their totally undeveloped frontier in the north needed everything—roads, mail service, troops to hold off Indians, law enforcement, courts. The settlers felt they were entitled to have their needs met and they wanted them met without delay. After all, this was 1851. Technology was advancing fast. Steam was propelling ships and trains. Modern times were at hand and these settlers, though not forgetting they were pioneers, didn't expect to be living for long in the primitive ways their grandparents and parents had endured when they settled in the Midwest.

Their needs called for a government of their own with a voice in Washington, D.C., and so an idea came into being.

The idea's originator was never recorded but the first to put it into print—in a letter to an editor—was a young lawyer in Oregon City, John Chapman. What should be done, he said, was to divide Oregon in two parts, north and south of the Columbia River, and the northern part should be called Columbia.

Later, in a Fourth of July oration in Olympia, he elaborated on the idea and it found favor immediately. To get to Oregon's capital then required a journey of several days by horseback over a trail to Cowlitz Landing, down a turbulent stream in an Indian canoe to the mouth of the Cowlitz and on up the Columbia in another canoe and into the Willamette as far as the falls, and finally, by horse again, or canoe, over the last miles into Salem. It was nearly always three days of travel.

A territory was entitled to one elected nonvoting representative in Congress and Oregon's was Joseph Lane, who had been governor and was a part of the Democratic organization firmly in control of politics in the new territory. The memorial made its way to him by the slow ways of the mail at that time—down the Cowlitz for a connection with a ship going to California, then by another steamer to Panama, by land across the isthmus, and on across the Caribbean by another steamer to the East Coast. Lane read it but was not persuaded that his territory, which he had just started to represent, should be cut in two. He filed the memorial with the clerk of the committee on territories where it was effectively buried.

Another meeting had been scheduled for May 1852, to start a movement for statehood if by then Congress had not acted on the petition for a territory, but it seemed futile when their missive about a territory had not been acknowledged. They were not discouraged, however, and their restiveness about their isolation and political plight increased. The Fourth of July, 1852, came and this time the orator in Olympia was Daniel R. Bigelow, another young lawyer newly admitted to practice. He was as eager as Chapman to display his oratorical talents and enthusiasm. He envisioned a great state in the northwest corner of the nation where "the force of our example and the advancement of free principles will...go on and illumine the islands of the sea, and exert such a powerful influence that benighted China will wake up from her sleep of ages and take strides forward in civil freedom."

At this point frontier journalism
enters the scene. Two printers—Thorn­ton F. McElroy and James W. Wiley, using the small press on which the Oregonian began publication—launched a weekly newspaper in Olympia, giving it a name they hoped would be prophetic—the Columbian.

The Columbian began aggressively promoting Columbia even before there was any assurance that northern Oregon would be allowed to secede. In an Oct. 9 article addressed to those planning to move west, it promised that “a territorial government will be organized for northern Oregon as soon as practicable, when we will have a market of our own—a governor, federal officers and a legislature of our own—a delegate in Congress of our own and finally a STATE of our own.... Your assistance is wanted in the settlement and improvement of the country—the organization of our territory and in the formation of a state.” In a later issue the Columbian confidently predicted that “a legal divorce from the south is inevitable.”

Within six months the Columbian had a circulation of 350, spread over a wide area, with agents in Monticello, Whidbey’s Island, Port Townsend, Steilacoom, Nisqually, Cowlitz Farms, Chickeeles (Chehalis), New York (Alki), New Dungeness, Oregon City, Seattle, Jackson’s Prairie, Poe’s Point and Washington City. The latter listing showed that the Columbian had readers from its outset in the national capital.

Leaders of the secessionist movement used the columns of the new newspaper to argue their case. All of its early issues contained material intended to generate more public determination to achieve independence as a separate territory.

The district court met at Jackson’s place near Cowlitz Farms in October 1852, and so many citizens were on hand that Major H. A. Goldsborough, one of the most vocal of Columbia Territory advocates, called an impromptu meeting to give consideration to a second convention. A new start needed to be made. Out of this came a call for delegates to be elected in every part of northern Oregon to attend a convention in Olympia in November. Later the site was moved to Monticello at the mouth of the Cowlitz in order to get good attendance from those living along the Columbia who could not be expected to be as eager to split off from southern Oregon as those who lived far away on Puget Sound.

The Columbian began to promote the forthcoming convention enthusiastically. It raised its editorial voice to a shout with the biggest type it had:

**CITIZENS OF NORTHERN OREGON!**

It behooves you to bestir yourselves to claim your independence from the territorial authority exerted over you by the Willamette Valley. Call meetings in your several precincts; memorialize Congress to set us off; exhibit our grievances both in omission and commission under which we have suffered from all departments of government and that body will be compelled to regard your prayer.

Editor McElroy realized that travel at any time was difficult and in November the trail south would likely be deep in mud. He urged those who lived along the way to help take care of the travelers going on foot or by horse to Cowlitz Landing, resting there, then moving on down the twisting course of the Cowlitz River for another 30 miles by canoe or bateau to Monticello. That settlement consisted only of Harry Darby Huntington’s place, part home and part hotel; Olson and Mahan’s store; two old Hudson’s Bay Company warehouses; and the houses and barns of L. P. Smith and Royal Smith. Help get the delegates to the convention, the Columbian urged, and “inasmuch as dollars are not plentiful in this region ... and as many of our delegates will have to incur considerable sacrifice in order to attend the convention, it is to be hoped that the good people along the routes—Warbassport, etc., instead of desiring to turn the necessary means for reaching Monticello at a profit, on the contrary ... will endeavor to make the expenses of the delegates from the interior as light as possible.”

The Columbian was determined that attendance at the Monticello convention be substantial, realizing that the more names on a petition to Congress, the more attention it was likely to get. Under the heading “PREPARE! PREPARE!” McElroy and Wiley explained why the meeting was to be held at Monticello, far down on the Columbia River, a hundred miles from Olympia.

The Columbian said voters should meet in every precinct and elect delegates and alternates. But there was to be no limit on number. “Let all be appointed who can possibly attend,” the Columbian urged. And the newspaper warned that “if we should fail again” (referring to Canoes such as this, hewn and carved from large cedar logs and capable of carrying several persons, were used during the 1850s and earlier for travel up and down the Cowlitz River, the main connecting link between the Columbia River and Puget Sound. Indians were employed to man the canoes.
lack of action after the Cowlitz convention), southern Oregon might achieve statehood before another attempt at separation could be made and "in the settlement of her boundaries, serious encroachments may have been made upon territory which nature designed should be incorporated with our own. We must be vigilant and active in arranging matters for the crises before us. Again we say, PREPARE! PREPARE!"

The tone of the exhortations in the following issue reflected the apprehension of the editors that the convention might not be well attended and therefore would not impress Delegate Lane and his colleagues. "TURN OUT! TURN OUT!" shouted the headline. "ACTION! ACTION!" Time was growing short. Delegates must be elected.

The great concern, the Columbian explained, was that southern Oregon would receive all favors from the federal government because all the territorial officers were down there, and because even the existence of northern Oregon might not be known in the national capital. Only through action at Monticello could that existence be made known.

"Rally! Rally!" shouted the Columbian in its issue of November 20. "On to the convention!" By then some of the delegates were on their way, including some who only the year before settled at two places on the Sound, New York and Alki, soon after to be known as Seattle. An even more distant settlement—Port Townsend—also sent a delegate.

One of the travelers, Quincy Brooks, was surprised to find at the Landing a young man he had known in the East, Edward J. Allen, then 22 years old, driving three yoke of oxen from Fort Vancouver north. Brooks explained their mission and urged him to leave his oxen at the Landing and accompany the group back down the Cowlitz to take part in the convention. Allen demurred, saying he could hardly qualify as a citizen of Oregon, having just arrived. But Brooks assured him that this made no difference. What was wanted at the Monticello convention was numbers, not merely delegates bearing credentials. So, to be obliging or just for the fun of it, Allen went.

At Monticello the delegates found shelter wherever they could and gathered for their meetings in Darby Huntington's large home. Forty-four were counted as delegates. A Puget Sound man, H. G. McConahey, afterward president of the first Legislative Council, was elected chairman and Dr. R. J. White secretary. Quincy Brooks moved the appointment of a 13-member committee to undertake the all important task of drafting the memorial to Congress. Those appointed besides Brooks, who served as chairman, were Seth Catlin, known as the "sage of Monticello," D. C. (Doc) Maynard of Seattle, W. W. Plumb, Alfred Cook, John R. Jackson, Eugene L. Finch, A. F. Scott, Fred A. Clarke, C. S. Harthawey, E. H. Winslow, Nathaniel Stone and the young man who just happened by—Edward Allen.

The Monticello Memorial to Congress, drawn up and promptly adopted, was considerably shorter than the one put together at the Cowlitz convention the year before, and was far better written. The actual writer may well have been Allen, putting into words what Brooks and the others advised him to say.

Addressed to the House and Senate, the memorial said that it "respectfully represents" that northern Oregon be set apart as a new territory to be called Columbia. The Columbia River should provide the border on the south and east, the 49th parallel on the north and the Pacific Ocean on the west. The 32,000-square-mile area requested did not even approximate the vast sweep of land that was to be designated eventually as the new territory.

Numerous reasons were given to support the petition. Oregon as it stood was far too big. The regions north and south of the Columbia were economic rivals and always would be. With most of the voters in the southern part, those in the north were not getting a fair share of the appropriations from Congress. The seat of government was 300 miles from those living on Puget Sound.

The petition concluded, "Northern Oregon, with its great natural resources, presenting such unparalleled inducements to immigrants and with its present large population constantly and rapidly increasing by immigration, is of sufficient importance, in a national point of view, to merit the fostering care of Congress, and its interests are so numerous, and so entirely distinctive in their character, as to demand the attention of a separate and independent legislature." (No mention was actually made of population numbers.)

The entire convention, the Columbian reported, was held in a "Spirit of harmony and agreement."
On January 31, two months later, Lane wrote to Brooks acknowledging their receipt. Meanwhile, on December 6, Lane had decided to take the action he had been urged to take a year before—he introduced a resolution calling for the creation of Columbia Territory.

But news of his action did not reach the Northwest for more than two months and the northern Oregon settlers were left wondering. The Columbian was willing to admit to doubts about the outcome in its issue of March 2, when it said, “Even the most active and enthusiastic supporter of these movements [perhaps referring to the editor himself] did not think that either of the memorials would have the desired effect on Congress.”

The next week there appeared a letter from “Agricola” urging that a meeting be held in Olympia to keep the separatist movement alive and proposing that a fund be raised to send an elected delegate from northern Oregon to Congress, even though he would have no status when he arrived.

But before another meeting could be held the mails brought the welcome report of Lane’s introduction of his Columbia Territory bill.

Several historians, including Clinton Snowden, Hubert Bancroft, Elwood Evans and Edmond Meany, mistakenly attributed Lane’s action to the Monticello Convention. Meany noted this discrepancy in the Washington Historical Quarterly in January 1922. He had noticed what he and the others had overlooked—that the convention report could not have reached Lane by December 6.

So what did prompt Lane to act? It could hardly have been the Cowlitz Convention Memorial, which he had received and buried in committee a year earlier. And it was certainly not the Monticello petition itself.

Actually the historians were only partly wrong about the influence on Lane of the Monticello meeting. True, he had not received the petition by December 6, but he knew it was coming and he knew what it would say. He knew this because he had read it in the Columbian, which, beginning with its first issue on September 11, 1852, had been trumpeting the cause of territorial division, announcing that a convention was to be held to petition Congress again, calling for widespread election of delegates, and otherwise stirring up public sentiment in favor of the creation of a new territory. And he could not but notice that there was no opposition being expressed in any quarter.

Lane, as the elected representative of Oregon Territory, was simply responding to the wishes of a sizable number of his constituents when he saw in the newspapers from home that the movement was gathering great momentum and finally deserved his attention.

A further consideration was the political situation in Oregon, where a so-called “clique” of Democrats was firmly in control of the new government with the capital established at Salem.

Governor Gaines was well aware of the separatist movement in the north, as well as another in southern Oregon. Addressing himself “to friends of separate territorial government in northern Oregon as well as those of Umpqua, Rogue River, Shasta, etc.,” he said a Mr. Matlock had introduced a bill for the formation of a state with a new territory on both its north and south sides. He said the boundaries of this state would probably be the Columbia River on the north and Umpqua Mountains on the south.

It is not difficult to believe that Gaines and Lane’s other political allies in Oregon urged him to sponsor the division. Northern Oregon was gaining population now that the treaty with Britain had been signed. There was more free land in the north for new settlers to claim. Voter strength could grow in northern Oregon to such an extent that those in power in Salem would be threatened. Better to let the northerners go off and...
The settlers had to wait as long as three months for a response to mail sent to Washington, D.C.

noted that in the four and a half years since Oregon Territory had been authorized by Congress, the population had spread north of the Columbia River and the people of that area "labor under great inconvenience and hardship, by reason of the great distance to which they are removed from the present territorial organizations. Communication between these two portions of the territory is difficult, casual and uncertain."

The memorial said the Columbia River was a natural dividing line and "experience has proven that when marked geographical boundaries, which have been traced by the hand of nature, have been disregarded in the formation of local governments, that sectional jealousies and local strife have seriously embarrassed their prosperity and characterized their domestic legislation."

Therefore, "the time has come ... to establish a separate territorial government for all that portion of Oregon Territory lying north of the Columbia River and west of the great northern branch of the same, to be known as the Territory of Columbia."

This document was adopted by the Oregon House on January 14 and the Council on January 18. Allowing a month for mail to reach Washington, it would have been mid-February before it reached Lane. Therefore it, like the Monticello Memorial, could not have influenced Lane when, on December 6, 1852, he introduced his bill to create Columbia Territory. But it is very likely that in mail communication between Lane and the territorial leaders at home he was urged, in November or earlier, to take action, or was informed by those leaders that they would not object if he undertook to follow the drastic course of excising and casting adrift half the territory.

Lane's bill came out of the Committee on Territories with favorable recommendation on February 8, 1853. It was one of several territorial bills, including those pertaining to Nebraska and Wyoming. None had completely smooth sailing. Lane's bill could have founded on the issue of Indian land title or whether there were enough people in northern Oregon to justify the expense of setting up another territorial government.

Representative Daniel Jones of Tennessee was against Lane's bill and said so—not enough population. He moved that the bill be tabled. There followed some parliamentary maneuvering and then Lane made his speech. It was a forceful argument for Columbia, repeating much of what was written in the Cowlitz and Monticello memorials.

At one point he was interrupted by Representative Charles Skelton of New Jersey, who asked what was the population of northern Oregon. Lane was ready with a skilful though evasive answer: as much population as the whole of Oregon Territory had had when it was admitted in 1848. The answer seemed to satisfy the questioner. And well that it did, for if Lane had been forced to put out a number, and he had been honest about it, he could not have said there were as many as 2,000 white citizens north of the Columbia River.

In his remarks Lane emphasized that the regions on both sides of the Columbia River were essentially the same—heavily forested with much good soil for farming. Each side, he said, would make a fine state. Congress had invited people to move West when it passed the donation land claim law. Now it had an obligation to provide adequate government for those who were responding to the invitation.

Upon the completion of Lane's speech, a new issue was injected into the proceedings. Suddenly the question was not whether the new territory should be created, but what name it should be called. Representative Richard Stanton of Kentucky rose and moved that the bill be amended by striking the word "Columbia" wherever it occurred and substituting "Washington."

Lane, perhaps sensing that this would give his colleagues new reason to vote for his bill—to give honor to the first president—without hesitation said, "I shall never object to that name."

Jones persisted in his effort to get a vote on his motion to table the bill, but he was interrupted by Representative Edward Stanley of North Carolina who made a short speech favoring the name Washington. "There is something very appropriate about it," Stanley said. "And it is a little singular that this same idea should have occurred to others at the same time." He had suggested it to his seat mate moments before, but he realized it "might lead to trouble" if there should be a city of Washington in a state by that name. "Washington, Washington" would hardly do.

The House then voted favorably on the motion to substitute "Washington" for "Columbia" without being told that it was contrary to the wishes of the people involved, emphatically expressed many times. That taken care of, the consideration of the bill itself was put aside while the House took up debate on a bill to create the territory of Nebraska.

One congressman made an attempt to
These are the first and last parts of a six-page, handwritten memorial to Congress adopted at the first convention held to initiate the proposal to divide Oregon Territory and create a separate territory north of the Columbia River to be known as Columbia. The meeting was held at Cowlitz Landing, near the present town of Toledo, on August 29, 1851. Copies of the memorial, which moved by slow mail, did not reach Joseph Lane, Oregon Territory’s delegate to Congress, until December. Rather than act on it, he simply filed it with the Committee on Territories.

A second convention was held at Monticello, on the site of present-day Longview, on November 25, 1852. No original copy of the memorial adopted at that meeting has been found. Lane introduced a bill to create the Territory of Columbia before he received the Monticello memorial, but the petition was read aloud on the floor of the House during debate on the question of granting the independence sought by the residents of northern Oregon.
restore the name “Columbia” to the Washington bill. Representative Alexander Evans of Maryland agreed that no one would object to honoring George Washington but, he said, “our geographical nomenclature has become such a mass of confusion that it is almost impossible, when you hear the name of a town, to know in what part of the world it is, much less to know in what part of the United States it may be found. We have perhaps in this country one hundred counties and towns of the name of Washington.” Evans suggested giving northern Oregon “one of the beautiful Indian names which prevail in that part of the country.” But it was too late. “Washington” had already been substituted for “Columbia” all through the bill, and that is the way it passed the House.

On March 2 the bill went before the Senate where it was quickly approved with no debate. “It is one of the old-fashioned territorial bills,” one senator explained, and so needed no discussion.

The National Intelligencer, a leading newspaper of that time, published in Washington, D.C., was not happy with the choice of name for the new territory on the West Coast. It said the name choice “contributes fresh confusion to our already confused nomenclature [and] will have to be changed.”

But it was never changed and the confusion that the Intelligencer foresaw did materialize, making it necessary for residents of Washington on the West Coast to add the word “state” to the name to avoid being confused with the city on the Potomac. Historian Julian Hawthorne commented in 1893 that “it would have been far better to have retained the name first selected... but as all things yielded to him [George Washington]” after the revolution, “so the name Washington appears to have been equally irresistible in 1853.”

Harvey Scott, pioneer Oregon editor and historian, blamed the change entirely on Representative Stanton, noting that he was a native of the capital city. Stanton surely was aware of the several failed attempts to fund the preservation of Mt. Vernon, Washington’s estate on the lower Potomac. This failure could be considered a slight to the first president. Naming a territory after him would help atone for allowing his home to decay. (Later a group of Southern women bought the property and has maintained it since.)

Scott wrote that almost every state had a county or town named Washington, and although several also had a Columbia or a Columbus, it was unfortunate that the name preferred by those who would live in the new territory was rejected. Bestowing the name “Columbia” would have made up in some measure for the name of Amerigo Vespucci being given to the continent when that distinction rightly belonged to Columbus.

The act took away more than half of Oregon Territory and made it into Washington Territory. The dividing line was the middle of the channel of the Columbia River from its mouth to the 46th parallel near Fort Walla Walla, then eastward along that degree to the summit of the Rocky Mountains, where it turned north to the Canadian border. It was a big territory.

News that the House had passed the bill, and changed the name to Washington, reached Olympia in early April. The size of the favorable vote, 128 to 29, made the Columbian confident that it would soon get Senate approval. Commenting on the name change, the newspaper remarked, “Although Washington is not the name with which we prayed that our infant might be christened, yet it is certainly a very beautiful one. Nevertheless this novelty has met with some distaste among many of our citizens, whilst with others it met with enthusiastic applause. It will be remembered that our Memorial prayed for the name ‘Columbia’—this the House refused to grant us. Be it so. Even if the name ‘Columbia’ had our preferences, we would not cavil at a name when principles are at stake. It is a mere difference in taste, and the people of northern Oregon
are not sticklers for truffles."

The settlers were obviously so pleased that their efforts were succeeding that they did not want to risk delaying or impeding final approval by objecting to the name the House had chosen, much as they preferred "Columbia."

On April 30, the Columbia was able to report the final good news: "The Territory of Washington is a fixed fact. Henceforth northern Oregon has an independent existence, and a destiny to achieve separate and distinct from that of her southern neighbor. She has been baptised by the Congress into a new name—a name Glorious and dear to every American heart. Everywhere, throughout the length and breadth of the Territory the news will be received with joyful acclamations. The separate organization which the citizens of northern Oregon with earnestness, and, may we say, entire unanimity, have ardently wished and labored for, has been triumphant achieved."

Thus Washington Territory came into being. It was a kind of political phenomenon. In 1846 only eight Americans lived north of the Columbia River. Two years later when Oregon Territory was created only a few more resided there. When the movement for separation was launched in 1851 the population may have reached a thousand, although when a census was taken in mid-1853 the new territory was found to have 3,965 persons, of which 1,682 were voters. This number of people had governance over all that is now Washington, plus northern Idaho and the part of Montana lying west of the Rockies. That vastness was not to endure for long, however, but when the boundaries were finally drawn, the new territory had far more area than the delegates meeting at Monticello had asked for.

One can speculate on how different the course of the region's history might have been. What is now Washington might very well have become a part of Canada. If neither Great Britain, which insisted that the boundary be the Columbia River, nor the United States, even more insistent that it be at 54° 40', had backed down, the issue conceivably could have been settled by armed conflict, which was threatened, or by arbitration. And if the United States had lost, the Canadian border would now be the Columbia River.

A difference was made by the start of American migration into the region by the Simmons party in 1844 and the failure earlier of the Hudson's Bay Company to establish a permanent colony of Canadians at Cowitz and Nisqually. If Canadians rather than Americans had been living on Puget Sound in 1846, London might have taken a differentstance in the negotiations of that year.

Almost certainly there would have been no Washington if the first settlers had not launched a movement to divide Oregon Territory or if they had delayed doing it. And they might not have been stirred themselves to conclusive action had it not been for the newspaper that came into being and revived interest that began to lag when the initial appeal for a separate territory brought no response. The enthusiasm stirred up by the Columbia was infectious. It convinced all with repeated argument and exhortation that separation need not be just a dream. Delegate Lane's reading of the early issues of the Columbia is probably what convinced him that he should heed the wishes of the northern Oregonians and introduce a bill to create a new territory. He knew another memorial would be forthcoming from the convention at Monticello that was being promoted enthusiastically by the Columbia, and when it did arrive, amid debate on his resolution to create Columbia Territory, he had the clerk read the text to the assembled House of Representatives.

The timing of the settlers' action was critical. If nothing had been done in the early 1850s, it is likely that Oregon would never have been divided. The building of roads and the establishment of river steamboat transportation in the late 1850s, with resulting better mail service and improved travel facilities, would have removed the main reasons a division was asked for—the distance and travel time between the two parts of the territory. If the settlers had decided to be patient and wait for what they needed, the efforts needed to achieve a division, not hard to arouse in 1851, might not have been forthcoming and Oregon would have remained whole.

It might be contended that because Oregon was so large, it would likely have been divided eventually anyway. But California was larger and it remained intact.

Washington came into being at the only time when division was feasible, as it would surely not have been later when the institutions of government in Oregon had become more firmly established, when there were more voters and when it would not have been possible for a mere handful of men to gather on a riverbank and represent themselves as the spokesmen for all those within hundreds of miles in asking for a separate government.

No opposition at all developed within the territory to the separation proposals. The political leaders in the Willamette Valley, firmly in control of the new Oregon government, and seeing the seeds of continuing north-south contention in an acrimonious dispute over the location of the capital, not only did not oppose giving up half or more of their territory; they actually gave it their blessing.

Because 36 years had to go by before statehood was achieved, it might be contended that Washington Territory must have come into being prematurely. Perhaps so, but it would not have come into being at all had it not been for the aggressive action of the first settlers.

We who are quite sure that we are better off with a state of our own, whatever its name, can admire and be grateful for those pioneers of long ago for their audacity, courage, persistence and foresight—all qualities which, when they appeared at the right time, led in successive steps to a triumphant conclusion, laying the solid foundations of what became the state of Washington.

The foregoing article is based on a 1986 Pettyjohn Lecture in history given by the author at Washington State University.
The Hard First Way
Across the Mountains

Naches Pass was a terrible route,
but the wagon train emigrants conquered it.

By Joan Robinson

The state of Washington, from the Canadian border to the steep walls of the Columbia Gorge, is bisected by a high mountain range. On other continents lesser ranges serve as borders between whole nations, but in the mid-19th century, when Washington Territory was created, the Cascade Mountains were not regarded as a logical boundary because there was a way, not to climb over them, but to go through them. The Columbia River had cut a gateway and no one foresaw any difficulties in establishing a territory that would have two distinct parts, divided by a range so high that four of its peaks were capped with snow.

But from the very beginning getting over or through the mountain barrier presented a problem and a challenge. It was Washington on both sides.

East-west lines of travel had to be developed. This meant finding the lowest places in the range, called passes. There are 12, none at a low level. The lowest turned out to be Snoqualmie Pass at 3,004 feet. But one of the highest, Naches, at 4,988 feet, was determined by those who came first to be the one that should be conquered.

It was not a good choice. Ezra Meeker, who crossed at Naches Pass in 1854, in later years called it "that execrable shadow of a road." That it was, but it could be crossed, cutting 200 miles from the old route from Fort Walla Walla down the Columbia River and up the Cowlitz to Puget Sound.

An ancient Indian trail began on the Yakima River, led up the banks of the swift Naches River, through rugged forests to the summit, then down the equally rough western slopes of the Cascades into the foothills bordering Puget Sound. Fur trader
Alexander Ross in 1818 noted that "the most direct line of communication from the Grand Forks [where the Snake and Columbia rivers meet] to the ocean [Puget Sound] is by the river E-yach-im-ah. By the E-yach-im-ah road the natives reach the ocean in ten days."

As early as 1839, employees of the Hudson's Bay Company had explored the trail, traveling from Fort Walla Walla, the company's post on the Columbia River, to Fort Nisqually, its post on Puget Sound. Little if anything, however, was done to develop the trail.

The United States Exploring Expedition sailed into Puget Sound in 1842 and undertook extensive land explorations. The commander, Charles Wilkes, sent a party through Naches Pass under the direction of Lt. Robert E. Johnson. It was guided by two Hudson's Bay servants who became permanent settlers in the territory—Pierre Charles, whose poorly pronounced name was given to the town Pe Ell, and Peter Bercier, who was related to Simon Plamondon, a pioneer Cowlitz settler. Their crossing is described in detail in the published journals of the expedition.

Although many emigrants made their way west to the Oregon Country in the first half of the 19th century, few settled north of the Columbia. The trip to Puget Sound was long, whether accomplished by sea or land. The would-be settlers who followed the Oregon Trail to its end found themselves in one of the most fertile locales in the Northwest, the Willamette Valley. Most of the travelers did not continue north. Only a few who were determined to settle on Puget Sound were undeterred by the prospect of a journey north involving sailing down the Columbia River to the mouth of the Cowlitz River and following a rough trail or traveling by bateau or canoe up the winding Cowlitz. At a point about 30 miles upstream at Cowlitz Landing the water journeys ended, and the overland trail to Puget Sound began. The road north was often muddy and always rough going, and their destination—Puget Sound—a hard-won prize.

The people who did straggle north to populate Puget Sound soon realized that if their region were to prosper, many more settlers were urgently needed. And to attract the new settlers, an easier and shorter route to Puget Sound had to be developed. The Naches Pass Trail seemed the answer. But who would improve it? Puget Sound settlers attempted to do so as early as 1850. The Hudson's Bay Company's Nisqually Journal of August 6, 1850,
mentions that a group of men visited Fort Nisqually that day on their way to build a road “across the mountains to Walla Walla.” Little came of the effort. The men, including a deserter from Fort Victoria, probably did not get farther east than the Puyallup River, about six miles from the western end of the trail.

Naches Pass was not the only route considered for the pioneering road. The Columbian, the Olympia newspaper established in September 1852, reported in an October issue that Dr. P.H. Lansdale of Whidbey Island had returned from an exploring trip over what would come to be called Snoqualmie Pass and said, “He has no doubt that a good wagon road can be easily contructed, leading up the Snoqualmie River to the great falls.”

The Columbian, eager to trumpet the virtues of northern Oregon as it pursued the goal of dividing the territory, concluded the report on Lansdale’s survey with the positive assertion that “the question is now settled that a road leading into our country can be made,” and then took a characteristic gibe at lower Oregon with a reminder that an emigrant had to pay a toll of five dollars to get into Oregon by the only land route then existing—the Barlow Road around Mt. Hood. The Cascade Road, the newspaper said, would carry no toll.

When Washington Territory was created in 1853, Congress acceded to one of the settlers’ demands and appropriated $20,000 to build a military wagon road from Fort Walla Walla to Puget Sound, a distance of 275 miles. The appropriations bill was signed by the president early in 1853, but Northwestemers were dismayed to discover that the money would not be forthcoming in time to improve the trail for use that year. Some of the Puget Sound citizens then decided to take matters into their own hands. They took up a collection among themselves, raising about $2,000 in cash. In addition provisions, tools, animals and labor were donated.

Two groups of men began work on the trail in the summer of 1853. One party worked west of the mountains clearing out the old road (started in 1850) from the western terminus to the Puyallup River and then constructed a new road up the White River to the foot of the mountains. A party that began work on the east side seems to have been less industrious, but a road of sorts was cut out as far as the source of the Naches River.

What resulted could hardly be dignified with the name “road.” It was more a narrow opening through the forest, avoiding the steepest slopes and as many stream crossings as possible. Only the worst obstacles to wagon passage were removed. The ax was the chief road-building tool. Strong men hacked away the dense vine maple and young trees, although in the virgin forest the ground cover was mercifully sparse. Fallen trees often had to be cut through. The broken stumps were simply bypassed. No logging that far inland had yet been undertaken. What little earth had to be moved was done with picks and shovels.

Occasionally, in wet places or on steep slopes, small logs were cut to eight-foot lengths and laid crosswise side by side. This primitive, bumpy, hard surface was called a corduroy road, something to be avoided by travelers and their livestock wherever possible.

Work on the west side stopped when a traveler from the east side reported that there were no emigrant trains heading for a mountain crossing that season. But there were. A train of 36 wagons led by James Longmire of Indiana, which included such well-known pioneer families as the Judsons, Kincaids, Himeses and Bileses, arrived in the Grand Ronde Valley of eastern Oregon in August 1853. George Himes, then 10 years old, in later years wrote that E. Nelson Sargent met them in Grand Ronde and urged them to go to Puget Sound, saying the opportunities were better there than in the Willamette Valley. “As an added inducement to go thither,” he wrote, “he said a wagon road was being made by the settlers of Puget Sound to the Columbia River by way of Naches Pass.”

The Longmire party left the Oregon Trail and journeyed to Fort Walla Walla (today’s Wallula)
n September 11, 1854, young Ebey and his party were at Fort Walla Walla on the east bank of the Columbia River—the beginning of the Naches trail. He wrote,

The fort stands on the east bank of the Columbia and north of the mouth of the Walla Walla in a sand plain. It is a miserable adobe place sadly out of repair. Mr. Pambrun is in charge for the H. B. Co. We met here Mr. Shirl[y] Ensign of Olympia who has established a ferry at this place. The river is ¾ mile wide, rapid and deep.

Fort Walla Walla was erected after Indians attacked Peter Skene Ogden's party here in 1818. It was first called Fort Nez Percé. The original wooden fort burned in 1842 and was replaced by an adobe fort, the one Ebey saw in 1854.

Five days later the party was at Canon Spring, also known as Wells Springs. David Longmire later identified Canon Spring as being on the E. F. Bensons ranch just below Rattlesnake Spring (near Selah). The Ebey party had chosen the wrong path that morning—evidently a common mistake there.

Today we have made but eight miles though we have been traveling hard all day. We took the road this morning from camp leading north around the base of the hills for three miles where the road strikes into the hills to the westward. The wagons preceding us had kept straight on. We turned to the left, but after traveling for a mile or two, concluded we were wrong, and turned to the right through the sage and grease-wood brush to the other trail. After traveling on this for a couple of miles we found we were wrong again as we were approaching the Columbia River again. It seems that the trains last year had gone wrong here, that the wagons this year following their trail got wrong and we did the same. Here we turned abruptly to the left and got on the right trail late in the evening.

This passage refutes the contention of several historians that Ebey’s party was the second to use
Summit Prairie, where the Longmire party found open space to camp before undertaking the eventful descent westward, as it looks today. The Pacific Crest Trail, extending the length of the Cascade Range, crosses this prairie. The Naches trail. Winfield Ebey clearly wrote that there were other wagon trains in 1853 and at least one preceded his group in 1854.

On Wednesday, September 20, when the train was camped at Pine Grove, Ebey notes,

\textit{Advanced 12 miles. Road much of the way rough and rocky... We are now at the foot of the Cascades and shall have timber the balance of the way. This grove is a very pretty place at the head of the Wenass... This morning we met Mr. Ezra Meeker of the Sound, going out to meet his father's family who are behind us. They are from Eddyville, Iowa. Poor fellow he had not heard of the death of his mother before. She died on the Platte. Much of his anticipated pleasure is dashed to earth by this announcement. We thought it better to let him hear the worst before he met his father. He pushed on with a sad heart to meet the family...}
The meeting with Meeker was a melancholy one. Ezra Meeker had left his wife and their two small children in a cabin on McNeil Island in order to help his parents with their overland journey. He elected to travel east via the Naches Pass Trail to check on its condition for himself. He had heard reports that the road had been improved but had some doubt since a similar report the year previous had proved inaccurate. Meeker set out on his eastward journey in September. On September 3, 1854, he appeared at the claim of Jonathan McCarty, near present-day Sumner. He was on foot, carrying a few provisions and half of a blanket. McCarty insisted on lending him a pony for the trip.

Ezra Meeker’s crossing of 1854 is reminiscent of Theodore Winthrop’s Naches Pass trip the previous year. The notes from Winthrop’s trip across the mountains formed the basis of his book Canoe and Saddle, a far-West classic. Meeker’s journey of 1854 made up a large part of his book, Pioneer Reminiscences of Puget Sound. Both men followed the trail west to east, Meeker by himself and Winthrop accompanied by an Indian guide. Both thought the trip unpleasant. Winthrop called a part of the trail on the east side “Via Mala,” competing with Meeker’s “execrable shadow” epithet. The trip proved exhausting to both men—Meeker reveals that he held on to his pony’s tail to negotiate the steeper slopes of the trail, and Winthrop was so overcome by weariness at one point he fainted and fell off his horse.

Ezra Meeker encountered the Ebey party camped by Wenas Creek where Winfield says that they informed Meeker of his mother’s death. But Meeker, in his Pioneer Reminiscences of Puget Sound, perhaps for dramatic effect, says that he was informed that his mother was dead when he joined his father’s wagon train.

The regimen followed by the Ebey party was similar to the routines of other emigrants on the trail. In the morning the cattle were put out to graze while the travelers breakfasted. The teams were then yoked, the cows milked and the wagons packed for travel. The train departed with the wagons leading and the livestock following. At lunchtime, an hour’s stop was made, then the teams were rehitched and travel recommenced. One of Winfield Scott Ebey’s duties as captain of the train was to scout for camping places. He spent part of each afternoon in this task. An hour before dark the wagon train would stop at the selected camping place, dinner would be prepared and consumed, and the balance of the evening would be spent socializing. The routine of the Longmire party of the preceding year differed in one detail. Some of the men had to work at clearing trail ahead of the wagons.

Camped on the banks of the Naches River on Thursday, September 21, Ebey wrote,

*The Naches comes winding its rugged way down a deep canyon or gorge of the mountains. It is about 20 yards wide, shod with swift current running over a rough stony bed. It is truly a romantic spot shut out from the world by the high mountains on every side. . . . Down the valley to our left leads an old Indian Trail to the “Yakima Mission” where some of the Catholic Fathers have established themselves for the spiritual control of the red men of the West. Up the stream to the right is the emigrant trail winding among the trees and rocks, scarcely passable. It is an old Indian trail but found to be much nearer for emigrants going to Puget Sound than the old road by The Dalles of the Columbia. At the last session of Congress the sum of $30,000 was appropriated for the purpose of opening this road for wagons and the work is now going on under the charge of Lieutenant Arnold, U.S.A., and Mr. E. J. Allen, contractor. We are informed that the men are at work near the summit of the mountains and that until we meet them we will have to work our way over the old trail—which I suppose is very bad. . . .*

(Ebey was mistaken about the amount of money allotted to build the Naches Road. Congress had, as mentioned earlier, appropriated $20,000 to develop a military wagon road “from Stilacoom, on Puget’s Sound, to Fort Wallawalla.”)

---

**With a rope of braided rawhide tied to their axles, the Ebey party’s wagons were lowered one by one down a 300-yard slope.**
o Captain George B. McClellan, later a Civil War general, whom Governor Isaac Stevens called "the best military road builder in the country," fell the assignment to open a military wagon road across the Cascades. But McClellan's performance during the summer of 1853 seemed intended to delay the completion of such a project. He arrived at Fort Vancouver later than expected, took an inordinate amount of time forming an exploration party and then set out slowly, sometimes moving only a few miles a day.

McClellan's survey party consisted of 64 men and 173 mules and horses. It was split into four sections to undertake explorations of separate areas and McClellan himself headed the group that examined Naches Pass. He concluded that it would be an impractical place for a railroad crossing of the Cascades.

It remained for Edward J. Allen, a 22-year-old engineer, in company with Lt. Richard Arnold, to carry out what McClellan had been assigned to accomplish. In May 1854, $15,000 of the government appropriation was left when Allen and Arnold with a party of workers set out to repair some sections of the Naches Pass Trail and reroute others. Ebey writes of his train's meeting both Arnold and Allen. This entry in the diary was written while the party camped at Summit Prairie.

Today we moved eight miles up the mountain and encamped near the summit of the Cascade Range of mountains. The morning was rainy and disagreeable. A couple of miles from camp we met...
Lieutenant Arnold, U.S.A., who is locating the new road over the mountains. At this place we met Mr. E. J. Allen and party camped. They have the road cut this far and expect to finish it to the foot of the mountains [east] this fall. There are some 30 men at work.

Summit Prairie was recalled fondly by many emigrants. It was a place of abundant grass and water, a place of welcome rest. Theodore Winthrop paused there in 1853, a short time before the visit of the Longmire party. Winthrop described it as “this fair, oval, forest-circled prairie.”

When the Ebey party reached the cliff where the Longmire party had lowered their wagons with ropes, the “bad hill” as Ebey termed it, they found that Allen, Arnold and their crews had made a passable descent out of what had been a nightmare in 1853. A railing had even been put in place on the lower side of the trail.

Descending to the canyon of the Greenwater River the Ebey party was compelled to cross it 14 times. Feed for the cattle was gone; the animals were forced to exist on browse. The party traveled through thickly forested country reaching the White River, and crossed it seven times. Fording the White River was a dangerous undertaking; its current was strong, its water rich with glacial flour which obscured the large rocks in its bed. Finally, the train emerged from the forest into open ground. Ezra Meeker had likened the experience to emerging from a dungeon into the sunshine. Winfield Ebey’s diary entry made at Grass Prairie shows that his relief at emerging from the forest was tempered by the knowledge that 35 miles separated him from the end of the overland journey:

We are through I suppose as we are west of the Cascade Mountains and near the settlements. We have been on the road five months and three days and feel tired and worn out and are not at our journey’s end. It is still some 35 miles to Steilacoom where our land journey will end.

The Ebey family’s trip over Naches Pass took 24 days. The Longmire party of 1853 took about 34 days. In part, the trip was shorter for the Ebey party because they traveled a little earlier in the year, before there was snow on the ground. But the main reason was that the Longmire party worked on the trail as they traveled it and the trail was being improved by the Arnold-Allen effort of 1854.

The Ebeyes joined Isaac on Whidbey Island. There Winfield served Washington in several
capacities during the 11 years remaining of his life. He was, at times, a lawyer, a deputy marshal and a deputy collector of customs. He lived to see his brother Isaac beheaded by northern Indians and to lament the deaths of others in his immediate family.

Other members of the wagon trains of 1853 and 1854 lived long lives in Puget Sound country. The reminiscences of some of them were published in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Time, however, tends to mutate facts; the "bad hill" changes dimensions, the number of river crossings expands and shrinks, and the time on the trail varies. The most reliable sources remain the diaries kept during the crossing. But despite the unreliability of pioneer reminiscences and the paucity of emigrant diaries, the story of the Naches Pass Trail remains a gripping one. And although after 1854 wagon trains would no longer struggle over Naches Pass, the road continued to play a role in Washington history for several decades. During the Indian War of 1855-56, several incidents took place on Connell's Prairie through which the Naches Trail passed. In one of the incidents, Michael Connell and James McAllister were ambushed and killed by Indians. A few days later, in almost the same place, settlers Miles and Moses, serving as territorial militiamen, were attacked and slain by hostile Indians.

In the late winter of 1856, after the famous skirmish termed the "Battle of Seattle" and after numerous other forays and repulses, the Indian fighting force amazingly retained enough strength to harass the troops building roads and fortifications in the Puget lowland. On March 10, the Indian leader Leschi and his warriors ambushed a group of volunteers as they moved out of Camp Connell. Fighting raged for eight hours, but in the end the Indians were defeated. This confrontation, sometimes called the Battle of Camp Connell, was the last real battle of the Indian War. Soon after his defeat there, Leschi led about 70 of his followers in a retreat across Naches Pass. By an ironic twist the road Leschi helped build was his escape route.

After the war was over, the Naches Pass Trail reverted to its earlier uses, by the Indians to cross the Cascade Mountains and by stockmen to drive cattle from Yakima to the Sound. It was never developed as a road that could be used by any but horse-drawn vehicles or livestock.

The Great Northern Railroad selected Stevens Pass for its mountain crossing and the Milwaukee railroad went over Snoqualmie Pass. Cross-mountain highways eventually were cut through at Chinook Pass, south of Naches Pass, and at Snoqualmie and Stevens passes. The White Pass highway, the southernmost route, was constructed over a long period in the 1950s. The last mountain highway to be built was the scenic route through North Cascades National Park.

In 1910, as a fitting last chapter, the old Naches road was used by two men who as young boys had crossed the Cascades with the Longmire party. George Himes and David Longmire, both advanced in age, retraced that early journey. George Himes' diary tells of the memories that came flooding back and of the aches and pains he and Longmire experienced during the 1910 revisit.

Today only a shadow of the "terriblest route of all" remains. In its stead there stand innumerable deep ruts made by off-road vehicles, denuded hills where timber harvesting has taken its toll and left in its wake stubble-covered, eroded ground, subdivision piled on dreary subdivision, and strip development with its gaudy signs and serviceless service stations. In less than a score of places, many of them on the east side of the Cascades, the flavor of the countryside and the tread of the Naches trail has been preserved. On the west side of the mountains, in only a few places is the trail at all like its original condition. But I do remember with pleasure standing near the monument on Connell's Prairie looking out at the emerald-clad fields—a replacement in kind of the prairie grass of earlier days. And Elhi Hill, logged in the last century, is once again covered with trees and must closely resemble its former condition. Summit Prairie, if one ignores the nearby evidence of off-road-vehicle use, is practically unchanged from its original state. The cliff—the "bad hill"—has suffered at the hands of bikers and of well-meaning workers who have sought to repair the trail. Imagine the disgust of a group of Longmire party descendants when, on approaching the base of the cliff, they found a group of bikers attempting to rope their vehicles to its top. The time has come for those people who feel that the Naches Pass Trail is an important part of Washington's past to find ways to preserve it before it disappears entirely.

Joan Robinson has a degree in English Literature from the University of Oregon and attended graduate school in anthropology at the University of Washington. She is currently employed by cultural resource management by Archaeological and Historical Services at Eastern Washington University in Cheney. Pete Rice, whose photographs accompany this article, holds a doctorate in Anthropology from Washington State University. He is a professional archaeologist who serves as director of archaeological and historical services at Eastern Washington University.
Long Road to Vindication for Accused Northwest Soldier

A strange chapter in the life of Granville Haller, prominent early-day Northwest businessman.

By Dr. Carl Schlicke

One reason for the harsh treatment of Indians during the Eastern Washington Indian War of 1858 was the humiliation the army had suffered in two resounding defeats at the hands of the Indians earlier in that decade. The army was determined to wreak retribution on its enemies and restore its tarnished image. The lives of both army commanders in those two disastrous encounters were in later years marred by further tragedy. Brevet Lieutenant Colonel Edwin J. Steptoe was subjected to widespread obloquy, reduced to a caretaker role during Colonel George Wright's retaliatory campaign and then sent home on sick leave, where he subsequently died from a series of strokes. Brevet Major Granville O. Haller was the victim of a stunning and unjust disgrace during the Civil War. It is with the career of the latter that the present account is concerned.—Ed.

In the dark days of the Civil War following the defeat of General "Fighting Joe" Hooker and the Army of the Potomac by Confederate General Robert E. Lee at Chancellorsville, Virginia, in early May of 1863, a 44-year-old career soldier from the Pacific Northwest, Major Granville Owen Haller, was at his home and birthplace in York, Pennsylvania, on sick leave from his service with Hooker. Major Haller had previously served on the staff of General George B.
McClellan, whom he admired greatly. After McClellan’s campaigns in Virginia and Maryland, Haller was presented with a ceremonial sword as a token of appreciation for his service—as commander of the headquarters guard of the Army of the Potomac—by the officers of the 93rd New York Volunteers who had been serving under him. Haller had also been with General Ambrose E. Burnside in the bloody debacle at Fredericksburg, Virginia.

When, in mid-June, 1863, Lee and the Army of Northern Virginia began the invasion of Pennsylvania, Haller volunteered his services to Major General Darius N. Couch, commander of the Department of Susquehanna, and joined his staff as an aide-de-camp. Initially Haller was assigned to take charge of military operations and mustering of volunteers in York.

Lee’s army moved north as far as Carlisle, Pennsylvania, and Confederate troops under General Jubal A. Early invaded York. Haller’s efforts to delay or repel him were unsuccessful, but after three days Early was summoned to join Lee at Gettysburg. Haller was in charge of blowing up a bridge across the Susquehanna River at nearby Columbia to deny the rebels easy access to Philadelphia. The attempt failed. Instead the bridge was burned. He was also responsible for the organization and placement of artillery on the south side of the Susquehanna River across from Harrisburg, and he selected points for the positioning of men and entrenchments further down the river, until they were driven off by the rebels.

During the last few days of June, Haller was off scouting and setting up roadblocks in the vicinity of Gettysburg as the two opposing armies converged on that area. Although nominally an aide to General Couch, he was at various times in charge of an infantry regiment and a detachment of cavalry.

By July 4, in a momentous three-day battle, General George G. Meade, who had replaced Hooker, won a great victory at Gettysburg. This same historic day, besieged Vicksburg, Mississippi, had surrendered to General Ulysses S. Grant. The North was jubilant, but for Haller the joy was short-lived. In mid-July the emergency which required his service as an aide to Couch was over and Couch released him from this duty. Haller returned to York, wrote official reports of his recent diverse activities and sent a wire to the adjutant general in Washington, D.C., inquiring whether he was now to rejoin his old regiment. He received a telegram in reply: “By Special Order No. 331, of July 25th, 1863, you are dismissed the service, by order of the Secretary of War.” Haller was thunderstruck. He hastened to the capital to learn the cause. When he called at the War Department he was merely shown an extract of Special Order 331, in which he was accused of disloyal conduct and utterance of disloyal sentiments.

Haller prepared a letter of defense and requested a court of inquiry. This was denied. He collected testimonials from officers under and with whom he served, including generals Herman Haupt, Burnside and Couch. Civilians with whom he had worked organizing volunteers in the hectic days before Gettysburg wrote enthusiastic letters of support. All strongly vouched for his loyalty, enterprise and courage, but to no avail. He incidentally found that his name had previously been submitted to the United States Senate for a brevet as lieutenant colonel. An acquaintance from York, Jeremiah S. Black, who had been attorney general under President James Buchanan, personally presented another request of Haller’s for a court martial or court of inquiry to Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton, but no response was received from Stanton. Haller asked for a copy of the proceedings of the investigation which had led to his dismissal. His request was returned with the endorsement, “The Secretary of War declines to accede to his request.” He pleaded for a hearing before a commission then investigating the dismissal of officers without hearings, but was refused.

The entire proceeding which led to Haller’s dismissal was conducted in secret. The War Department never notified Haller of the accusation made against him nor gave him any opportunity to confront his accuser or to refute the allegations. No other witnesses were summoned. It seemed as though the United States Army, with the enormous problems facing it and the ever-mounting number of casualties being reported, had more to worry about than the problems of a junior officer whose loyalty was suspect. Or, as Haller thought, there may have been some more sinister reason for the secrecy in which the whole matter was shrouded. Finally, late in 1863, Haller, having been denied access to any other source of justice, notified Colonel James A. Hardie, assistant to the secretary of war, that he planned to take his case to the public. He privately published a booklet in his defense in which he presented the facts of the matter, supporting testimony and a résumé of his military services. Haller never asked for reinstatement. He sought merely to clear his name, feeling that he owed this to his family, his friends, his country and himself.

Was the accusation against Haller true? Was there anything in his past which might lend it credence? Could a bitter and disgraced career officer salvage anything from the remainder of his life?

The facts of the matter were that on December 17, 1862, just a few days after the appalling defeat of General Burnside by General Lee at Fredericksburg, Haller, having obtained a bottle of whiskey, invited a few gloomy friends to his tent on the bank of the Rappahannock River for some hot punch. One of his guests was a visiting naval officer, Lieutenant Commander Clark H. Wells, who was temporarily sharing his tent. As the evening went on, Wells, who had been soberly imbibing, exchanged veiled aspersions of cowardice with Haller and became quite incensed. Haller feared the alcohol might bring on an attack of an infirmity from which Wells was known to have suffered. Just a year earlier mental problems had
landed Wells in the Pennsylvania Hospital for the Insane for three months. Later in the evening, Wells took exception to a toast offered by Haller to Major Charles J. Whiting, another guest at the party. He also criticized Haller for blaming the administration for mistakes in the conduct of the war and saying that McClellan should have been left in charge of the army. About midnight Wells stalked out of the tent in high dudgeon to sleep elsewhere.

The next day Haller and Wells parted on a friendly basis and a few days later Haller received a cordial letter from Wells expressing his pleasure at his visit with the army and saying he had visited York and dined with Mrs. Haller and the children. He did express some concern about the amount of liquor consumed at "Haller's parties" and Haller's tendency after a few drinks to be critical in political matters, which "strangers might misinterpret." In February 1863, Wells took it upon himself to report his interpretation of Haller's toast and his far from uncommon "barracks groaning" to the secretary of war by letter and in person, as evidence of Haller's disloyalty. After Wells informed Haller what he had done the correspondence between the former friends became considerably less cordial. Haller proceeded to gather testimonials as to what he had actually said and regarding his loyalty. When his request for a court of inquiry proved fruitless, Haller considered asking for an investigation by a Masonic Lodge, as both he and Wells were members of this order. However, he was advised against this.

Haller was able to learn that the examination of Wells under oath had been conducted by Colonel Joseph Holt, judge advocate general of the United States Army. Holt hated McClellan, who he felt had placed obstacles in his path toward becoming secretary of war after the dismissal of Simon Cameron. His vindictiveness extended to friends and supporters of McClellan such as Haller. It was Holt who submitted to his rival Stanton the report which led to the ruin of Haller and his family, based on the ex parte testimony of a man Haller said was a "lunatic." Wells meanwhile became commandant of the Philadelphia Navy Yard. In spite of all Haller's efforts to defend himself from the "false testimony of an incompetent and irresponsible witness," nothing prevented the devastating blow from falling.

Haller's case was of sufficient importance to reach as high as the White House. In a court of inquiry held many years later Colonel Samuel Ross, Ret., testifying in Haller's behalf, stated that Major General Henry W. Halleck, then chief of staff, attended Lincoln's cabinet meetings. At one of these sessions, after the order for Haller's dismissal was issued, Lincoln remarked, "Look here, Stanton [Edwin M. Stanton, secretary of war], I don't think you should have dismissed
Major Haller preemptorily. Inasmuch as you can court-martial an officer for making water against a stump when a lady can see him with a telescope, what is the use of dismissing a man without a trial?" Halleck is alleged to have said that if he had been secretary of war he would have regarded this as an order to revoke Haller’s dismissal. But Stanton, not an admirer of Lincoln, was unmoved. He let the dismissal stand.

Granville Owen Haller was born to George and Susan Pennington Haller on January 31, 1819, in York, Pennsylvania. After the death of his father when the boy was two years old, his mother reared him hoping he would study for the ministry. However, at the age of 20 he applied for admission to the United States Military Academy at West Point. Appearing before an admissions board in Washington, D.C., he passed its examination and was admitted directly to the army and commissioned second lieutenant in the Fourth Infantry Regiment.

His first assignment was among the Cherokee Indians at Fort Gibson, which he described as a "very sickly post." He next participated in the Seminole War in Florida and received favorable mention in a subsequent history of the war. In the Mexican War he served with General Zachary Taylor in the capture of Monterey. The Fourth Infantry then joined General William J. Worth’s division under General Winfield Scott in the advance from Vera Cruz to the city of Mexico. He participated in the Battle of Churubusco and was a member of the storming party commanded by Brevet Colonel George Wright which assaulted the Molino del Rey. Haller also took part in the capture of the capital and for his gallantry during the war was awarded two brevets, captain and major.

After the Mexican War Haller married Henrietta M. Cox, also from York, by whom he had two sons and two daughters. In 1852, with Company I of the Fourth Infantry, he sailed around Cape Horn to Fort Vancouver. In July 1853 he moved up the Columbia River to the post at The Dalles, which he considered "a dreary, isolated spot." He found its garrison reduced to two companies of 56 men each by recent desertions to the gold fields.

In late August, 1854, word reached Fort Dalles of an attack by the Snake Indians on the 20-member Alexander Ward emigrant party on the Oregon Trail near old Fort Boise. Major Gabriel J. Rains, the district commander, ordered Haller to take a detachment of 26 men to the area to aid any survivors and, if possible, punish the perpetrators. On the way Haller’s detachment was augmented by a small group of volunteers under Captain Nathan Olney and by a few Nez Perce and Umpqua Indians. When they reached the massacre site they found that 18 of the emigrants had been murdered and mutilated and only two teen-age boys had survived. Another white, who with a few others had attempted to come to the rescue of the emigrants, had also been killed. Haller buried the bodies he found. The involved Indians had long since fled into the mountains and it was too late in the season to attempt to find them. A few Indians encountered in the vicinity were seized for questioning and two of them shot when they attempted to escape. Haller returned to Fort Dalles with little accomplished except a show of force in enemy country and the recovery of some of the property of the emigrants.

The following spring, General John E. Wool, commanding the Pacific Department, ordered Haller to take two companies of the Fourth Infantry and a detachment of the Third Artillery to protect immigration on the Oregon Trail and resume the search for the murderers. This time Haller found the Win-nas band of the Snakes, which was responsible for the massacre. His pursuit took him as far as the headwaters of the Missouri River. During the expedition he executed as many members of the band as they had killed whites (19). A few of these were
hanged from gallows erected at the site of the massacre. Haller stated that these capital punishments were carried out in the hope of preventing future murders of whites and not for revenge. At the hangings he insisted upon strict decorum among the troops. Wool in his reports to Secretary of War Jefferson Davis lauded Haller's conduct of his mission.

Before Haller's departure from Fort Dalles on his expedition, he had entertained Washington Territorial Governor Isaac I. Stevens at his home. The governor was on his way to hold a council with the regional Indian tribes at Walla Walla near the site of the old Whitman Mission. At Rains' order he furnished the governor with an escort of 40 soldiers under Lieutenant Archibald Gracie, for what was to be the first of a number of councils east of the Cascade Range at which Stevens hoped to persuade the Indians to sign treaties opening their lands to white settlement and agreeing to move onto reservations. Meanwhile, several prospectors on their way to the newly discovered gold fields near the Hudson's Bay Company's Fort Colville were murdered by the Yakima Indians. In September Indian Sub-agent Andrew J. Bolon, who had planned to join Stevens, went into the Yakima country instead, to investigate. A friendly Yakima chief warned Bolon that his life was in danger in view of the agitated state of the tribes resulting from what they were hearing of the whites' intentions. In an attempt to return to The Dalles Bolon was slain by a group of Yaki mas he encountered, an act which precipitated the Yakima War.

When Rains received news of Bolon's death, he ordered Haller to take one company of 51 men into the Yakima country. Haller decided to take two companies and three officers although it badly depleted the garrison. At this time Haller was 36 years old and had 16 years of military experience, but many of his men were new recruits. Civilian authorities were apprehensive about such a small number of soldiers venturing into hostile territory, but Haller and even some of the Yakima leaders expected a parley rather than a fight. And yet, many Northwest tribes were preparing for war and whites were leaving the Walla Walla Valley for the Willamette settlements on the advice of Olney.

Haller and his men crossed the Columbia River and headed north on October 3. As they came down from the Simcoe Mountains into the Yakima Valley and approached Toppenish Creek, on the afternoon of October 6, they suddenly encountered a large band of Indians. There is some dispute about who fired the first shot, but soon a full-scale battle was raging. A bayonet charge drove the Indians back temporarily and during the night Haller was able to move to a more defensible position and to send off an Indian scout to Fort Dalles with a request for reinforcements. With daylight the fighting resumed and went on all of the seventh, with frequent charges by the soldiers and a steady increase in the number of Indians until over 700 were present. The soldiers had with them a howitzer, which they used effectively. Some of them were armed as a trial with the new long-range rifles which fired Minie balls, but most were using the old smooth-bores. Many of the Indians had guns. The inexperienced soldiers did a lot of random firing, wasting ammunition; the new rifles fouled easily and were difficult to load.

As usual, at nightfall the fighting broke off. The Indians, who by this time were estimated to number over 1,000, planned to finish off the beleaguered command in the morning. It was obvious there was no longer any chance for a parley with the Yakima chief, Kamiakin, and the only hope for the hungry, thirsty and weary soldiers to escape with their lives lay in an attempt to flee during the night. Packs and supplies were burned or abandoned and cattle and unneeded horses turned loose before the command crept away. En route the howitzer was buried, and during the night a 40-man rear guard went astray. The next morning a number of Indians caught up with the retreating soldiers and a running fight went on for most of the day. On the ninth the lost rear guard was found and a 45-man relief company arrived. The battered and humiliated command got back to Fort Dalles October 10. Casualties included five men killed and 17 wounded. Another small body of troops coming over from the coast to join Haller learned of his defeat and returned to Fort Steilacoom.

Haller felt that his men had fought well against tremendous odds. Wool, however, criticized him for proceeding without "the precautions necessary against savage warfare." Wool also thought Haller overestimated the number of Indians, although Father Charles M. Pandosy of the nearby St. Joseph Mission on Ahtanum Creek considered the estimate correct. He wrote Haller, "I did not think it possible you could execute so happy and honorable a retreat." Others felt Haller might have prevailed if he had held out a little longer until the arrival of his reinforcements. A defeat might have cooled the ardor of the Indians for war, whereas their victory emboldened them. After a visit to the battle site, James W. Nesmith, colonel of volunteers and later senator from Oregon, in a report to Governor George L. Curry, said it was surprising that any of Haller's men survived and that the "courage and intrepidity" of the major and his command were worthy of the highest commendation. He later told Haller that he deserved a brevet.

On October 30 Major Rains decided to take things into his own hands and marched into the Yakima country with a command of almost 400 regulars and several companies of Oregon volunteers, to carry out a retaliatory campaign. Haller went with him for his third arduous campaign in six months. The expedition turned out to be totally ineffective, with the remaining Indians scattering before this superior force and Rains failing to take advantage of the few opportunities for decisive action. The entire operation served only to increase the contempt of the Indians for the fighting qualities of the army. The only losses were two men drowned and a horse herd stolen by the Indians. Almost the only example of heroism and initiative was provided by a gallant, independent charge by two companies, one led by Haller. As winter set in Rains returned to Fort Dalles. His own officers were disgusted by his dilatory
tactics and pressed charges of incompetence against him.

Rains, on his part, lashed out against everyone for the futility of his campaign. Haller he cited for his “shameful retreat” and for sending a report of his battle to the Oregonian before reporting it through official channels. Haller’s request for a court of inquiry was ignored.

In December Oregon volunteers moving from The Dalles to the Walla Walla Valley erected a temporary fort at the Umatilla River which they named Fort Henrietta in honor of Haller’s wife, who had let them have her personal carriage when the army refused to furnish the volunteers with any wagons.

General Wool had by this time become sufficiently concerned about the situation in the Pacific Northwest to request the War Department to send additional troops to the area. In response, the Ninth Infantry arrived at Fort Vancouver in January 1856 under the command of Colonel George Wright. Within a few days of their arrival, an Indian attack on Seattle was repulsed by the citizens with the help of a naval contingent.

Wright was instructed by Wool to establish posts in the Yakima country and the Walla Walla Valley. In March, on his way to the latter, no sooner had he passed by the Cascades of the Columbia River than the blockhouse and settlement—from which Wool had just removed most of the company of soldiers assigned there by Wright—were attacked by a party of Yakima, Klickitat and Cascade Indians. Fourteen civilians and three of the remaining soldiers were killed. Wright and part of his command returned on the boat which had brought him the news, and Lieutenant Philip H. Sheridan came up with some dragoons from Fort Vancouver. Most of the Indians dispersed, but nine were seized and executed for their “unprovoked attack.”

When Wright had started out for Walla Walla, Haller and his company had been left to rest at Fort Dalles; however, after the Cascade fight Wright changed his plan and decided to march into the Yakima country first, Haller and his company being ordered to join him. Late in April Haller and a number of other veterans of the Rains campaign led Wright into the Yakima country. Wright established a temporary fort on the Naches River whisker Steptoe was ordered to bring reinforcements the following month. This brought to over 500 the number of regulars with Wright. While Wright was there, a number of Indian chiefs visited him but Haller said Wright seemed more interested in the beards, hair and appearance of his men than in fighting Indians. “Time,” said Haller, “is hanging heavy in camp.” The early part of the summer was spent marching about the country between the Cascade Range and the Columbia River, “showing the colors” and parleying with the Indians, for Wright at that time still hoped for peace by negotiation rather than force. In general Haller seemed on good terms with the colonel and with Father Pan­dosy, who was a great help to Wright in his dealing with the Indians. Earlier, when the volunteers with Rains had plundered the Ahtanum Mission, Haller was able to salvage some of the priest’s religious vestments and paraphernalia.

In late August Wright returned to Fort Dalles, leaving Haller and Major Robert S. Garnett in the Yakima country to build Fort Simcoe. On the way, Wright recovered, “unimpaired,” the howitzer which Haller had left behind. This was made possible when two Yakima leaders, Owhi and his son Qualchan, told Haller where it had been moved by the Indians. Haller was miffed that he had not been permitted to retrieve it himself, since it had been in his charge when abandoned.

Wright, by the time he finally got back to Fort Vancouver, felt that the war in the Yakima country was “closed.” Steptoe was dispatched with several companies to build Fort Walla Walla.

Much of the summer was spent by Haller reading, keeping a diary, writing to his wife and entertaining fellow officers in his tent. He enjoyed convivial drinking but there are no reliable accounts of his using alcohol to excess.

In November Haller was ordered to proceed to Fort Townsend on the Olympic Peninsula with Company I of the Fourth Infantry, and to erect a fort there to protect settlers and travelers from raids by the fierce bands of Indians from the far north. Haller served as its first commander and a little revenue cutter was placed at his disposal. The labor performed by the soldiers clearing the land of its huge trees and erecting quarters was, according to Haller, “immense.” Haller was also supposed to evict any Haida Indians currently working in the area or dwelling there as mistresses to unmarried settlers. In spite of his presence and that of Captain George Pickett at Fort Bellingham, which had been established a few months earlier, numerous sallies took place to capture or drive away marauders. The following summer a war party of Haidas returned to Whidbey Island and murdered and decapitated Isaac N. Ebey, colonel of volunteers and pioneer legislator, in reprisal for the 1856 killing of several of their fellow tribesmen in a skirmish near Port Gamble. Because of Haller’s assignment to the Puget Sound area he missed participation in the 1858 battles in Eastern Washington.

Late in 1858 General William S. Harney was placed in command of the Department of Oregon and the dispute over the ownership of the San Juan Islands heated up. Having been left in limbo by the 1846 treaty which established the boundary between the United States and the British possessions at the 49th parallel of north latitude, they were claimed by both nations. Early in the summer of 1859 General Harney closed Forts Townsend and Bellingham. Haller was sent to Fort Steilacoom and Pickett was ordered to set up a base on San Juan Island and establish United States authority there. Later in the summer the army acquired the S.S. Massachusetts from the navy, and Haller’s company was assigned to the ship to patrol the islands and protect the Boundary Commission, which was working in the area. Haller heard of a raid by Nooksack Indians in Whatcom
County. He landed there, marched 25 miles, surprised the hostiles, seized the war party and chased the remainder out of Bellingham. On August 1 Lieutenant Colonel Silas Casey ordered Haller to take Company I to San Juan Island to reinforce Pickett, who by this time was confronted by several British warships. Haller thought he was to assume command on the island but was not even permitted to land because of an agreement Pickett had made with the British squadron commander that neither side would land more troops unless the other did.

Haller, who was closely questioned by the British naval officers, relayed to them the first news of England’s possible involvement in a war between France and Austria, and its obvious reluctance to become involved in another in the Pacific Northwest. Haller also warned Pickett of the potential consequences of Harney’s aggressive policies. Haller felt that possession of the islands should be determined by competent authority such as the Boundary Commission. On August 10, Casey arrived with additional companies of the Fourth Artillery. Harney ordered Casey to land his troops and Haller’s as well, which he was able to accomplish without incident in a dense fog. Casey, as the ranking officer on the scene, was ostensibly commander of the entire Puget Sound area but actually only in charge of Fort Steilacoom, while Pickett was in charge of the islands.

Haller believed that what Harney and Pickett were up to was a conspiracy among Southern officers to involve the United States in a war with Great Britain which would be disastrous to the Union cause and assure success to the secessionists. Interestingly, McClellan later voiced the unlikely opinion that it was actually a patriotic effort on the part of these officers to force war on Great Britain and, by uniting the nation in a foreign war, avoid a civil conflict. Haller had enjoyed intimate relations with both Harney and Pickett and was thoroughly familiar with every phase of the so-called “Pig War.”

When Washington, D.C., finally got
word of what was going on in the Pacific Northwest, General-in-Chief Winfield Scott was dispatched to the area by President James Buchanan to look into matters. Scott reached Fort Vancouver October 20 and was able to establish an accord with the British. All but 100 troops of each nation were to be removed from San Juan Island until the matter of ownership could be settled by arbitration between the governments involved. Pickett was sent back to Bellingham and Harney admonished. No sooner had Scott departed than Harney attempted to undo the arrangements which had been made and returned Pickett to San Juan Island. This was the last straw for Buchanan and Scott, who promptly relieved Harney of his command and turned it over to Wright, whereupon relative calm returned to the area.

In August 1859, Haller and his Company I were transferred to Fort Mojave, which had been established four months earlier on the left bank of the Colorado River in what is now Arizona, to control the Mojave and Paiute Indians. Haller described it as the "very worst post in the United States." The fort was abandoned in 1861 and in June of that year Haller reported marching 387 miles in 18 days, taking his company to New San Diego Barracks where he assumed command. While he was there, Colonel Edwin V. Sumner, commander of the Pacific Department, received a somewhat disturbing letter from K. H. Dimmick, United States attorney in Los Angeles. Dimmick said he had in his possession some papers belonging to a deceased person which contained an accusation against Haller. His loyalty was not questioned but he was accused of a "small peculation for his private purse." Dimmick suggested that the documents might be useful if Haller ever "proves untrue." There seems to have been no follow-up on this charge and at this time Haller embarked for New York to join McClellan's army. In December he was promoted to major.

A year after his dismissal from the army, and after further unsuccessful attempts to obtain a hearing, Haller returned to Puget Sound with his wife, two sons and two daughters. For two years he lived on his farm at Crescent Harbor on Whidbey Island. Then he opened a general merchandise store at Coupeville, a little farther south on the island. He owned a handsome home there which still stands, overlooking the waters of Penn Cove. For a long time his store was the only large establishment of its kind between Bellingham and Seattle. His customers came from a wide area and his son recorded that he was highly esteemed by his patrons. Many of these he helped to get their start as settlers by extending them liberal credit, although there are tales that he sometimes charged them 30 to 36 percent interest per year! His son, however, maintained that his father's generosity at times was so great as to endanger his own finances. He invested in several mills and acquired wide real estate holdings, particularly farmlands. He was active in civic affairs and joined numerous fraternal orders. He was appointed postmaster in 1868 and served as county treasurer from 1870 to 1871.

Finally, in 1879, 16 years after his dismissal, through the efforts of loyal and influential friends, Congress passed a joint resolution requiring the secretary of war to order a court of inquiry for Haller. The trial was held in Washington, D.C. After reviewing pertinent documents and hearing numerous witnesses the court announced that it found nothing disloyal in the sentiments expressed by Major Haller in his discussion of the conduct of the war, although his remarks might have been impudent. The toast, as charged by Wells, had been, "Here's to a Northern and Southern Confederacy during the administration of Lincoln." The court viewed this as so unintelligible and expressive of any tone of political thought that it was inclined to believe the wording adduced by Haller and guests at his party, including Major Whiting: "Here's to the Constitution as it is, the Union as it was.” As to "evidence" regarding disloyal conduct, the court held that this could only refer to sentiments expressed, there being no evidence of any overt act of disloyalty. The court found the judge advocate general's examination of Wells to have been so ex parte as to serve merely as a basis for charges and not for the purpose of reaching the "internal merits of the case." The record of that examination had been sent to the general-in-chief and forwarded to the secretary of war with the recommendation that Haller be brought before the then-existing court for the opportunity of disproving the charges. That this recommendation was not followed gave neither advantage to the government nor justice to Haller.

The final verdict was that Major Granville O. Haller, late Seventh U.S. Infantry, had been dismissed for disloyal conduct and disloyal sentiments on insufficient evidence, "wrongfully," and therefore the court annulled said sentence. After some brief skirmishing regarding the authority of the court and the constitutionality of the congressional resolution, President Rutherford B. Hayes approved the findings of the court which completely exonerated Haller. The president further nominated Haller to be made a colonel of infantry. This was confirmed by the Senate to date from July 19, 1873, the date on which he would have been considered for promotion if he had remained in the service. He was, however, not awarded back pay for the period during which he had been in limbo.

With his good name restored, Haller elected to go back on active duty rather than return to his life as a prosperous merchant. He was assigned the command of the 23rd Infantry in May 1880 at Fort Supply in Indian Territory (Oklahoma). After six months he was transferred to Fort Dodge, Kansas, for three months and then spent about a year at Fort Union, New Mexico. He retired then at the age of 64, two years and seven months after his vindication, and moved to Seattle, where he became one of the city's most prominent citizens.

On Capitol Hill he built the largest house Seattle had seen up to that time and called it Castlemont. He lived there until his death. A contemporary later spoke of the Hallers as the "First Family on Seattle's fashionable First Hill." Haller looked after his property interests and made extensive improvements. He was partial to farming and owned a number of
Brevet Major Granville O. Haller, while in the Pacific Northwest during the late 1850s.

model farms. The only tragedy which marred his later life was the death of his older son by drowning in 1889. Haller died May 2, 1897, leaving his wife, one son and one daughter. (The fate of his other daughter is unknown.)

Castlemond was inherited by a son who lived in it for several years. Built before the era of electricity, central heating and modern plumbing, the house finally came to be considered unlivable and was razed.

A journal which Haller kept during much of his military career in the Pacific Northwest is in the University of Washington Library. He also wrote a number of essays, including Kamiah in History, The San Juan Imbroglio and The Dismissal of Granville O. Haller, the booklet he published in the effort to clear his name, a copy of which is in the University of Idaho library.

In the overall history of the United States Haller was not a very important person, but what happened to him was of the utmost importance, because of the principles involved. As his son, Theodore N. Haller, was to write, "It is astonishing that an officer of the United States Army could be disgraced and deprived of his commission without a hearing on such flimsy charges." That a soldier, after nearly 24 years of faithful service, could be summarily dismissed without any opportunity to defend himself is almost unbelievable. A single such gross injustice, uncorrected or unchecked, places in jeopardy the rights, liberty and protection ensured to all by our Constitution. Even the Articles of War require that an accused officer must have a fair trial and be furnished with a copy of the proceedings.

From his writings, Haller appears to have been an intelligent man. His military record is that of a competent, courageous and loyal officer. He was a sociable and gregarious individual. At one point in his career there was the one unsubstantiated allegation of peculation but otherwise his morals seem to have been beyond reproach. He had his differences with Wool and Rains, but so did many others. Like so many soldiers, before and since, he did not hesitate to complain about the posts to which he was assigned and, among peers, to criticize the conduct of military affairs. It is hard to think of him as a scoundrel, much less as a traitor, when one reads the warm and enthusiastic letters of support which were written in his hour of need by his superiors and civic leaders.

The character of his accuser Wells was far from blemishless. The conduct of his prosecutor, Colonel Holt, was certainly not in conformity with the Articles of War and Holt's malice toward anyone with ties to McClellan is a matter of record. But the final responsibility as judge and executor rested with Secretary of War Stanton, and his totally distancing himself from the whole matter is inexplicable—unless, as has been suggested, Wells had connections as high as a member of Lincoln's cabinet (Stanton), or if some even more sinister reason for all the secrecy existed.

Dr. Carl Schlicke, a Spokane surgeon, is a regional historian and the author of a biography of Colonel George Wright.
The FAMOUS OVERLAND VOYAGE of Columbia Lightship No. 50
Mere house movers succeeded where the best marine salvage efforts failed.

When marine salvage crews failed, a firm of Portland house movers took over, and the Columbia River's first lightship was saved from destruction in a 1901 engineering feat unprecedented then and probably not duplicated since.

*Columbia Lightship* No. 50 was a 250-ton vessel, 112 feet in length, with no propulsion machinery and only light sails. She was towed from San Francisco in 1892 and anchored off the Columbia bar, there to shine a bright light so that ships going into the river could determine their position with some precision and avoid going aground on beach or rocks—a fate that befall so many ships that the Columbia bar became justifiably known as the “graveyard of the Pacific.”

In the early evening of November 28, 1899, a particularly vicious storm struck the coast and the lightship, its bow pitching violently in high seas, snapped its anchor cables. Sails were hoisted but they were soon ripped apart by the high winds and the helpless vessel drifted slowly toward the shore.

Two tugs were able to put lines aboard her the next morning, but the storm still raged and the lines would not hold. The vessel drifted into the line of high breakers on the seaward side of Cape Disappointment, north of the Columbia bar, but was fortunate to go aground on a short stretch of sandy beach between McKenzie Head and the cliffs at the end of the cape, where the venerable Cape Disappointment lighthouse flashed its beacon amid the muzzle-loading mortars of Fort Canby, one of three coastal forts built to catch an invading warship in a cross fire if ever an enemy vessel dared brave guns and the treacherous Columbia bar at the same time.

The crew of the Cape Disappointment lifesaving station hurried across the narrow isthmus in the middle of the cape peninsula and put a line aboard the lightship with the second shot from a line gun. The crew of eight was quickly and safely brought to shore.

*Lightship* 50 was so firmly stuck in the sand that all efforts to pull her off at high tide failed. Ships aground on the beach...
Mounted on a cradle, the ship was inched along over rollers by use of blocks and tackles with lines attached to capstans turned by horses.

were not an uncommon sight along the Long Beach Peninsula, but there hadn't been one for a while and the lightship attracted a steady stream of the curious, many of whom speculated about a bizarre salvage scheme that had been suggested. Would it be possible to pull the ship across the three-eighths-mile-wide isthmus and get it back in the water at Baker's Bay on the other side?

Abandonment of the ship, which was the fate of most vessels wrecked along that shore, was not considered. Sea salvage efforts were continued by a Portland contractor retained by the United States Lighthouse Service. After more failures, the contract was canceled, and in June 1900 new salvage bids were called for.
Most of the bidders proposed to pull the lightship off the beach but three offered to do the unprecedented—to lift the ship onto blocks and pull her overland to Baker's Bay. This did not seem feasible to officials in Washington, D.C., who awarded the contract this time to a shipbuilding firm, Wolff & Zwicker Iron Works of Portland.

This firm was determined to succeed where others had failed. It set out with heavy cables and anchors, a large crew, a barge and a tug. They waited for favorable weather only to find that a sandbar had formed on the seaward side of the stranded ship. Large pumps were used to wash away the sandbar but still the sand held the ship fast. The contractor's time

The ship was transported overland on large rollers, which moved on a heavy-plank roadway. The bearded man wearing a suit is Andrew Allen of the firm of Allen & Roberts, house movers.
BELOW: The house movers used their feat to advertise themselves.

RIGHT: Large crowds came out, usually on Sundays, to watch the ship being pulled along by its anchor chain.

Bids were called for again, but this time for land hauling only. And time was of the essence. The Lighthouse Service was getting frustrated and impatient. Bids ranged from $14,650 to $25,000, but the winner was Allen & Roberts, Portland house movers, who contracted to rescue the ship in 35 working days for $17,500.

To make sure they would finish on time Allen & Roberts installed a generator on the ship to furnish light so that the operation could continue on a night-and-day basis.

The house movers, naturally enough, used house-moving methods. They put
heavy timbers under the hull and lifted it with jackscrews so that a cradle, to be moved on rollers, could be built underneath.

The work proceeded more slowly than expected and time soon ran out. But because the contractor was doing his best, working around the clock, a $100-a-day penalty clause in the contract was waived and the time limit extended.

Once on dry land, the cradle was inched forward by the pull of lines running through large blocks and tackles and around capstans turned by horses. Whether the house movers considered bringing in a steam donkey engine of the kind then being used increasingly in logging operations was not recorded, but

LEFT: Three sets of block-and-tackle were used on uphill slopes.

BELOW: A side view of Lightship 50 headed down the beach to its launching in Baker’s Bay.
Across the three-eighths-mile isthmus at last, Lightship 50 is ready to go back into the water.

they did not. Two live horses were enough to move a 250-ton load.

When Lightship 50 was within 250 feet of Baker's Bay and it was plain that the salvage would be successful, repairs were hurriedly made to the rudder and hull, damaged during the year and a half it was pounded by intermittent storms while still stranded.

The moving was a major spectator event on the lower Columbia. The curious came by the hundreds to see the strange spectacle of a big ship, high and dry, being pulled through the woods on rollers. Excursions were run from Astoria—fare one dollar with bicycles checked free.

On June 2, 1901, a little more than
This map shows where Lightship 50 was beached on the seaward side of Cape Disappointment at the north entrance to the Columbia River. The dotted line shows the route over which it was pulled across the narrow part of the peninsula to be launched in Baker's Bay.
Allen, Roberts and various workers and onlookers pose in front of the ship-moving machinery.

three months after work had begun, Columbia Lightship No. 50 was triumphantly launched into the calm waters of Baker’s Bay and then towed to Portland for final repairs and refitting.

Soon thereafter the ship was back in service, swinging at anchor off the Columbia bar. In 1905 she broke her cables again and drifted ashore, but this time she was pulled free by tugs and continued to serve until 1909, when she was replaced by Lightship 88.

Lightships have long since been replaced by large lighted buoys. The last Columbia River lightship is now moored permanently as a historic exhibit along-side the Columbia River Maritime Museum in Astoria.
Allen and Roberts, proud of their feat, had progress photographs taken by J. F. Ford and mounted them in albums. The accompanying pictures are among the 28 from one of those albums. A more complete account of the salvage of Lightship 50 is in the Oregon Historical Quarterly, Vol. 69, No. 4. All of the photographs are from the collection of John McClelland, Jr.

Its land voyage over, Lightship 50 is launched anew.
An obedient wife played a key role in delaying women’s suffrage in Washington.

By John Fahey

It was a 19th-century saloon owner’s wife, Nevada Bloomer, not the least interested in public controversy, who agreed at her husband’s urging to become the pawn in an involved plot to deny her sex the right to vote, just as Washington was about to become a state nearly a century ago.

Like many married women of her time, she felt that men alone should handle public affairs—or if she did not, at least her convictions were not strong enough to cause her to decline when her spouse, Edward Montague Bloomer, said he wanted to use her in a balloting test case.
As a result her name became firmly connected with the cause of women's suffrage and eventually appeared on the calendar of the United States Supreme Court, taken there by an eccentric lawyer who lit his cigars with five-dollar bills.

In the 1880s Washington's territorial legislature took a progressive step and passed a law allowing female citizens to take part in elections. The act was promptly challenged by its opponents before the territorial supreme court, where Associate Justice George Turner, a firm opponent of the idea that women were capable of voting properly on public matters, and who was in his last months in office, ruled that the act's title was defective. That decision in effect snatched away the voting franchise from Washington women before they had a chance to exercise it. This decision was offensive to many male citizens, who regarded his reasoning as shabby hair-splitting.

Turner's reputation, then and later, as a master of political intrigue (he would never quiet rumors that he bought his seat in the United States Senate) simply added to the suspicion that he had pulled a fast one on the legislature. But the legislature reversed him. In its last session before statehood, on January 18, 1888, it passed the suffrage bill again, this time with a clearer title.

The politicians then meeting to frame a constitution for the new state, Turner among them, argued a good deal about women's suffrage, particularly about the words in the organic act specifying that "white male inhabitants over twenty-one" were to be the new state's voters.

To a cabal of Spokane saloon owners the possibility of women voting was threatening because women would surely vote for Prohibition. Women's suffrage and temperance had been linked in the campaigns of Susan B. Anthony, when she toured Washington in 1871, and Amelia Bloomer (no close relation to Nevada), whose trousers gave their name to a liberated woman's costume—those frilly pantaloons called "bloomers."

One of the saloon owners in Spokane was Edward Bloomer, 47, once a Civil War captain in the 89th New York Volunteers, a railroad man and a Mason who did not hesitate to take part in political arguments. Bloomer learned that one of his suppliers, John A. Todd, a bottler of Bohemian beer, was to be an election judge in the fourth ward, where the Bloomers and their three sons lived.

A plot then was hatched. Bloomer would march his compliant wife, Nevada, to the polling place in a municipal election. Todd and the other election judges would turn her away and then a suit could be filed in her behalf, challenging the denial of her right to vote. This would occur before Washington's admission as a state and the legal complications could delay suffrage indefinitely.

After nearly a century, it is still uncertain how many conspirators there were or how many others knew about the scheme. One attorney who did know shouldered himself into Nevada's

George Turner, territorial judge, U.S. senator and Nevada Bloomer's adversary in the suffrage case.

To a cabal of Spokane saloon owners the possibility of women voting was threatening because women would surely vote for Prohibition.
case and called it "rotten at the core—a put-up job."

Serious men, however, believed that suffrage should be fairly considered as a provision in the new state constitution. A leading Seattle attorney and former justice of the territorial court—who had dissented from Turner’s ruling denying women the vote—was Roger S. Greene. He favored “getting at the bottom of this vexed question of woman suffrage under the organic act.” Greene didn’t think Nevada Bloomer cared about suffrage but he was willing to accept her case as a test to settle the issue, even though he heard that her suit was “being pushed, at this time, merely for public political effect.”

As a territorial justice, Greene had admitted to practice the first female attorney in Washington, Josephine Leila Robinson, who came out from Boston in 1884. When she could not attract any clients, Greene had her appointed to defend a Chinese accused of smuggling. (When she won the man’s acquittal, women in the courtroom applauded.) Discouraged by lack of business, Robinson soon returned to Boston, where she worked to advance women lawyers in Massachusetts, and apparently she bombarded Greene with suffragist propaganda during the Bloomer affair.

On April 3, 1888, Nevada Bloomer showed up at the polls as her husband told her to, marked her ballot, and handed it to the three election judges who, as agreed, refused to accept it. A few days later, Nevada Bloomer sued John Todd and the others for $5,000 for “wrongfully depriving her of the privilege of voting.” Her attorney, William M. Murray, moved fast. Haste was important because of the approaching constitutional vote. Todd hired as attorneys the Spokane firm of Kinnaird, Forster and Turner. The latter was former judge George Turner, by then retired from the territorial bench.

Turner would write the briefs for Todd’s defense in the Bloomer case. His first was three lines long, a demurrer stating that Mrs. Bloomer had no case. On May 24, as intended, a judge sustained Turner’s demurrer and Murray, as planned, appealed his client’s suit to the state supreme court.

The supreme court was familiar turf for Turner. An erect, solemn, imperious warrior, graceless as a public speaker, aloof, long-winded, his arguments suffocated with technical interpretations of the law, but he was formidable, self-educated and a political opportunist.

Murray and Turner both stipulated that they would not unnecessarily delay the Bloomer suit. Roger Greene wrote the chief justice, Richard A. Jones, that with this stipulation “it is possible to get a decision at least two weeks before the November elections; it is certain that to get such a decision so early would be eminently satisfactory to all good citizens of the territory and particularly to those who favor woman suffrage.” Greene him-
self expected to prepare an argument, as a friend of the court, because he believed the Bloomer case "demands the broadest and most searching examination of liberties and prerogatives of citizens, male as well as female."

Several other attorneys planned to write their views on suffrage as friends of the court—but none had foreseen the entry of Arthur S. Austin, who literally appointed himself Nevada Bloomer’s attorney, and sped between Olympia, Spokane and Portland. Murray found out about Austin from an article in the Oregonian describing Austin’s meeting with the prominent Oregon suffragist, Abigail Scott Duniway, to seek her endorsement. Thereupon, Murray wrote an angry note to the clerk of the supreme court saying, "Mr. Austin has not and never did have authority to represent Mrs. Bloomer."

Austin was not so easily suppressed. He had gone to Olympia a few months earlier from New York where the Times, reporting his odd behavior, called him “the queer Vermonter.” Austin, outraged by the newspaper, threatened to shoot reporters who followed him as he handed out free cigars to strangers in hotel corridors and lit his own with five-dollar bills. He had made his fortune in real-estate speculation in Birmingham, Alabama, and spent his money so recklessly that his wife, sister, mother and father asked a court to commit him as insane.

They had him locked up in Bellevue hospital in New York but Austin’s attorney, ignoring professional opinions that Austin was indeed demented, talked the court into letting him out because Bellevue didn’t afford the light, air and space his client needed. Free, Austin bundled up his wife and three children and moved to Olympia. There he found another crusade. He had gone to New York only to defend an alderman accused of stealing public monies and now, at 36, Austin found Nevada Bloomer and women’s suffrage.

Austin succeeded Murray as Bloomer’s lawyer simply by raising the money Bloomer needed for an appeal bond required by law. But his flamboyant approach to her suit was too vigorous for Nevada. She was virtually submerged by the antic Austin, who gave newspaper interviews declaring, “These saloon keepers and liquor dealers are afraid that if women vote, they’ll put in some cranky reform” such as Prohibition. Meanwhile, the earnest Greene had gotten himself into hot water with old friends on the territorial court by sending them suffragist circulars (doubtless from Josephine Robinson) as examples of propaganda. Greene was horrified to read in the Post-Intelligencer that the justices received “annoying and even threatening circulars” from “a prominent attorney of Seattle.”

Greene apologized to the justices and told them he was too ill to write the friendly brief he had intended. Chief Justice Jones was ill, too—dying, in fact—but he dragged himself to the bench to hear the case. Presumably he even read through George Turner’s convoluted argument, which reviewed the history of citizenship in the nation, the U.S. Supreme Court’s decisions on suffrage (the court had ruled in 1874 that women’s votes were up to the states), and the precedential elements of the Bloomer case. Turner’s main argument ran that "the United States is a government of men" and the word “citizen” in the organic act was clearly intended to mean "male."

The territorial court ruled as might have been expected, and even adopted some of Turner’s language, that "citizen" in the organic act “meant and still signifies male citizenship and must be so construed.” In shaky handwriting, Jones inserted the word "male" in this sentence.

The Bloomer case closed the issue as far as the state constitution went. Women would not vote. Nevada was done, and doubtless relieved.

But Arthur Austin was not through. Roger Greene had expected the Bloomer case to go to the United States Supreme Court and that is where Austin carried it. In a new salvo of newspaper interviews, he raised more money for an appeal, and even a promise from Abigail Duniway that she would collect Oregon contributions. Austin chatted with Governor Elisha P. Ferry, who opposed women’s suffrage, and wrote Robert G. Ingersoll, the noted lecturer, freethinker and attorney, trying to enlist him in Bloomer’s cause. (Ingersoll apparently didn’t reply.)

The Bloomer case was thus scheduled for the October 1891 session of the Court. When that time came, Washington had been a state for nearly two years (and under its constitution, women might vote in school elections), Jones had died, Arthur Austin (after a term as Olympia justice of the peace) had moved to another state, and the Bloomers were in Denver where Edward worked as a passenger conductor for the Union Pacific and dreamed of someday retiring to a chicken farm. But the case never reached the Supreme Court. The lawyers who were to have paled Nevada Bloomer’s contested vote agreed to dismissal of the case without an opinion.

Women finally won the franchise in Washington in 1910, when the state’s male voters approved it by a margin of two to one. Bloomer’s name did not even come up in the campaign. More than half a century had gone by since Seattle’s Arthur A. Denny first tried to sneak suffrage through the territorial legislature.

By 1910 Edward Bloomer had his chicken ranch on Curlew Lake in Ferry County, Washington. He died there in 1917, survived by his widow, Nevada. His obituary did not mention the saloon keepers’ plot to deny women the vote. Nevada moved to Seattle where she died, unheralded, in 1923.

Talk to Bloomers in Ferry County today, and they will tell you they never heard of Nevada Bloomer, but the Bloomers are a numerous and proud clan. Every Labor Day weekend they gather for a reunion at Ava, Missouri, where, among other activities, they “boil a pickup-load of roasting ears.”

John Fahey, Professor Emeritus at Eastern Washington University, is the author of numerous books and articles on historical aspects of the inland Northwest.
The Women's West is a series of articles based on papers presented at the 1983 Women's West Conference. Twenty-one essays examine Western women's history using nontraditional methods of scholarship. Coeditor Armitage, director of women's studies at Washington State University, argues that traditional research methods are inadequate to understand Western women's lives, in part because information about most Western women is found outside the customary sources of published histories and archives. Her colleague Jameson advocates a "new and more comprehensive framework" for the study of Western women's history, one that includes Mexican women, Indian women, women from economic classes, as well as middle-class white women. Jameson writes, "We need to approach women's history not through the filters of prescriptive literature or concepts of frontier liberation and oppression, but through the experiences of the people who lived the history."

Most of the essays in this volume analyze the experiences of quite specific groups of people: miners' wives in Colorado, Mexican women in Arizona from 1863 to 1873, domestic servants on the Canadian prairies, and so on. Typically the essays also employ nontraditional research methods. In some cases the authors explain their methods in very technical detail, the significance of which will be difficult for most amateur historians and lay readers to grasp. And, in other cases, the research methods seem rather farfetched or narrow in scope to justify coming to conclusions about anyone other than the person or people studied. For example, one article examines in painstaking detail 23 letters written between an engaged couple over a three-month period, after which the author makes some universal conclusions about "ordinary people" of that generation.

Happily, most of the authors are more successful in explaining their methods and the purposes of their research. Corlann Gee Bush's essay "The Way We Weren't: Images of Women and Men in Cowboy Art" does a fine job of using standard techniques of art criticism, including analysis of color and composition, to show how paintings have reinforced the public's stereotypical images of men and women in the West.

One disappointment in this book is that many of the photographs are small and dark. However, this is more than offset by the good index plus the notes that follow each article, many of which contain useful bibliographical references. The intended audience for this book appears to be professional historians, because a number of the articles presume knowledge of previously published works. Nevertheless, the book has much to offer to any student of women's history, especially in the area of the examination of perceptions about what does, and what should, constitute "history."

COLUMBIA REVIEWS
Edited by Dr. Robert C. Carricker

The Trial of U. S. Grant: The Pacific Coast Years, 1852-1854.
Reviewed by Dr. Robert T. Smith.

Ulysses Simpson Grant lived for only two years on the Pacific Coast, but Dr. Charles G. Ellington of Bellevue, Washington, has devoted more than ten years of his life to researching those precious months. Such is the nature of good historical biography.

Traveling from New York to Panama and then up the Pacific Coast to San Francisco, Brevet Captain U. S. Grant spent the late summer of 1852 on detached duty in California. In the fall he was transferred with the Fourth Infantry to Fort Vancouver, then called Columbia Barracks. Grant traveled the lower Columbia region several times and he liked what he saw. But after only 15 months he was detached from Fort Vancouver and reassigned to Fort Humboldt, near Eureka, California. The 31-year-old Grant became desperately discouraged after only four months at his new post and resigned his captain's commission on April II, 1854.

In a carefully written foreword John Y. Simon, the distinguished editor of the Grant Papers documentary project, assesses the major achievement of The Trial of U. S. Grant. Ellington, he believes, amply demonstrates that, while many of Grant's contemporaries during the Civil War—and certainly the majority of historians since his presidency—have gossiped that he resigned from the United States Army in 1854 because of his predilection for liquor, in truth Grant's entire tour of duty on the Pacific Coast was a difficult period for him because of a combination of factors, not just a single weakness.

Whether he was in California or the Pacific Northwest, Grant felt himself "forsaken" and in a sort of domestic exile from his family and friends in the Middle West. Graduation from West Point and a creditable performance in the Mexican Coast assignments notwithstanding, he seemed always to be given routine duties while on his Pacific Coast tour. This frustration, coupled with some health problems, forced Grant to make his fateful career decision. Ellington has done an excellent job of synthesizing the many diverse factors that entered into Grant's decision.

The Trial of U. S. Grant is bound in blue linen cloth and printed on heavy paper. It has 18 illustrations and maps, a chronology of events, a selected bibliography and an index.

Robert T. Smith is a Professor of History at Eastern Montana College, Billings. He is a member of the Council on America's Military Past.
The Adventures and Sufferings of John R. Jewitt: Captive of Maquinna.
Reviewed by Dr. G. Thomas Edwards.

A t the age of 19 John R. Jewitt left his native England as an armorer on the American vessel Boston bound for a trading voyage. He arrived at Nootka Sound on Vancouver Island in 1803. In time the local chief, Maquinna, and the ship's captain had a dispute. This led the crafty native leader, who was nursing old grievances against white traders, to direct the massacre of the Boston's crew. Jewitt, who suffered a severe head wound, and John Thompson, an older sailor, were the only survivors. Maquinna made them his slaves. Jewitt was pressured into marriage, doing blacksmithing, making weapons, and performing other jobs. The captive impressed the Indians with his good humor, skills with a forge, and attempts to learn the language. Jewitt sent out letters, hoping they would lead to his escape, and he also patched up troubles caused by Thompson, who detested his captors. In July 1805 Captain Samuel Hill unexpectedly sailed the Lydia into Nootka Sound and Jewitt outwitted Maquinna and won freedom for himself and Thompson. The two sailors joined the crew of the Lydia, journeyed to China, and arrived in Boston in 1807.

During his captivity, Jewitt kept a secret journal. It was published, but far more influential was Richard Alsop's narrative based on Jewitt's notes and recollections. The result is this exciting and informative volume, especially the sections on Indian leadership, clothing, food, war and technology.

Generations of readers have found the Jewitt narrative to be both informative and enjoyable; it reminds them of Robinson Crusoe. Hilary Stewart's carefully edited and illustrated edition will continue this tradition. Her notes often enrich and sometimes correct the text. For example, she explains the importance of Indian twins and points out errors in accounts of sea otters and porpoises. The editor puts the manuscript into context by providing useful details about the fur trade prior to the arrival of the Boston and the culture of Northwest Indians, and biographies of the domineering Indian leader and his resourceful slave. The illustrations of people, tools, boats and marine animals, the clear maps, the bibliography and the index add to the reader's pleasure.

On the other hand, there are unnecessary annotations, such as those on strawberries and magazines; too little detail on the fact that in 1805 the Lydia may have been as near to Lewis and Clark as to Jewitt; and no citation of the useful essay by Edmond S. Meany, Jr., "The Later Life of John R. Jewitt." But these few faults do not detract from a handsome and useful volume that received proper care from both the editor and publisher.


A Letter Home.
By Lucia Williams, with supplementary text and photography by Jerry Gildemeister and original art by Don Gray, Union, Oregon: Bear Wallow Publishing Company, 1987. 120 pp. $24.50.
Reviewed by Carol Burroughs.

F or those who seek a collector's edition of a pioneer's account of a journey over the Oregon Trail, Bear Wallow Publishing Company has produced A Letter Home. This limited first edition, signed by the artist and photographer, is composed of two separate parts. The first is a contemporary essay which provides an overview of the Oregon Trail experience, beginning with the jumping-off points along the Missouri River and following the route through the West to Oregon City. It describes typical events and major landmarks. The best features of this section are the original black-and-white photographs of the landscape, wildlife and sites along the trail, with quotations taken from actual pioneer diaries.

The second part, which is of far greater interest, is the text of a letter from 36-year-old Lucia Lorain Williams to her mother in Findlay, Ohio, recounting the overland journey of her family from Ohio to Milwaukee, Oregon. Written just two weeks after her arrival, the letter is a fresh and clear account of the 1851 crossing made by Lucia, her husband Elijah and their four children. This part of the book is illustrated with original artwork which was inspired by the text of the letter.

The actual letter has been passed down through the family and is now in the hands of Lucia's great-granddaughter. This heretofore unpublished account is written in diary form with dated entries, and captures the pioneer experience as no secondhand account can. It is among the best letters of women pioneers which survive, being simply written but emotionally expressive and rich in detail. Some of the events that this family experienced were encounters with Indians, which included both hostile and friendly varieties; the crossing of dangerous rivers; and the death of a child. The description of this tragedy is indicative of the style of the letter, which begins: "Dear Mother, we have been living in Oregon about two weeks, all of us except little John, and him we left 12 miles this side of Green River. He was killed instantly by falling from a wagon and the wheels running over his head."

The first essay in this book adds little to the literature of the Oregon Trail, although the accompanying photographs are well done. Lucia's letter home is a treasure not to be missed. The work is beautifully printed, and will interest both collectors and historians.

Carol Burroughs is Head of Information and Research Support Services at Arizona State University-West. She is researching the role of women in overland wagon trains and has traveled over much of the Oregon Trail.

Address all communications and review copies to: Dr. Carriker, History Department, Gonzaga University, Spokane, WA 99258.
Newspapers Reflected the Impatience of a Territory Waiting for Statehood

By the late 1880s Washington had been a territory for more than 35 years. Other territories, such as Oregon, had not been forced to endure the second-class status of territorialhood nearly as long. Washington settlers were dissatisfied with the reasons, mostly political, that delayed what was their certain ultimate entitlement—statehood.

The accompanying editorial from the Seattle Daily Press is typical of expressions in newspapers throughout the territory at that time.

A territory, said the Press, had the same relationship to the federal government that a county did to state government. It was subordinate—too much so. A territory was entitled to only one elected member of the House of Representatives—no senators. Its governor, judges and other state officials were appointed by the president, which means they were changed each time there was a new administration in Washington, D.C. The territory was dependent on federal appropriations to operate the territorial government. The situation was so much resented that some of the pioneers might have wished that they had not changed their relationship to the federal government that a territory was entitled to only one elected member of the House of Representatives—no senators. Its governor, judges and other state officials were appointed by the president, which means they were changed each time there was a new administration in Washington, D.C. The territory was dependent on federal appropriations to operate the territorial government. The situation was so much resented that some of the pioneers might have wished that they had not succeeded in 1852 that led to the creation of Washington Territory. If that had not been done, statehood might have been achieved in 1859 when Oregon was admitted.

What called the Daily Press in January 1889 was that despite the need for a session of the legislature to attend to matters of pressing need, such a session could not be held because Congress had not come up with the necessary appropriation. Such was life in a territory.

But statehood matters were not being neglected while they were being delayed. Montana, Wyoming and Dakota territories were as impatient as Washington for statehood. An omnibus bill bringing all of them into the Union at once was being debated. And in February 1889, it was passed.

The accompanying editorial from the Seattle Daily Press, Seattle, Washington Territory, Thursday, January 17, 1889

**THE URGENCY OF ADMISSION**

It is not necessary to again impress upon the people of this Territory the urgency of the admission of Washington as a State into the Union, but another reason for most immediate action has suggested itself in the recent opinion delivered by Attorney-General Mathey on the question of whether the Legislature can meet this winter. From that elaborate array of legal authorities it can easily be seen what relation the Territory actually bears to the National Government, and how limited are its powers as a separate community. The Attorney-General makes it quite plain that as an ordinary county is to any State so is Washington Territory to the Congress of the United States.

We have laws upon our own statute books which need immediate attention. Some of them are pernicious, others are inoperative, others insufficient to meet the demands of justice and equity, nevertheless the Territory is helpless to remedy the defects of its own legislation. And why? Simply because Congress failed to make the necessary appropriation for a Legislative session.

Remote from the chambers of National law making, this Territory stands at the doors of the Capitol at Washington in about the same light and with about as much persuasiveness in influence as a hungry mendicant at a rich man's door. The prosperous possessor of a palace, who has accustomed himself to the delights and luxuries of opulence neither appreciates, nor gives thought to the needs of the beggar, and this the Representatives in Congress, pomping as they do from various parts of the Union, whose prosperity is old and long established, hardly give thought to the demands of a Territory situated in the extreme Northwest, no matter what its resources may be, nor what development and rapid accumulation of wealth are due to the enterprise and industry of its citizens.

Think you, citizens, of a community boasting self-government, that cannot have a Legislature in session of its own, merely because Congress, disregarding its parental obligations, neglected so important a matter as providing the proper wherewithal to meet the expenses of that community's law making! An oversight, doubtless, on the part of Congress, but a very grave omission in so far as it affects our rights and our needs. Yet such a state of things must necessarily continue so long as Washington remains a Territory. The time to act is now. Sign the petition; flood Congress with memorials, and by very importance itself secure the attention of Congress to the imperative need of admission.

The eyes of the commercial world are turned toward the progress of Washington; it cannot be that the law makers of the nation are blind to facts which merit for us the constitutional benefit of the American Republic.

Our population and wealth are sufficient, will our energy and our importance be equal to the occasion?
Bostonian Impressed

I am most impressed by the quality of your publication.

I have shown the magazine to a number of persons in the Boston area who are interested in the history of the Northwest Coast of North America and of the North Pacific region generally. Their reaction, too, is quite positive.

As a fifth-generation Northwesterner long resident in the East, I am delighted that my native region has produced a historical magazine with this much promise. I am confident that Columbia can play a key role in the reorganization and revitalization of Northwest history.

James Reed
Boston

Douglas Archive Open

I have just finished reading your Summer 1987 issue and found every article excellent. I was especially drawn to Bob Mutt’s well-crafted and interesting piece on Yakima’s William O. Douglas. I spent over four months in Yakima’s excellent museum sifting through most of the Douglas material, and especially appreciate the task Bob had examining it when it was first delivered.

Although most of Douglas’ thousands of books had to be repacked and won’t be on display until the current museum expansion is funded and completed, almost 400 of his speeches have been summarized and cataloged. Similar catalogs of various Douglas tape recordings, hundreds of black-and-white photos and some of his newspaper clippings are available. If any of your readers are interested in this material they should contact Frances McDermott, the archivist at the Yakima Valley Museum and, even with space cramped due to the expansion needs, she would make those recordings, hundreds of black-and-white photos and some of his newspaper clippings available to legitimate researchers.

James G. Neubill
Yakima

Some Inaccuracies Claimed

As a history buff it gives me some problems to read in Columbia, Winter 1988, page 34, the third paragraph. There are some serious misrepresentations. A little research will show that David Thompson passed Box Canyon on July 6, 1811. He was a cartographer for the North West Company which at that time was established at Spokane House.
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Columbia River above Kettle Falls to transfer furs north through Arrow Lakes to Boat Encampment then east by canoe and horses to Fort William on Lake Superior.

Spokane House and Fort Spokane were moved to Fort Colville in 1826. When the northern boundary of the United States was established in 1846, it was only a couple of years until Fort Colville was moved north and was reestablished as Fort Richardson on the west side of the Columbia in Canada.

The article headed “The Story Behind the Pictures,” with the reproduced document “The Upper Columbia River,” were well done. It was my pleasure to know Captain McDermott, Valentine, and Comehl, who are mentioned in the article.

John J. Weber
Spokane

Oregon & California Railroad Openings

I am writing in regard to your article, “Stagecoaches to Trains, Just 100 Years Ago,” that appeared in the Winter 1988 issue of Columbia.

Just by chance, last November, I came across several paper artifacts that are a supplement to the invitation appearing on page 27 but oriented to the trip from Portland to Ashland for the last spike ceremony. They seem to be more or less self-explanatory; however there are several items of some note. 1. The Californians’ schedule from San Francisco and Sacramento was a two-day, one-night trip to Ashland. The Oregonians planned a much more leisurely five-day trip from Portland. 2. R. Koehler, receiver to the Oregon & California Railroad in 1887, was general manager of the railroad—at least in 1882. 3. The handwritten Trip Pass issued to Mr. Fenton and its date would seem to indicate that a train left Portland on the 16th for Ashland, apparently accommodating those who were unable to leave on the 12th. He seems to have had his lower berth assignment preempted by someone else. 4. The railroad, not the city of Portland, paid for the hotel, carriage drives and the steamboat excursion scheduled for the invited guests and issued a complimentary pass for same.

A very good friend, who lives in Mossyrock, sent me a copy of your article. It was probably fortunate that he was aware that I had sent you a copy of your article, “Stagecoaches to Trains, Just 100 Years Ago,” that appeared in the Winter 1988 issue of Columbia.

Dale E. Bell
Saint Ignatius, Montana
1988 NEW ADMISSIONS POLICY

ADULTS .............. $2.00
SEN I ORS ............ $1.50
YOUTH (6-18) ......... $1.00
FREE ............... 

To the public on Tuesdays
To W.S.H.S. members every day
To prearranged school tour groups
To children under six
To library researchers by appointment

MUSEUM HOURS

PUBLIC HOURS
Tuesday - Friday
10 a.m. - 4 p.m.
Saturday and Sunday
Noon - 4 p.m.

ADMINISTRATIVE HOURS
Monday - Friday
8 a.m. - 5 p.m.

Washington State Historical Society
315 North Stadium Way
Tacoma, Washington 98403
(206) 593-2830

Haller's Defeat, an oil painting donated to the Washington State Historical Society by the renowned "cowboy artist" Fred Oldfield of Federal Way, Washington. For more about Major Granville O. Haller see "Long Road to Vindication for Accused Northwest Soldier" beginning on page 21.