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AT THE MOST RECENT meeting of our board of trustees, a couple of my colleagues were discussing the looming effects of Initiative 695. One was saying, "In King County the arts folks are just going to get hammered." I said, "Ha! Yesterday in Grays Harbor they laid off the county fire marshal and a prosecuting attorney. We have no arts to cut!"

Life on "The Leading Edge of the North American Continent" is no different than throughout the rest of our state. Indeed, our Society and history organizations large and small must address the prospect of less public funding. Let’s make some good news.

Taking a page from the proponents of I-695, starting January 1 the people of Washington began receiving a windfall in the form of reduced automobile license fees. For some of our most active supporters, that windfall will be substantial. I recognize this because in an earlier conversation with my colleagues we were talking cars...nice cars...cars with expensive tabs. Folks driving Beetles might save hundreds, but if you drive a big, new SUV, Benz, Caddie or Volvo, you’ll save a thousand dollars or more.

Voters passed I-695 to take control of choices about taxes. Let us accept the responsibility to choose to support history with our savings. We can “vote with our dollars for history.” You can choose to do something meaningful with your windfall. An Infiniti driver won’t live or die over the $500 dollars not spent on a license tab, but history organizations will thrive on your generosity. If we are seriously concerned about the implications of I-695 for organizations like ours, we need to do something immediate and constructive. Supporters of history who voted for I-695 have a particular responsibility to put both ethics into practice. Lovers of history have something better to do in this moment than bemoan the situation...and then jump in the Lexus to go spend license savings on Pokémon cards for the grandkids.

Think about it. There is an envelope enclosed in this edition of COLUMBIA. Use it to vote for history. As you write your historic first $30 check for license tabs, make it your new habit to give a generous share of your savings for history. If you invest a historic tax savings in “The Future of Washington’s Past,” you will make history to be proud of.

—David E. Lamb, President of the WSHS Board of Trustees
A Public-Private Stewardship for Washington's Legislative Building? YES!

By Leavitt S. White

Growing up in the 1920s in the quiet New Jersey "commuter town" of Plainfield somehow steered my youthful mind to the ancient legends of King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table. We lived only 20 miles from the excitement of New York City, yet I was more entranced by the exploits of Roland and Charlemagne, two of the most famous armored warriors of the Middle Ages. By the age of 10 or 12 I was already hooked on history. Here is where I found my first heroes, and I'm still hooked today.

As I began to notice the nurtured publications in our home, I found a special gold-covered issue of a magazine called The Washingtonian. Inside were eye-catching pictures and a big story on Washington's monumental Legislative Building, newly finished on the shores of Puget Sound, way across the country. This classical structure, with its towering dome, broad granite steps, and immense carved stone columns—plus its marble hallways, huge bronze doors, Tiffany chandeliers, and spectacular furnishings—had captured a prestigious architectural award. Even a raw New Jersey youngster could see that something very big was going on in that state called Washington. It seemed as if I was looking at history up close.

What great pride and awe I felt as I came to understand that my father and his architectural partner (their firm name: Wilder and White of New York) had played a key role in this current step forward in government—the creation of the new Washington State Legislative Building! With the passing of time and patient instruction from family, teachers and authors, I learned much more about Washington's "audacious state capitol and its builders"—a distinctive, marvelous phrase captured by Professor Norman J. Johnston of the University of Washington to spotlight a remarkable project and the group of people who dared to plan and build it. I can never forget that Washington incurred no bonded debt to handle this remarkable $7.5 million project in the 1920s. As with the design and construction of Washington's Temple of Justice and Insurance Building, timber revenues had paid all the bills, making the new Legislative Building seem like a gift to all the people of Washington.

Now let's hit the "fast-forward" button—almost to the present. Take a new look at our proud Legislative Building and what do you see? On the surface, grandeur and classic beauty still dominate the major public areas, but almost everywhere there is a distinct undercurrent of constant, heavy visitor traffic, overcrowding and clutter. There are pervasive signs of wear and tear and worrisome maintenance troubles in tired rest rooms and legislative support spaces. And with the repeated costly experience of unexpected interior water leaks, water infiltration into decorative exterior stone, and standing water in clogged roof or plaza channels, there is increasing pressure on the routine systems used for maintenance. Too little money has been turning up in annual repair budgets. Too little action has been initiated to preserve, protect and renew this classic structure.

Yet, during the last decade we have had our connection to history on the front burner in Olympia as state leaders, consultants and specialists have examined and considered both immediate and long-term problems and options involving the care of our 72-year-old Legislative Building. In fact, the more this building has come to be "a most treasured historical symbol," the more it has become the focal point of concerned study. Several recent events reinforce the opportunity for new directions and new decisions tied in with any commitment to the Legislative Building.

First was the completion in January 1999 of a comprehensive predesign study on the Legislative Building's renovation and preservation by a team of two Seattle architectural firms—PBA+BSA Architects and Leavengood Architects. This 15-month study, initiated in 1997, was conducted for the Department of General Administration and its ten-member Legislative Building Renovation Committee, composed of elected and appointed officials. In September 1999, at the suggestion of the Office of Financial Management, an
independent “value engineering” team of highly qualified consultants was assembled to review the predesign package and provide a high-level technical assessment of the projects being proposed. While the predesign study and the technical assessment raised many unanswered questions, they set in motion a process for preserving and renewing the Legislative Building.

The second event that resulted in a new approach to the stewardship of this important structure was the passage in April 1999 of House Resolution 4410, with the senate concurring. This resolution established the Commission on Legislative Building Preservation and Renovation. The commission was directed to develop a preservation/renovation plan, identify resources, and report its progress and recommendations to the legislature in the 2000 legislative session. With a series of monthly meetings, starting in July 1999, and sub-committees also at work, this commission has been growing into its desired basic planning role as specified by the legislature.

The third event was an initial “consensus step” taken in October 1999 by the commission. Considering the challenges ahead, members came to agree that major parts of the building’s total preservation and renovation were automatically the responsibility of the public sector while other elements and aspects of a future care package called for special talents and resources distinctively found within the private sector. This opened the door to an interesting concept: Would the Legislative Building benefit from a public-private partnership? And how could such a partnership be established and implemented?

The house resolution had directed the commission to investigate all areas of possible citizen involvement in the project. Said the commission: “Let’s explore this avenue of private citizen participation. It is at work already in other government tasks and assignments. It might be very useful and helpful here.”

Architects Bud Schorr, David Leavengood and Peter Bocek were frank and direct in their January predesign executive summary. They stated: “The Legislative Building, the legislative center and democratic symbol of Washington’s statehood, is in a continuing state of decay…and there are extremely compelling reasons to change the course of this deterioration—both inside and out.” Specifically, they noted that the building is unsafe, its infrastructure systems are failing, the roof and walls are leaking, the decorative stonework is eroding, spaces are overcrowded and, finally, the foremost symbol of Washington’s statehood must be renewed and preserved.

Pictures, sketches and diagrams reinforced these startling points, revealing some very serious interior and exterior conditions. Among the safety factors were these: the building has no sprinkler protection system and no smoke control system; there are not enough exits, per code, for an emergency evacuation; many doors swing against the flow of exiting; and the dome requires reinforcing to reduce seismic stress.

In their summary the architects detailed an eight-year program for exterior preservation at a projected cost of $29.9 million. This preservation project has, in fact, already been started. Much more work is scheduled for coming years. This includes critical elements such as cleaning and protection of stone; elimination of water infiltration, especially related to fragile areas of damaged decorative stone; repair and preservation of the plaza as well as the lantern on top of the dome; and repair of the monumental north stairs.

Overall, the summary may one day lead to a comprehensive long-term maintenance and preservation plan that “routinely evaluates, cleans and repairs damage to the building’s waterproofing and drainage systems.” An added recommendation by the architects urges “the Owner to insist on a Preservation Specialist to have oversight on all future interior or exterior work on the building to insure that the historic integrity of the structure is maintained.”

Several options were suggested for interior renovation, tracking ideas that emerged from earlier sounding-board meetings of the Renovation Committee and other internal focus groups representing people who work in the building. To relieve overcrowding, for example, the architects roughed out an idea for a new underground extension to the building that would be located adjacent to the south portico. This would provide a weather-protected link to legislative offices in the nearby Cherberg and O’Brien office buildings, as well as the Pritchard State Library.

Visitors and tourists are another element requiring planning and attention at the Legislative Building. Each year hundreds of thousands of out-of-towners visit the capitol. Tour guides, including many volunteers, are on hand to host
these visitors. Learning about government has become an important adjunct to public education. This has generated a large number of student visitors to the Legislative Building—as many as 900 a day when the legislature is in session. There are also occasions when sizable groups of activists appear at the Legislative Building, sometimes numbering in the thousands for a particular demonstration.

The high volume of public traffic in and around the Legislative Building has prompted questions on how to better accommodate visitors, including what might be done to move informal bag lunches by student groups away from rotunda stairways. The predesign study looked at various ideas, suggesting that part of the first floor might be a public gathering place with planned exhibit areas for groups wishing to bring a message to legislators. Independently, the commission and the value engineering team, led by consultant Bob Rude, came to the same conclusion: legislative business must have the highest space priority within the Legislative Building. Other potential options for public uses would not fit the primary purpose of this government building.

Complex space planning questions are still on the table, however, and new elements have surfaced at almost every commission meeting. The architects’ predesign study had proposed a single-level underground office extension of perhaps 40,000 to 59,000 square feet to help relieve overcrowding. The value engineering team came up with attractive space-saving ideas and thoughts, too, about new interior stairwells in each wing of the Legislative Building to meet life-safety fire code requirements. Also, a difficult new seismic issue has appeared. This concerns the physical attachment of exterior stone. In October Rude told the commission that stainless steel anchors might be needed to keep sandstone from falling in an earthquake. Such a seismic upgrade could cost up to $22 million, said Rude, as he agreed that further study on this issue is needed. A formal report from the value engineering team is expected by February 2000.

By the November 1999 commission meeting it was apparent that planning was still unsettled on many questions. Pertinent information was still being generated on space requirements, and reconciliation of conflicting recommendations was not yet complete. But preliminary estimates for an underground extension plus renovation of the Legislative Building had been listed in the predesign study at $87.5 million. So an early total indicated that the cost of preservation and renovation was around $117.4 million—certainly enough to get the attention of any legislator. And a seismic upgrade would boost this total to $140 million. The preliminary outline of a plan for the legislature was coming into focus.

Last April, when the house and senate adopted House Resolution 4410 to preserve, protect and renovate the Legislative Building, they specified that the new commission should include eight legislators, six major government officials, and five private citizens (to be appointed by the governor). As its first order of business the commission added two more citizens as honorary members. They take part in deliberations but have no vote. Altogether, in terms of background and experience, the diversity of the members is noteworthy. Among the citizens, for example, are a television broadcast executive, two emeritus professors in architecture, a museum development executive, a former computer marketing executive active in historic restoration, a former mayor of Wenatchee, and a retired industrial public relations executive.

In identifying a plan and resources for the preservation and renovation task, the resolution instructs the commission “to look first to traditionally dedicated and trust revenues as the funding source while investigating all avenues of citizen involvement to engage the public in contributing to the renovation and preservation of the legislative building.”

So, altogether, the stage has been set for vital direction, oversight and planning by a special group of Washington people. Internal logistical support comes from the Department of General Administration and external advice and experience from specialized consultants. Prompt feedback goes directly to the legislature. The public is engaged and connected in the planning. The commission is acting for the people to get the project under way and quite possibly to see it through, while the legislature holds the ultimate “power of the purse.” Nothing will truly happen until funds are allocated.

Regarding major funding, the commission appears ready to count first on dedicated trust revenues—the final planning to be done when the parameters of the project are in hand. Finance subcommittee meetings have been looking at the details.
The mandate for citizen involvement is a key part of the legislative resolution. Will that citizen just read about the “long-ago, tax-free gift” of the original Legislative Building to Washington citizens and then yawn? Or will he or she have some history in mind and think about getting involved? How is this to be accomplished in light of a couple of hard-edged perceptions about the Legislative Building that could be on anyone’s mind? Probably the first is this: “So there’s a problem with the Legislative Building? The state should pay for its own repairs!” The second perception is likely to be: “The state’s neglect has created the problem; don’t dump it on me!”

These likely reactions suggest that there is a strong need for citizen commitment to our state’s history. That commitment must simply override any shortcomings or failures of our democratic system. We cannot allow the centerpiece of our state’s government to fall into disrepair. So, now is the time to consider what is required to put our Legislative Building back in order and back in its place as the gem of the Northwest. As House Resolution 4410 notes, “This building is a unique American contribution to architectural history and an outstanding example of the imperial classic tradition and the City Beautiful Movement in America.”

That is why last October the commission held initial informal discussions on the potential interest of private citizens in the preservation and renovation project. Certain segments of the project were seen as candidates for special attention by the private sector. The commission came to a consensus on the positive value of a private foundation as a useful instrument to help create the public-private partnership. The mechanism for a foundation and details of any foundation are as yet undecided and uncertain. It is clear, however, that decisions on this foundation can only come from private individuals brought together by a common interest in the Legislative Building.

One suggestion was: “Create an endowment for stone replacement...for the purpose of generating funds indefinitely into the future for the continued maintenance and conservation of the Legislative Building exterior.”

This sandstone quarry endowment is not the only challenge for a Legislative Building foundation. The commission has reviewed the need for resources “to finish the building with appropriate touches of art, in keeping with original plans by architects Wilder and White.” The current architects’ request for a preservation specialist—really a special consultant on call to provide oversight on future interior and exterior work—remains unanswered. Support from the private sector through a well-funded foundation holds particular promise for raising the level of public interest in the building and for helping to move the level of maintenance to a higher standard. There is a prospect, too, of real “people dividends” for our state as more and more individual citizens build personal ties with their government, bringing significant citizen experience and talent to state operations.

The ultimate goals, the ultimate achievements of such a foundation and, in turn, the ultimate performance of the public-private partnership on the Legislative Building will only be realized as the citizens of Washington decide what they want from that partnership. Generating a public-private stewardship of our Legislative Building is not an easy task, but there is a great deal at stake. It is a practical assignment challenging citizen interest and commitment. How will the citizens of Washington respond to this unfolding challenge?

Leavitt S. White is an honorary commissioner of the Commission on Legislative Building Preservation and Renovation.
In 1853 some fur traders put their feet up in Tom Cranney's Coveland store on Whidbey Island. As they smoked their pipes they marveled at the tall “spar” trees that towered over the shore of a deep cove to the east. Before long, a high-seas veteran, Captain J. G. Parker, visited the store while his ship lay anchored in Penn’s Cove. He told Cranney about the demand for spars in Europe and the need for lumber to rebuild San Francisco, which had suffered a major fire. Cranney mentioned this to his friend Lawrence Grennan, who was cutting logs and selling smoked salmon for a living.

Grennan wanted a deep-water harbor with a gradual shoreline suitable for snaking out logs and a level area large enough to build a sawmill. He was an unmarried 30-year-old Irish-Canadian born in St. Johns, New Brunswick, and had come to Whidbey Island via Wisconsin and the California goldfields. Apparently he had not taken to mining and soon headed north from San Francisco on a clipper ship, passing through Deception Pass, and landing at Penn's Cove where there was a small settlement. Sailing ships were already putting in at Penn’s Cove for spiles, the heavy timbers used to support San Francisco’s new wharves.

Soon after hearing about the deep cove, Grennan sailed eastward across Saratoga Passage in a small boat with two partners—Marshall Campbell and a man named Thomson—and an Indian interpreter. They passed one rocky point, then a high bluff, and beyond that lay a beautiful calm cove on Camano Island. It was called Utsalady by the
LEFT: Lawrence Grennan was an adventurous logger and entrepreneur as well as a sensitive person who contributed to local education and religious activities.

BELOW: Thomas Cranney and his wife Sarah, daughter of Captain and Mrs. Thomas Coupe, who founded Coupeville in 1852.

Kikiallus Indians who had a year-round village on the bay. The Kikiallus were part of the Skagit tribe of the Coast Salish Indians. Their main village was near Conway, up the Skagit River. Utsalady housed several hundred people in long, low houses that were constructed from rough cedar boards. These peaceful Indians carved dugout canoes from cedar logs and used them to obtain fish and shellfish, their main diet. They also ate a variety of dried berries and camas bulbs. According to most sources, Utsalady is an Indian name meaning “place of many berries.”

Around the shoreline of the bay Grennan saw that centuries-old Douglas fir grew near the water, easy to get out. It was a beautiful cove with a magnificent view to the northeast of snowcapped Mount Baker. He chose Utsalady as the place to build a sawmill—not for its beauty, but because the Kikiallus were friendly, the bay was sheltered and deep enough for large sailing ships. Other plus points included a sloping gravel beach, the two rivers—Skagit and Stillaguamish—that flowed into the larger bay, and its fairly close proximity to the settlement at Penn’s Cove. Nevertheless, at that time it was a remote spot because the mainland to the east was an unexplored, forested floodplain. The sole inhabitants along the banks of both rivers were Indian tribes, some of them hostile. While Penn’s Cove had an established trade with San Francisco, its contact with the outside world was via Port Townsend, then out through the Strait of Juan de Fuca and down the coast.

Grennan got permission from the Kikiallus to cut timber when sawmill machinery could be obtained. The partners also learned from the chief that the Lummi Indians in the north were working in a small sawmill at Whatcom Creek. Grennan talked with Captain Henry Roeder, the owner of the sawmill, about machinery for the mill and selling the lumber. Grennan and his partners then ordered the mill equipment from San Francisco.

Unfortunately, the ship sailing north with the engine, boiler and saws ran into a storm crossing the Columbia River sandbar; the captain, in order to save the vessel, ordered the sawmill equipment shoved overboard.

Meanwhile, Thomas Cranney continued to run his store in Coveland, interested but uninvolved in Grennan’s undertaking. Born in Marimicki, New Brunswick, on June 11, 1830, Thomas had helped out in the family dry goods store, and when his father, Martin, decided to go west in 1850, young Thomas went with him. The two journeyed around Cape Horn and went to work in the California goldfields. Martin Cranney became ill and returned home, but Thomas continued to mine for gold until 1853 when he sailed north to Whidbey Island.

During this time Governor Isaac Stevens was attempting to work out a treaty with the Native American tribes. In 1855 a meeting was arranged in Mukilteo where the chief of the Kikiallus, Sdzo-mahtl, together with the chiefs of other tribes, signed the Point Elliott Treaty, establishing several Indian reservations. Schools and other benefits were promised. In exchange, the Indians ceded most of their land, including all the Kikiallus land on Camano Island, to the United States government.

Cranney thought about the natural harbor at Utsalady, almost free land, and the overseas market for spars. These prospects raised the enterprising spirit in this 25-year-old merchant. He decided to cut spars at Utsalady Point and soon became partners with Grennan and Thompson.

Spars are used on sailing ships for the masts, yardarms, booms and gaffs. Because they receive a tremendous amount of stress, they have to be strong. The tall, straight fir trees that
grew on the shore of Utsalady Bay produced knot-free spars without a blemish—just what European navies and shipbuilders wanted. Since the bay was deep, oceangoing sloops and barkentines could sail into it to load the spars; all Cranney had to do was fell the trees and get them to the water, but that was no small task.

An amazing scene met Cranney's eyes when he first entered Utsalady Bay: Kikiallus women and children were in the shallows shouting, raking and throwing handfuls of smelt onto the beach. It was a joyous occasion which even now comes to the bay at about the time that blackberries are ripe. Once ashore Cranney spoke to the chief using the Chinook jargon he had learned at his store, pointing to the axes, ropes and peaveys in the sloop and then to the trees. He gave the chief two colorful blankets to seal the bargain for ownership of the point of land jutting into the bay and permission to cut the tall, straight timber.

Cranney set up a spar camp and hired loggers and ox drivers from Whidbey Island to work with him. He brought nine yoke of oxen and blocks and tackles to haul the logs to the beach. He hired Kikiallus from the village and trained them to use axes and saws. It took skill, patience and daring, not to mention a lot of hard work, to fell a tree 200 to 250 feet tall so that the trunk was not split and it could be dragged out. Because the base of the Douglas fir is bulbous and full of pitch, loggers had to make their notch eight to ten feet above the ground, swinging their axes while standing on a springboard wedged into a small notch in the trunk. The earth shuddered when a towering fir crashed to the ground, the choppers jumping from their boards and running as the giant trunk began to topple.

A fairly straight path had to be cleared and leveled to drag the spar to the water. The log was maneuvered into line using a block and tackle, and the front end had to be sniped, or beveled, so that it would not catch on the skids. To keep the log from digging into the dirt, the paths had eight-foot-long round skid poles laid perpendicular to the route. The newest or youngest logger became the greaser; he dashed in ahead of the log, behind the oxen hooves, with a ten-pound bucket of thick, black oil rendered from dogfish livers to grease the skids and make the huge log slide more easily. The dogfish livers were obtained through trade with Kikiallus who caught the inedible fish while harvesting salmon.

The greaser put the livers in buckets in the sun and let them ferment until the thick, slimy oil could be pressed out. Some spars were 100 to 125 feet long, from 35 to 50 inches in diameter at the base, and weighed 15 to 20 tons; even with several strong oxen teams it could take several days to drag one out.

A bull Skinner, or whacker, handled the huge, ponderous, ornery oxen. The job took skill and strength, and a booming voice. The Skinner had to place heavy wood and leather yokes on the thick ox necks and hitch them in pairs to a heavy chain that was attached to the log by an “iron dog.” The bull team was prodded with a goad, kicked and sworn at to make them move in unison down the slight grade to the water. It was a slow method, fraught with injuries. Even so, Cranney had considerable success in skidding spars into the bay and selling them.

The barkentine Anadyr took the first cargo. Captain James Henry Swift sailed December 1, 1855, for Falmouth, England, and on to Brest, France, with the first spars from Puget Sound to a foreign port. In 1855-57 Swift made two more voyages to France with the Anadyr. In 1856 the Williamsburg took a hundred spars, ranging in length from 80 to 120 feet, to Holland. In August 1866 a flagstaff 150 feet long, 24 inches at the stump, and 11 inches at the top was loaded on the Belmont. The spar was 200 feet long and without a blemish when it was cut, but the ship could not carry that length and so 50 feet had to be sawed off. The spar went to Paris for the exposition held there in 1867.
Governor William Pickering, in the legislature, gave Cranney full credit for originating and carrying out this plan “of sending our native-grown national flagstaff from the territory of Washington to the world’s greatest fair ever held on earth.” Pickering noted that 50 feet had to be sacrificed, but still “the glorious flag of our beloved country will float from its top, to the admiration of all visitors, far above the emblem and banners of any other nation.”

Puget Sound lumber prices rose in the mid 1850s, and Cranney and Grennan decided to build a sawmill. In the winter of 1857-58 they put up a hewn-log frame—about 600 feet long and 100 feet wide, and held together with pegs—on the flat eastern part of Utsalady Point. The mill had two levels, with a large platform extending out from the second level over the water. Iron rails helped to roll lumber out to the ships. The single 14-inch by 4-foot steam engine was built in New Brunswick and brought around Cape Horn. In the water there was a boom to hold logs and a chute to get them up to the carriage.

The mill began sawing in February 1858. There was a big gang of vertically-placed saws. When even the largest fir log was put on the carrier, it moved through the saws and was cut in one operation. Among the largest logs cut was one over 96 inches at the butt and about 42 feet long. When the big gang saws were working, it was said, “The whole island shook.” At full operation, the capacity of the mill was 64,000 board feet per day.

While the sawmill was being built at Utsalady, Cranney still ran his store across the bay at Coveland. He was becoming important on the island: the first postmaster for Coveland appointed on July 17, 1857, and the county auditor from 1856 through 1858. In 1859 he married Sarah Elizabeth Coupe, and the two moved to Utsalady.

In 1859 there was a depression along the West Coast, including San Francisco, one of the mill’s main markets. When lumber prices dropped, the mill ran short of operating funds. On August 3, 1859, Grennan and Cranney mortgaged the mill and their land to the Samuel Price Company for $15,000 in order to pay bills, but they managed to stay in business. Soon after, in 1860, lumber from the mill was shipped to Shanghai on a windjammer under command of Captain Isaac Parker. Captain Parker had helped finance the mill, and this shipment was his payment.

Grennan and Cranney also built a storehouse for supplies, a cookhouse, a bunkhouse and a number of single family homes. By 1860 there were 58 non-Indians living at Utsalady. Thirty-six of the men were laborers in either the spar camp or the mill. Other residents included two engineers, one machinist, one watchman, two surveyors, two blacksmiths, two carpenters, two sea captains, one cooper, one cook, one ship carpenter, and one farmer. There was only one family; the other men were unmarried or had no wives with them. The 1860 census shows that their average age was 29.

Of the 29 American-born men, eleven were from Maine, seven from New York, three each from Massachusetts and Mississippi, two from Pennsylvania, and one each from Iowa, South Carolina and Wisconsin. But it was a truly international community: 25 foreign-born residents hailed from 10 different countries. The birthplace of two Indian laborers was given as Oregon.

The mill hands and spar employees worked a 12-hour day six days a week. Wages were $1.00 to $1.50 a day. Most of the men lived in the company bunkhouse (called the Bummer’s Hall) and ate in the cookhouse.
The Kikiallus hired by Grennan and Cranney acquired clothes and modern implements such as axes, saws, shovels and cooking pots. They also acquired illnesses that came on the ships: smallpox, tuberculosis, influenza and venereal diseases. People who had been exposed to these illnesses had some immunity, but the windowless, multifamily longhouses that had served the Indians well now became a liability. Illness spread rapidly in the confined living quarters, and many Indians died. In the 1850s and 1860s the numbers of the Skagit, Snohomish and Kikiallus tribes were greatly diminished by disease.

With an increase in lumber prices in the 1860s, the settlement at Utsalady expanded. Square-rigged ships loading lumber for Holland, France, England, Spain, China and Mauritius turned the bay into a busy port, with a town alongside. Warehouses, a store and offices for a shipping agency were built near the mill site. There was a hotel, a newspaper office, and a growing residential area with a park. A shipyard was built on the shore, and in 1861 a saloon and billiard room opened. Tom Cranney was county commissioner for Camano Island from 1861 through 1867.

People married and children followed. At Cranney's request, Island County School District No. 5 was approved on August 17, 1863. The mill provided the building and facilities for 14 pupils. Later there were 17 students, including three children from Oak Harbor. Cranney served as the school clerk in 1867, recording the growth of his family which eventually reached seven children. By 1873, with 23 pupils, the town of Utsalady raised $231.28 in private contributions to keep the school open nine months. It was the first in Island County to have a full term.

Not much is written about Grennan; territorial historian Clinton Snowden's brief biography cites his commanding personality coupled with kindness and consideration for all. In his dealings with Indians, Snowden writes, Grennan was "most just and conscientious, and he enjoyed their especial confidence." He was deeply interested in education and religion and contributed to both. Grennan married an Irish woman, Elizabeth Augusta Hale, at Utsalady on October 19, 1864, in a ceremony performed by Father Charles Varvy, a priest under the jurisdiction of the bishop at Nisqually. The five large vessels in port: the barkentine Modock and the schooners Triumph and Sarah. The shipyard at Utsalady later constructed some small steamboats, mostly sternwheelers, that served the growing number of river and Puget Sound settlements. A famous boat built in 1869 was the 125-foot tug Favorite. This big steam side-wheeler worked for the mill until 1874 when P. D. Moore of Olympia bought her as a mail and passenger boat running out of Seattle.

Sea traffic and businesses related to it grew rapidly in the new port. The Royal and United States Mail steamer lines and the Inman Line, representing large transatlantic firms, had their agents and offices at Utsalady. The Pacific Steamship Company registered its ships there, along with the great steamer City of Seattle. The small bay grew crowded with ships undergoing the lengthy loading process. In 1862 loading 200 spars for the Spanish navy took 35 days—some were 125 feet long, and the cargo was worth $18,000. In 1863 the Washington Standard described the five large vessels in port: the 3,000-ton capacity King Lear, one of the largest ships entering the sound, was loading spars and lumber for Toulon, France; Clara Morse was loading lumber for Hong Kong; Havershow and Isabella Horkers were both bound for China; the bark Vessa had lumber on board for New Zealand, and Live Yankee had lumber bound for San Francisco.

By 1870 the Utsalady community had expanded to 54 houses and 147 persons. It still possessed a very cosmopolitan population: 118 of its residents were foreign born, and 88 of those were not United States citizens. The Norwegian immigration, which became a major influence in the Stanwood/Camano Island area, began at this time.

In 1872 a Masonic Hall was built with lumber bought from the Grennan and Cranney mill at a cost of $832.49. This clearly demonstrates Utsalady's importance, considering that the only way members from Stanwood (then called Centerville) or Florence could attend the island lodge was by canoe, launch or steamer.
The sawmill and port also employed Whidbey Island residents. Scandinavians who had settled on Strawberry Point rowed back and forth across the bay to work. In time a ferry ran from a place called Olson's Landing on Whidbey to Utsalady and LaConner.

In 1874 Cranney ordered a new steam engine and two 48-inch-diameter, 27-foot-long boilers from San Francisco; there were now two steam engines and four boilers. As the trees were logged off and the land cleared, cultivation began on the newly diked land of the Skagit River delta. Farmers brought their grain down the river in scows to Utsalady. A 50-foot by 60-foot two-story granary with its own dock was built on the shore of the bay.

Island County records showed that the Grennan and Cranney mill owned 2,143.61 acres of timberland on northern Camano Island in 1871. The partners had started out with preemption claims of 160 acres each and had soon increased their 320 acres to 867.25 acres. In addition they had purchased land at $1.50 an acre from the holdings set aside in the territorial Organic Act for the university: 301 acres in 1862; 1,345.25 acres in 1864; and 71 acres in 1865.

Lawrence Grennan was the first of the partners to die, at the young age of 39. According to Snowden, he died while on a business trip in Vallejo, California, on August 18, 1869, and was buried in San Francisco. Grennan's widow sold her interest to Cranney on September 1, 1875.

The treacherous Pacific Ocean brought another tragedy affecting the Utsalady sawmill. The large side-wheeler steamship Pacific took on passengers and a heavy load of grain at Utsalady, stopped at Victoria, then sailed for San Francisco. Colin Chisholm, the mill manager, was a passenger on board, carrying money and credits from the Grennan and Cranney mill. Other passengers had funds to settle bills for the stores, shipyard and logging camps in the Utsalady area. The ship also carried $250,000 in gold from various mining districts in Canada. Near Cape Flattery the Pacific collided with the American bark Orpheus and went down a total loss. All but two of the 275 persons on board perished, including Chisholm. This tragic accident on the night of November 4, 1875, changed the lives of many families and businesses in the northern Puget Sound area.

On February 5, 1876, the Washington Standard learned that the Utsalady Mill Company had shut down. There were liabilities of over $100,000, mostly owed to parties in California, and Thomas Cranney had to declare bankruptcy. The mill, its site, and some of the timberland were sold in March 1876 to the Puget Mill Company. Cranney sold his private holdings to Henry A. Webster, trustee, on March 30, 1877. Out of business, he and his family moved back to Whidbey Island. A well-liked and respected member of the community, he was elected to many county offices. His wife Sarah died in 1894; in 1896 he married Mrs. Henrietta D'Jorup of Camano. Cranney died in 1907.

As a result of the Pacific's tragic accident, the first phase of Utsalady's growth came to an end. The port and the mill, owned by the large and influential Puget Mill Company, flourished until 1891. For a while its role in international commerce rivaled Seattle's, but that ended when the port was bypassed by the railroad. Now all that remains is the beautiful bay, with its view of Mount Baker, and a growing residential community.

A volunteer and board member of the Stanwood Area Historical Society, Dennis Conroy is currently working on a biography of Gardner Goodridge and other pioneer settlers of the lower Stillaguamish valley.
Main Street in Cliffs, Klickitat County, Washington

"The best manufacturing, warehouse, and lumber yard sites in the Northwest.... Many cities of 10,000 people have less natural advantages than Cliffs," boasted the advertising broadsides of the Lamont Townsite and Development Company. The town of Cliffs was established in 1907 as a district terminal on the Portland and Seattle Railway (later, the Spokane, Portland and Seattle), which was being constructed on the north bank of the Columbia River in Klickitat County. Cliffs was named for a series of steep basaltic outcroppings that rose up behind it. Speculation was rampant and the town prospered briefly. A substantial number of residents turned out for this 1909 publicity photo.

In 1911 railroad officials decided to move the district terminal some 13 miles downriver to Fallbridge (now Wishram) where the SP&S would connect with the Oregon Trunk Railway, which was then building into central Oregon. Cliffs, which had boasted a population of 250, soon languished and died. Buildings were razed or moved, and the citizenry sought their fortunes elsewhere. In 1912 the railroad's western land agent noted, "The town presents a most desolate and uninviting appearance." Today there remains no evidence that on this site once stood a town that embodied the hopes and dreams of scores of investors.

The Historical Society gladly accepts donations of prints or negatives of regional historical interest to add to its photograph collection. (Please contact the Society before making donations.) Readers are invited to submit historical photographs for History Album. If a photograph is to be returned, it must be accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope.
Our "Splendid Little War"

The First Washington Volunteer Regiment Rallies to the Cause in the Philippines

BY JAMES B. DAHLQUIST
In 1898 over 1,200 men from Washington volunteered for military service, thinking they would fight the Spanish armed forces and free Cuba of colonial rule. They were, however, shipped in the opposite direction, and the Washington volunteers ultimately found themselves on an obscure archipelago in the Pacific Ocean.

That year became a pivotal one in the history of both Washington and the rest of the nation. People from the Pacific Northwest usually identify 1898 with the famed Klondike Gold Rush and the economic growth it brought to the region, but it is better known nationally for a conflict later called our “Splendid Little War.” In one summer America gained a far-flung empire and emerged as a new world power.

The aftermath saw the nation leaving behind isolationist policies, entangling itself in foreign affairs, and fighting its first unpopular overseas war. President McKinley, who led our nation into the 20th century, was assassinated, and a war hero named Teddy Roosevelt rose to take his place, becoming one of America’s most renowned presidents.

Today the direct role that Washington played during the Spanish American War is not well-known, and many contemporary Northwest historians have also overlooked this chapter of the area’s history. So what did Washington have to do with Admiral Dewey or Teddy Roosevelt? What about Santiago, Manila, or San Juan Hill?

Weren't Washingtonians of 1898 preoccupied with gold fever? They certainly were, but while some fought the arctic conditions of the Yukon, another group of Washingtonians fought tropical heat, disease, and the native army of the Philippine Islands.

The dominant news story of the Klondike Gold Rush was eclipsed by a fervently patriotic war with an aging world power. Washington quickly raised a volunteer regiment of infantry and sent them off to bring glory to the state and the national endeavor. The Washington volunteers spent their first seven months in “hurry-up-and-wait” mode and the last seven months in field operations without relief. One of every ten was killed or wounded. Amazingly, only one of every hundred later died of sickness, an unusually low number even for that era. After one year in the Philippines, the Washington regiment was relieved, arriving home in 1899 to a robust and patriotic welcome. Afterwards, the veterans of America’s first Southeast Asian war began a long slide into obscurity.

When in the 1970s a large number of Washington’s citizens were once again involved in a war in Southeast Asia, the national mood was quite different from that in 1898. Americans were divided by widespread opposition to the war. Patriotism was quieter and not so public. America’s military forces dealt with fickle policy changes and elusive, ever-shifting “strategic objectives.” Tucked away in houses and retirement homes throughout Washington were the last few living veterans of the Spanish American war, men in their nineties and beyond. They could empathize with combat troops returning home from Vietnam. Long marches through rice fields in sweltering heat, jungle terrain, booby traps and ambushes, search-and-destroy missions—all buzzwords for a modern generation of Americans—were also well-known to these soldiers of a century ago.

Americans of the 19th century held a near-reverential attitude toward military service. In 1898 there was no need for a draft; in fact, the government had to turn away thousands of disappointed young men. The Spanish American war volunteers were a composite of the United States, representing most ethnic groups, occupations, and income levels of the day. Raised in a more genteel time that respected authority, soldiers of the Victorian era rarely questioned superiors or allowed moral dilemmas to bog down military objectives. Orders were carried out punctually, although the men might privately grumble about them. Army service in the 1890s had changed little since the Civil War 33 years earlier. Discipline was strict and unrelenting. Punishment for trivial military infractions was the norm. Equipment was generally good but often outdated, and many small service luxuries taken for granted today were nonexistent. Food was sparse or of questionable quality, and soldiers often foraged to feed themselves properly. There was, of course, no motorized transport, medical evacuation, or air cover. Resupply to troops in the field was very rare. Troops went into the brush with what they could personally carry and marched for long periods with much physical deprivation.

By February 1898 the Cubans’ civil war against Spanish rule had gained widespread attention and sympathy. That Americans started out with genuine humanitarian concerns is undisputed, but the national mood in America turned to anger with the loss of the battleship Maine and 260 of her crew. A tremendous explosion, still unresolved today, destroyed the ship while it lay moored in Havana’s harbor. Public opinion was inflamed by a hasty official investigation that blamed a Spanish mine, and “Remember the Maine, To Hell With Spain” became the popular national cry. President William McKinley reluctantly began preparing the nation for the war it was demanding.

Few Americans knew that the Spanish empire also included the Philippine Islands. The parallel struggle of the Filipino people for independence from Spanish rule was likewise almost unknown. A liberal movement against Spain had

OPPOSITE PAGE: Private Fred Scholtz from Tacoma displays the 1899 field uniform worn by the Americans. Remaining in Luzon as a civilian photographer after his discharge, Scholtz was killed while accompanying a military supply column that was ambushed in 1900.
begun in the 1890s; its figurehead was poet and intellectual Dr. Jose Rizal. This movement sought the integration of the Philippines into the Spanish empire, with political autonomy and equality for the Filipino people. The authoritarian government in Spain at that time, like most such regimes, blundered by having Rizal exiled and ultimately executed. The Filipino response was unanticipated—Rizal became a national martyr, and the independence movement became radicalized, seeking to overthrow Spanish authority. Fresh troops from Madrid and Barcelona were sent to put down the uprising while a young middle-class merchant from Luzon named Emilio Aguinaldo rose to prominence after several successful military encounters against Spanish forces. By 1898 Aguinaldo realized that the Spanish still had the upper hand, and he welcomed the intervention of the Americans, hoping they would assist him as they appeared to be doing in Cuba.

Washington was an early participant in the impending war. On March 6, 1898, the battleship USS Oregon slipped out of her dry dock at Bremerton's Puget Sound Naval Station. Her record-breaking 68-day journey to the Caribbean theater of operations was quite a feat in the days before the existence of the Panama Canal. The event itself figured prominently among the reasons for building the canal several years later. Far off in the Pacific Ocean lay the United States Navy's Asiatic squadron, under command of Commodore George Dewey, a Civil War naval veteran. His flagship was the armored cruiser USS Olympia, named for the capital of the new state of Washington. It was Theodore Roosevelt, then assistant secretary of the navy, who ordered Dewey's squadron to the Philippines in anticipation of the impending conflict.

War was declared in April 1898. The United States Navy began a blockade of Cuba, and the federal government asked for 100,000 volunteers for military service. The 14th United States Infantry, which had garrisoned the regular army post of Vancouver Barracks on the Columbia River for the 14 years prior, was ordered to the Philippine Islands. In Olympia Governor John R. Rogers received notice from the War Department that Washington state was authorized one regiment of infantry. The National Guard of Washington, created just after statehood in 1889, was to become the nucleus of the new regiment. Within days their number reached full strength—around 1,200 men. A training and assembly site was selected south of Tacoma. Today the area is covered by Pierce County Transit's bus barns, but in 1898 it was a level prairie surrounded by farms and stands of Douglas fir. Trains carrying carloads of men from all over Washington arrived and dumped their human cargo onto the prairie, creating a beehive of activity. By the first of May an orderly tent city, appropriately dubbed Camp Rogers, had arisen. During this same time, halfway around the world, Commodore Dewey engaged the Spanish naval squadron at Manila Bay and destroyed it completely, with almost no American casualties. Overnight, the previously unknown Dewey became a national hero and was quickly promoted to admiral.

Governor Rogers appointed regular army Lieutenant John H.
Wholley to command his new regiment, now officially called the “First Washington Volunteer Infantry.” Wholley was a West Point Academy graduate who had served previously at Fort Spokane. At the war’s outbreak he was professor of military sciences, civil engineering, and mathematics at the University of Washington. An impressive, no-nonsense officer, Wholley initiated a rigorous training schedule for the men.

William J. Fife became second in command. The Washington National Guard’s ranking officer as well as one of its founding members, Fife was an attorney by profession. In Alaska at the time of the call-up, he arrived back in Washington to find that his command had been given to Wholley. This caused some friction, but in hindsight Governor Rogers’s choice turned out to be the best one. Volunteer regiments led by West Pointers and former regular army officers were going overseas; those led by career guardsmen were generally not.

The regiment’s 12 companies represented dozens of cities and small towns throughout the state, coming from every conceivable trade and profession of the era. Cowboys drilled next to lawyers and bank clerks, loggers and fishermen shared shelter tents with schoolteachers and druggists. United by a common bond of patriotism and compelled by a sense of adventure, the men quickly took to military life. The training was made easier because of the several hundred experienced guardsmen who formed the basis for the regiment. Crowds of onlookers came to Camp Rogers each day, many arriving by excursion train from Tacoma. A few con men and toughs showed up as well, but when a naive recruit lost all his meager belongings, these men were forcefully run out of camp. One hard fellow unfortunately flashed his pistol at the guard detail to show them he meant business. For a reply, he received a rifle butt to the head. Hauled away by the Pierce County sheriff, the badmen returned no more.

Every recruit was inspected by federal army surgeons before being officially mustered into service. The only glitch to an otherwise smooth process came when a popular guard officer from Centralia failed to pass his physical. Wholley appointed another experienced guardsman to fill the slot, but a few dozen men stated they would not serve unless it was under their friend. This caused a division with the rest of the men, who just wanted competent superiors. When a few men began using political influence, Governor Rogers quickly moved to disband the company with the proviso that those who desired to stay could re-enlist in the “new” company. The majority did, and the dejected captain with his disgruntled followers took a train back to Centralia.

Volunteer regiments in 1898 were being issued recently outdated single-shot army rifles that fired a powerful but smoky black powder cartridge. At the war’s outbreak there were simply not enough modern rifles to go around. The Washington volunteers wore the traditional blue wool army uniforms, which were comfortable for the West Coast but not for the tropics. Within a few weeks the 12 companies were grouped into battalions and ordered to San Francisco to join volunteers from many other western states and prepare for overseas service. The first battalion marched out of Camp Rogers on May 10, 1898, traveling on the dirt thoroughfare now known as South Tacoma Way and then down the length of Tacoma’s Pacific Avenue to a waiting steam-
ship. As the men passed through downtown, tens of thousands of onlookers cheered them amidst patriotically be-decked buildings. Adding to the tumultuous send-off were steam whistles from all over town, shrieking in unison at appointed times. The second battalion followed several days later. The third and last battalion cleaned up the site of Camp Rogers and soon departed by train for duty at Vancouver Barracks, joining their comrades in California several months later.

The summer of 1898 went by swiftly as the Washington men trained and received disheartening news indicating that they might not be needed for the war. In early July several days of furious fighting between American and Spanish forces around Santiago, Cuba, had decided that island's fate. In August the beleaguered Spanish army in Manila negotiated the terms of an American occupation. There had been only desultory fighting. Camp rumors had the Washington men staying stateside or, worse yet, being discharged.

Although the end of the conflict seemed imminent, the political situation in the Philippines was growing more uncertain. Emilio Aguinaldo had recently formed a government and drafted a constitution in anticipation of America's liberation of the Philippines. His armed forces had been kept outside the city of Manila by collusion between Spanish and American authorities, and 1898 drew to a close with Aguinaldo sensing that the Americans were in no mood to simply let him take power.

Aguinaldo's feeling of betrayal was strengthened by the Treaty of Paris, whereby the Spanish government transferred control of the Philippine Islands to the United States for the sum of $20 million. President McKinley's administration, with wide-spread support from Congress and the American public, decided to administer the islands under a policy eventually called "benevolent assimilation." This would seek to modernize, educate and "Christianize" the Philippine people before allowing them to govern themselves. The fact that the majority of Filipinos had been staunch Roman Catholics for hundreds of years seemed to have been lost during the political debate.

In October 1898 the Washington volunteers received their long-awaited orders to the Philippines. Before leaving they were issued somewhat lighter army uniforms—one made of brown canvas and another of white cotton. Sailing in two steamships loaded to the gunwales, their three-week sea voyage turned out to be relatively comfortable and somewhat boring. The trip included one highlight for the men—a stopover of several days at Hawaii, another recent American acquisition. There the men toured the quiet town of Honolulu and were feasted royally by a patriotic citizens' committee.

Upon arriving in Manila the regiment disembarked and was soon assigned to the village of Paco, southeast of Manila proper. Rice fields surrounded this hamlet of thatched nipa houses and a few western style buildings, while a magnificent old Spanish church and ancient cemetery, complete with its spectacular "boneyard," stood nearby. An ominous-looking Spanish army blockhouse stood next to the road out of Paco, which headed east toward Santa Ana. The men were billeted in several older houses, draping themselves at night with mosquito nets so they could sleep.

Residing with Tacoma's Company C was the regimental mascot, a little brindle bulldog named "Punch" who slept on an embroidered blanket provided by a group of patriotic ladies in San Francisco. Punch had been secreted aboard one of the transport ships, despite the usual army orders prohibiting such things, and spent the next year in the islands with his doting companions.

Captain George Fortson died after being wounded during an ambush. Seattle named one of its downtown parks after him, but the planned monument to the Washington volunteers was never built there, and the park is still unmarked.
The Washingtonians arrived in the midst of increasing tension between American forces occupying the Manila area and Aguinaldo’s forces surrounding the city. Chafing at the refusal of the Americans to let them into Manila, the Filipino soldiers in their trenches and fortifications nevertheless restrained themselves from provoking a fight with the American newcomers. The Washington men performed patrol duties along the line between the two sides. Their particular demarcation was at Concordia Creek, just east of Paco and the Spanish blockhouse. In shifts of 24 hours they fell in for inspection of arms and walked their beat. Aguinaldo’s men, under terms of an earlier agreement, could pass through the Washington lines in small groups to enter Paco or Manila, but they were not permitted to bring weapons. For several months the two sides remained surprisingly cordial, yet there remained a palpable undercurrent of suspicion on both sides.

In the early morning hours of February 5, 1899, the uncertain calm was shattered. A Nebraska volunteer named Willie Grayson fired on Filipino sentries whom he believed refused to obey an order to halt. Shooting between the two sides spread quickly down the lines. In the early morning light all American units surrounding Manila were ordered to advance. The Washington regiment charged through the deep, muddy creek and fought their way across several miles of rice fields and thickets. They assaulted a heavily defended knoll guarding Santa Ana and continued on through the town itself. Back in Paco, Colonel Fife and Washington troops from the band and hospital corps fought with snipers in the bell tower of the old church. Amidst the gongs that rang out over the area as a result of bullets hitting the old tower bell, several Washington men were able to evacuate a group of women and children huddled in the lower portion of the church. These people were all led to safety before the grand old building was leveled by fire. By the end of the day the Americans had pushed Aguinaldo’s troops back several miles. It had cost them 358 dead and wounded. The Washington regiment’s first day of war, dubbed the Battle of Santa Ana, resulted in 12 dead and 45 wounded. The Filipino forces suffered more, losing at least 2,000 men and many of their military stockpiles in the immediate area.

For the next six months the Washington volunteers were kept in the field. Stationed at the recently captured villages of Macati, Pasig and Taguig, they forayed out on patrols and expeditions designed to secure the tangled region between Manila and the large freshwater lake east of the city—Laguna De

RUNNING THROUGH APRIL 23, 2000, at the Washington State History Museum, the exhibit Across Oceans of Dreams explores the history of Filipino migration to Washington during the 20th century. Rare abaca cloth, indigenous costumes and Islamic carvings introduce the complicated history of this island nation. Photographs, music, artifacts and oral histories tell the stories of the many Filipinos who worked in the fields and factories of Washington, and stayed to establish businesses and raise families.

Filipino migration to the United States began as a result of the Spanish-American War. American occupation of the island during that war is explored through military uniforms, maps, weaponry and photographs, many now on display for the first time. Filipino-Americans have a long history in Washington and have one of the largest, if not the largest, Asian-Pacific American communities in the United States.

Bay. One Tacoma soldier wrote his hometown paper about some of the more disagreeable aspects of field service:

The Philippine rice field is at this season of the year almost as great a curse to the soldier as the sun. It is a former quagmire tramped full of holes and wallows by herds of native cattle, intersected by a dike two or three feet in height at regular intervals of about twenty paces, all baked by the sun to the hardness of brick, which tears shoes, breaks shins, and causes more profanity than the Army Blue Book.
Another writer stated, “You can’t believe how hot the sun is here. Our guns get so hot they burn when we touch the barrel.”

About a week into the war a company of men decided to take a hill in their immediate front. As they advanced through broken foliage they were fired upon. Their initial response was to jeer at the Filipino troops, but within minutes they found themselves pinned down, unable to advance or retreat. Only with great difficulty were they able to extract themselves, and the men decided that they would not underestimate their enemy again. On February 20 Washington companies from Waitsburg and southwest Washington successfully ambushed a similar number of Aguinaldo’s best troops. A month later one of the Seattle companies commanded by a popular National Guard captain, George Fortson, was beginning a patrol and were themselves ambushed on a Pasig bridge. Fortson received a mortal wound. At first light the troops located the buildings the snipers had used. Owned by a French businessman, these buildings had been previously spared on the condition that they not be occupied by Filipino soldiers. The Washington men now shot their way into the buildings’ walled courtyards and burned them. Several more Americans were injured in this action, some mortally. Up in the Pasig church tower crouched the Scholtz brothers from Tacoma, snapping pictures of the scenes below. Enlisting together, Fred, John and Charles Scholtz recorded much of the First Washington’s Philippine experiences on film.

Scarcely a day went by without some incident. Despite the growing number of casualties and fatiguing skirmishes, the men found many lighter moments. One morning the companies at Macati were eating a quick breakfast while Filipino troops kept up a harassing fire. A company cook finished his chores, then picked up his rifle and scurried to join his buddies who were now firing back. A Filipino bullet hit his rifle butt with a loud crack, causing the men nearby to turn in time to see the shocked cook spontaneously hurl the gun “as if it were a hot brick.” Their laughter momentarily rose above the clatter of battle.

During lulls some men amused themselves by catching lizards and putting them on leashes while others swam in the Pasig River. They puffed on Philippine cigarettes and cigars, added native fruits to their diet, and scoured the local ruins for hidden money, apparently digging up so much valuable metal that newspapers reported the Washington regiment as having a “Klondike” of its own. Some wrote back to Washington using the recently created postal card. The Washington regiment’s chaplain had died of dysentery soon after his arrival in the islands, but the men found a new chaplain and managed to hold semi-regular services.

A few Washington men were a little less inclined to such civilities. One day, while a captain was investigating suspicious fires that had nearly burned the American quarters in Paco, he ran across “some civilians” with “half a dozen soldiers of the Washingtons, armed, and in a boisterous and drunken debauch.” The captain blamed the civilians for starting the event and reported, “A more unseasonable time for such a disgraceful affair cannot be imagined.” The entire group was placed under arrest by a passing patrol.

For several months the Washington volunteers served in a brigade under the famous General Charles King. A popular
author of military adventure novels, King lauded the Washington men and included them prominently in his reports. On one long-remembered day they completed a punishing 30-mile reconnoiter on foot through mud and jungle growth, continuously exchanging fire with their opponents. The temperature never dipped below 100 degrees the entire day. They also participated in three different “amphibious” expeditions commanded by King’s regular army replacement, the towering and aggressive General Henry W. Lawton. Lawton was a veteran of the Civil War and later gained renown for his pursuit of the Apache chief, Geronimo, during the American Indian wars. Towed at night in large Philippine “cascoes” [barges] across Laguna De Bay, the men waded ashore under fire at dawn and helped seize towns such as Santa Cruz and Calamba, which were held by Aguinaldo’s forces. Several times they helped rescue a number of Spanish army prisoners, who cheered the troops with, “Viva los Americanos,” upon their release from captivity.

The expedition to capture the Morong Peninsula is illustrative of American efforts to secure the region. The Washington men were to march north with a column from Pasig and link up with a southward-moving column pushing the Philippine forces onto the peninsula. The Washingtons would then march back to Pasig and board cascoes for a daybreak move on the town of Morong from the lakeside. The northern column would meanwhile continue to push the enemy south toward Morong. If all went as planned, the Philippine army would be trapped on the peninsula. The Washington volunteers marched as planned, then boarded their cascoes for the night trip to Morong. The men waded ashore under cover of several gunboats that accompanied the flotilla. As they assembled on the beach their opponents opened fire. Eventually the town fell as its defenders pulled back to the steep surrounding hills. Washington scouts hiked north to link up with the northern column, losing Private Carl Thygesen, their “point man,” to an ambush. The northern column arrived very late, slowed by rugged terrain, ambushes, and native guides who may have taken the wrong trail now and then. Philippine forces had simply melted away, only to reappear elsewhere. Such frustrating campaigns would become common in the years ahead.

By the end of July 1899 the Washington regiment was almost played out. As with all the volunteer state regiments, the strenuous campaigning in tropical heat and rain had taken its toll. Almost half the men were barely fit for duty, many suffering from malarial fever or dysentery. In August they were finally ordered home. Of the 1,126 Washingtonians who had left for the Philippines, 129 were killed or wounded, but only 14 had died of disease or accident. Another 239 stayed in Manila to pursue civil interests or join new army regiments being raised to suppress what was now being called an “insurrection.”

The 700-some men who arrived back in San Francisco recuperated for a month and then received their discharges. During this period the enlisted men had a sword engraved for Colonel Wholley and, as a group, presented it to him with his young wife present. Wholley informed the men that he would not be going back to Washington with them but would be returning to the islands with a new command. In early November the regiment headed back to Washington via railroad and a chartered steamship, the Queen. A small tiff arose because the steamship, paid for by the philanthropic father of one of the soldiers, could hold only a few hundred of the men. Their return would thus be in groups rather than as a regiment. Several companies from eastern Washington were anxious to get home after their 18 month absence and opted to take the train back to their hometowns for local festivities.

The state’s official homecoming reception was held in Seattle. A three-day series of events, the Seattle Times pro-
claimed it the largest celebration yet seen in the city. Trains delivered hundreds of volunteers ahead of time, while the Queen steamed into view out of an early morning fog bank, surrounded by a noisy flotilla of welcoming ships. Bands played at several locations, punctuated by both official and unofficial blasts and noisemaking. The grand parade featured nearly 600 Washington volunteers marching through downtown streets, cheered by over 50,000 citizens. At the Denny Hotel just north of downtown, Governor Rogers presented each man with a specially struck medal. With the conclusion of the festivities, the First Washington Volunteer Infantry passed into history.

Meanwhile, the conflict in the Philippines continued. Aguinaldo's army, mauled by American forces when they tried to fight on conventional terms, resorted to irregular or “guerrilla” warfare after the state volunteers returned home. At the same time that American military leaders called for more federal troops, they assured Congress that the situation would soon be under control. Troop strength swelled to 65,000. While the American policy of “benevolent assimilation” brought with it schools, public works and reformed infrastructure, its military forces were locked into a low-voltage war with the Philippine army for control of rural Luzon.

In the United States, opposition to the war began to grow. The “Anti-Imperialist League” included such luminaries as author Mark Twain, industrialist Andrew Carnegie, and William Jennings Bryan (colonel of the Third Nebraska Volunteer Regiment in 1898 and the Democratic presidential contender in 1900). Soldiers also assisted the cause. Their letters, sometimes describing cruelties committed by both sides, were used to educate the public about the war, which had started out with humanitarian goals but had now lost its moral compass. Even some conservatives debated whether the Philippine policy was consistent with the ideals upon which the United States was founded.

By 1901 the war was at its zenith. The Philippine army had been weakened by vigorous American campaigning, factional infighting, and an inability to obtain reliable re-supply of material. Armed bandit groups harassed both sides in rural areas. The crucial blow came when Aguinaldo himself was captured in his remote mountain hideout by five Americans who were led to his lair as “prisoners” of friendly Filipino troops. The amazing story of the capture, with its extreme hardships and danger, reads like an adventure novel even today. Two of the five Americans were former Washington volunteers, Oliver and Russell Hazzard of Aberdeen.

With Aguinaldo’s capture and the accelerated surrender of his officers and men, the Americans made one final push to end resistance, resulting in a number of brutal responses and counterresponses by both sides. Congress was finally provoked into hearings on military conduct in the war, but Filipino resistance fizzled out just as many Americans began to grow weary of the conflict. On July 4, 1902, President Theodore Roosevelt declared that the Philippine “insurrection” had been quelled. American military losses exceeded 4,000, while Philippine military losses were estimated at 20,000. Some historians have placed total Filipino casualties at 200,000 or more when factoring in disrupted crops, disease and other intangibles resulting from a war climate that had prevailed for several years. Fighting later flared up between the Americans and Muslim Filipinos in the southern islands, but the question of who controlled the Philippines was no longer at issue.

The Washington veterans organized in 1900 as part of a larger group eventually called the “United Spanish War Veterans.” Many went on to prominent positions in government and civic circles. Private Oliver Morris of Hoquiam became a senator in Olympia for several terms. Corporal J. Grant Hinkle became Washington's secretary of state. Herbert Collier was Seattle’s city treasurer. Others, such as Captain Marshall Scudder of Yakima’s Company E, made the military a career and went on to command regiments overseas in World War I. As late as World War II, a few former Washington volunteers were still serving their country. Oliver P. M. Hazard, who became a momentary national hero in 1901 for his role in capturing Aguinaldo, became a military circuit judge. In sad contrast, Oliver's brother Russell (once recommended for the Congressional Medal of Honor) turned up in Seattle after several instances of puzzling behavior. Apparently degenerated from tropical diseases, he committed suicide in a squalid downtown hotel room.

America and its new possessions had settled into an era of relatively peaceful stability and coexistence. As Washington volunteers grew older they witnessed dramatic events in Philippine history. The Japanese occupation during World War II caused over a million deaths and virtually leveled the city of Manila. Fighting alongside rather than against each other, thousands of Americans and Filipinos had died repelling this latest invader. The subsequent independence of the islands in 1946 and a long tradition of bilateral immigration helped bring about a true friendship between the nations.

Overshadowed after World War II by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion, the United Spanish War Veterans kept alive the memory of the sacrifices the men had made and the hardships they had endured. Their last reunion was in the 1970s. Washington still bears lasting, albeit muted, evidence of their legacy. An army post constructed in 1900 in Seattle's Magnolia district was named Fort Lawton, in memory of General Lawton. Only months after the Washington troops returned home, Lawton was killed by a sniper under the command of a Filipino officer...
whose name, ironically, turned out to be Geronimo. Today the old fort site exists as Discovery Park. On Capitol Hill in Seattle, the former City Park was renamed Volunteer Park to honor the men and women who willingly left their jobs and homes to serve their country. An unmarked triangle of trees and shrubbery at Second Avenue and Yesler, across from downtown Seattle’s Smith Tower, is actually named Fortson Place after the brave but unfortunate Captain George Fortson. Large bronze memorials depicting a volunteer soldier and bearing metal salvaged from the ill-fated USS Maine were erected at Seattle’s Woodland Park and in Olympia. Several ancient Spanish bronze cannons were shipped from Manila and erected in parks throughout the state. The USS Olympia, sole surviving United States Navy ship of the Spanish American War era, rests in Philadelphia.

The little bulldog Punch, faithful mascot of the Washington regiment, disappeared into history after the regiment’s return, although it was reported that the Tacoma Fire Department might become his new home. The two senior officers who commanded the First Washington died within a year of each other. William Fife’s death in 1911 made the front page of Tacoma’s newspaper. John Wholley’s exemplary military career was cut short with his untimely death in 1912. He left behind his wife and two young children. Emilio Aguinaldo, who maintained an air of dignity despite a lifetime of shifting events in Philippine politics, outlived all the American military leaders he fought against, passing on in 1964. The last surviving Washington volunteer was William Hicks, a private from Spokane’s Company A. He participated in Seattle’s annual Memorial Day parade until his death in 1969.

The passing of time has forever erased the last firsthand memories of our colonial conflicts. These events of a century ago dramatically changed both the way America saw itself and the way the world viewed this powerful and growing nation. The dawn of the 20th century found the state of Washington dealing directly with a vast Pacific region that stretched from Alaska’s arctic to the tropics of southeast Asia. The last few tangible reminders that are left from that era still speak of Washington’s nearly forgotten role in America’s imperialist adventures.

Seattle attorney and Air Force veteran James B. Dahlquist has a life-long interest in history and collecting artifacts, primarily from 19th-century American life. Some of the artifacts on display in the current WSHS exhibit, Across Oceans of Dreams, are from his private collection.
The eyes explore the visual field and abstract from it certain objects, points of focus, perspectives.” —Yi-fu Tuan

East of Portland, Oregon, the Columbia River runs through a 3,000-foot-deep gorge in the Cascade Mountains on its westward course to the Pacific Ocean. Near the end of its 1,210-mile run from the Canadian Rockies, the river cuts the only sea-level passageway through the chain of volcanic mountains that string along the western edge of North America. It is a spectacularly scenic landscape. Rising steeply on the south bank, volcanic cliffs clothed in hemlock, fir, cask, spruce and cedar loom over the river and elevated escarpments on the north bank. Dozens of glacier-fed streams fringe the precipices, dropping their waters hundreds of feet in falls and cascades to the Columbia. Formed by millions of years of catastrophic geological and hydrological forces, the Columbia Gorge has impressed, even stunned, every generation since it was first described by explorer William Clark in 1805. Oregon Trail emigrants feared its perilous rapids, 19th-century steamboat operators fought its currents, and 20th-century tourists regaled it as the greatest “spectacle of nature anywhere in the world,” where “the scenery is arranged most effectively” to produce awe.

By the mid-20th century the Columbia River Gorge had become emblematic of the river’s scenic character, even though the Columbia had been transmogrified into a chain of manipulated reservoirs where the only falling water came from the outflows released over the spillways or the river’s drop through the turbines. Nonetheless, this particular section of the mighty river seemingly had been spared many of the changes that characterize modern development on the Columbia and therefore it begged official recognition. During the 1980s a coalition of conservation-minded groups who revered the gorge for its aesthetic qualities, especially its spectacular waterfalls and dense forests, lobbied Congress for federal protection, arguing that the area needed a tightly drawn management plan to save it as a special place, as a “national scenic treasure.” After years of political wrangling and sometimes volatile disagreements between the protection advocates and local residents, Congress passed the Columbia

In this singular and unprecedented piece of legislation, Congress identified an officially designated cultural landscape where the future would be controlled and the effects of time would be managed. The statute defined a narrow band of territory along more than 100 miles of the Columbia in Oregon and Washington as a special place. This act was more reification than creation, for Native Americans and generations of non-Indian tourists had long seen the gorge as an important landscape. From the Indian viewpoint, this stretch of the Columbia was homeland, fishing grounds, and a culturally rich place where community gave deep meaning to the environment. For Euro-Americans, it was assigned unique status: a place where nature's power could be observed first-hand and appreciated. The scenic area legislation was, as historian Carl Abbott has cogently explained, an effort "to transform a particular aesthetic and moral judgment into public policy...[establishing] that the natural and/or pre-European environment is more attractive and meritorious than the European-American built environment."

Labeling the gorge as a cultural place with specific qualities was a potent identification. It was a self-consciously nostalgic and largely romantic characterization of place, one that blended the scenic qualities of the river landscape with distant historical events and images. The process had been comprehensive and included numerous landscape studies, political discussions and community forums, but it ended up raising important and vexatious questions about the meaning of place, the connections landscapes have with human community, and the historical significance of territorial definitions. What meanings do we assign to landscapes? Which human values do landscapes include? What perspectives are the most accurate and discerning?

Answering these questions about the investment of human meaning in landscape thrusts us into a thick conversation between place and perception, between the observable physical qualities of the environment and the cultural meanings humans attach to the land. People identify places through their own
historians and anthropologists label "the Encounter," when century, the distinctions between "resident" and "visitor" took on larger meaning. This was during the period that such it is a product of cumulative memory and multiple views. Because nothing appears quite the same from different perceptions. Digging into place, in other words, means excavating our cultural texts, exposing the content of what we say about the environment around us.

What we mean when we identify or label a place has everything to do with our orientation. For an inhabitant, the landscape is sustaining home, but for the explorer or traveler it is unknown, exotic, or representative of the "other." At any moment in time, however, a cultural landscape is, as geographer John B. Jackson explains, "a space or collection of spaces made by a group of people who modify the natural environment to survive, to create order, and to produce a just and lasting society." There is nothing simple here, nothing that does not touch and affect all human activity. A place is a complex, multifaceted, multi-layered, and dynamic connection humans make with the world they encounter, and as such it is a product of cumulative memory and multiple views. Perspective is everything, geographer Yi-fu Tuan reminds us, because nothing appears quite the same from different vantage points. For the visitor, Tuan argues,

perception is often a matter of using his eyes to compose pictures. The native, by contrast, has a complex attitude derived from his immersion in the totality of his environment. The visitor's viewpoint, being simple, is easily stated. The complex attitude of the native, on the other hand, can be expressed by him only with difficulty.

On the Columbia River, during the first half of the 19th century, the distinctions between "resident" and "visitor" took on larger meaning. This was during the period that historians and anthropologists label "the Encounter," when Euro-Americans invaded the Indians' world. People from divergent and distinctive cultures met, interacted, and began a process that changed the physical landscape and layered on it new cultural meanings. That historical change, which has altered and continues to amend lives in the Columbia River Basin, is a dynamic composed of diverse and powerful forces, including the effects of population growth, capitalistic enterprise and modern engineering. Before those changes dramatically altered the environment—in large measure a 20th-century story—Native Americans met Euro-Americans and introduced them to their lands.

In the journals of mariners and land explorers we read descriptions of those meetings between English seamen and Chinookan Indians at the mouth of the Columbia, and between Lewis and Clark and Sahaptin-speaking groups far upriver. What strikes us in these descriptions are the differences among the native people and the relative similarity of the Euro-American visitors. The indigenous peoples of the Columbia looked at their land from the inside out, from their own beginnings as a human community, and from their lives as shapers of their place. At the time of first contact with Euro-Americans, Indians living on the lower river resided in densely populated communities, with as many as 300 persons inhabiting residential structures, while up on the plateau the groups were family-sized; in the entire Columbia River Basin population density averaged about one person per square mile. Native people spoke an amazing variety of languages, with many as singularly different from one another as contemporary French and Chinese. Their clothing, residences, hunting and gathering strategies, and cultural forms were as diverse as their languages.

How these people described and understood their places can best be seen as cultural maps that included an incredibly detailed and intimate knowledge of the region and its resources. These cultural maps disclosed much more than an environmental catalog of resources. They also reflected hundreds or thousands of years of knowledge and meaning. Along the middle Columbia, for example, ethnobotanist Eugene Hunn has documented an incredible richness in botanical names known and used by Sahaptin-speaking Indians who had memorized a catalog of more than 200 names to identify plants, their locations, the season for harvesting, and other distinctive characteristics. This ecological map focused on everything that related to humans and the natural world.

Fundamental to these maps are words, for it is with names and their associations that Indians in the Columbia River Basin created and described their place. The names come from within a lived space, where human events are connected to landforms, sources of food, sacred places, home. Some names reflect the physical appearance of the landscape, while others document the coincidences between human activity and natural resources. Others serve as guides for travel, locations of medicinal plants, and sites of danger. Hunn records names on the Columbia Plateau, for example, that translate as "many pestles," "Indian hemp place," "large-scale sucker
place" and "swallowing monster." They are names with histories and utility. "Many pestles," for example, refers to a rich area for desert parsley on the plateau east of the Cascade Mountains, a place where Indian women gathered these plants and, using basalt pestles and oak mortars, pounded the parsley roots into a meal. The women's activity, the location of the roots, and the richness of the ground inform this name on the Yakama Indians' cultural map and invest it with meaning. In like ways, prime fishing spots, streamside locations where specific families settled in their winter lodges, camps where celebrations were held, and hundreds of other places were named according to experience and meaning. The fishing spots at Celilo Falls, for example, are named for the gear used in landing salmon, the families who claimed the locations, and the varieties of fish taken there.

Names and words dominate in the Columbia River Indians' place mapping because it was through language, especially vested in stories, that native people knew their world, the realities of the environment, and the meaning humans attach to creation. Through language, generation upon generation learned the revealed secrets of the world, and those revelations constituted a literal map of the region. Creation stories were some of the most dynamic oral traditions among Columbia River tribes. These narratives described the beginning of the world, the exploits of animals in the mythic age, the adventures and misadventures of Coyote, and how people should live in this world. They were essentially stories of place that mapped out the core truths about existence. Through these stories, as mythologist Mircea Eliade has explained, "the world 'speaks' to man, and... reveals itself in language."

The image of the world speaking to humans is unfamiliar to modernists who have long since objectified the visible world, but for Indian people on the Columbia—and for indigenous peoples throughout the world—communication with the land is bidirectional. The place had and continues to have voice. Among the Colville Indians on the upper Columbia River, for example, two Coyote stories illustrate the inseparableness of landscape and human community. In the stories, names and cultural prescriptions about human beings and their relationship to place make up important components of the tale. The relationships between place and humans in the story are a reflection of Native American understandings about a similar inseparableness in life.

In the first story, Coyote longs to give the people some manner of gift that will elevate them and bind them together as part of creation. He travels for miles down many streams until he comes to a large lake. There he pauses to rest, tired as he is from arduous travel, and drifts into sleep. In his dreaming he hears the "lap, lap, lap" of the water on the shore and when he wakes he knows what he shall give the people. On his return, Coyote brings the drum as his gift and instructs the people to strike it rhythmically: "thum, thum, thum." When they hear
that resonant sound, Coyote tells the people, they should think about themselves as a whole and remember their duties to each other as people. The image of water, the distances between rivers and lakes on the Columbia River Plateau, and the importance of a healthy environment to the prosperity of the people are intermixed with the cautionary image of prosperity as a result of responsible behavior toward the land.

In the second story, Coyote is again desirous of giving something to the people. He knows how valuable the salmon have been to the people living far down the Columbia River, but salmon could not make their way far enough upstream to give themselves to upstream tribes. Coyote blasts through an obstruction in the river and leads the salmon to his people, but when he offers this priceless gift he warns the people not to transgress the world and its creatures, not to misbehave and neglect their duties to plants, land and animals. If they forget or ignore the rules of life, Coyote admonishes, he will throw up barriers across the rivers and streams and block salmon from their place. In the rock formations along the tributaries of the upper Columbia today, if you look carefully you can still see images of salmon in the rocks, where Coyote made good on his caveats.

In these stories and others that tell of complicated characters such as Coyote or ice changing the world for people, there are powerful didactic messages about what humans should do with each other and how they should relate to the larger environment. There are also distinctive markers and delineations about the landscape that map out place as more than a three-dimensional, sensory reality. Spiritual themes and ideas are pervasive. Stories carry the strong message that everything in the world has theological meaning and that humans must acknowledge the spiritual power vested in an unlimited universe.

"People, animals, plants and other forces of nature—sun, earth, wind and rock—are animated by spirit," Eugene Hunn explains, and "as such they share with humankind intelligence and will, and thus have moral rights and obligations of moral persons."

Columbia River Indians mapped out what modern interpreters might call an "enchanted" landscape, where life forces permeated all things and all things were inherently part of the purpose of life. The burden of living in such a landscape could be endured only if people had some assurance that the world would accommodate them and nourish their existence.

The native's map of this world identified safe and dangerous spaces, places with power, places for sanctuary, and places of plenty. Such maps also identified "landscapes of fear," as geographer Yi-fu Tuan has called them, and landscapes of joy. The distinction resides in the bargain of responsibility humans struck with the environment, which included sets of relationships with all of creation, animate and inanimate. In exploiting natural resources, native peoples connected their wealth directly to the sacrifices made by plants and animals on their behalf, and directly to their gratefulness and spiritual affinity with the nonhuman world. In the Indians' world view, creation could not be divided into living and nonliving, spiritual and nonspiritual. The Columbia River landscape was an environment of mutual obligation and respect among humans, plants, animals, rivers, land and atmosphere. Maintenance of this complicated ethical bond informed native peoples and in large measure defined their maps of place.

The contrast between the native peoples' map of their world and the maps created by Euro-American visitors to the Columbia River Basin could not be more different. Euro-Americans had no similarly enchanted or spiritual view of this landscape. Their perspective had a larger geographical frame and a more selective purpose. They came as commercial adventurers, representing foreign nations and seeking new pathways to wealth and often the treasure itself. They came initially as investigators and catalogers, and later as claimants and occupiers. First by sea and then by land, the explorers looked at the land and drew specialized and instrumentalist maps quite unlike the ones created by the Indians. The first ones were drawn in the last decade of the 18th century by maritime explorers and traders who charted the river's mouth and its first 100 or so miles. On George Vancouver's exploratory mission in 1792, for example, crew members drew nautical charts, noting sandbars, islands and other riverine features, while scientists described flora and fauna they observed on their trip up the river. A little more than a decade later, Meriwether Lewis and William Clark drew detailed maps of the courses of the lower Snake and Columbia rivers and included substantial detail about natural resources, plants and animals they saw, and the character and composition of native groups they encountered. During the first decade of the 19th century, David Thompson, a fur trader/explorer in the employ of the Northwest Company, described the Columbia in even more cartographic detail while he scouted prime fur-trapping country.

Of the early Euro-American mappers of the Columbia, Lewis and Clark spent the most time on the river and produced the most commentary about what they saw in the Columbia River Basin. Their inventory of the region has astounded scholars for generations because of the intimate detail included in their reports and the impressive range of subjects they addressed. They had begun with a staggering letter of instruction from President Thomas Jefferson, who...
had bid them to investigate all flora and fauna, topography, minerals and resources, all native groups and their customs, including language, ceremonies, political organization and much more. They were to explore all major tributaries of the Missouri and Columbia rivers and collect as many specimens from the region as possible. But more than anything else, Jefferson instructed them to pursue commercial relationships with Indian tribes and to evaluate their route as a commercial causeway to the Pacific and the market of Asia.

The two men came into the Columbia River Basin in August 1805 with their minds full of the previous months’ experience cordelling up the Missouri and its tributary streams to the Continental Divide and trying to find an easy passage between the two great river systems. The explorers entered a terra incognita after they left the Mandan villages in April 1805, but they traveled with an articulated purpose, a list of what they should observe, what they should record, what questions should be answered. This discovery matrix—the kinds of items they should find and how they should see them—came with them on the journey as part of their intellectual equipment. They were men of the Enlightenment, which equipped them with a well-developed method of observation. That method—in effect a way of seeing the material world—rested on two scientific perspectives: Francis Bacon’s definition of exploration as a “dwelling purely and constantly among the facts of nature,” and Carl Linnaeus’s prescribed terminology for cataloging the world’s flora and fauna. Their Baconian guidelines assured Lewis and Clark that while wonderment was the spur to investigation, it was not its end, and that truth lay at the conclusion of factual discovery, precise notation, and creation of an understandable order. The more careful the inspection and recording of the new world seen by the explorers, Bacon’s prescription promised, the better their map, the truer their portrait of place, and the more complete their demystification of nature.

Lewis and Clark’s journalizing also owed much of its form and content to Linnaeus’s methodological perspective on the botanical and zoological world. The captains looked at the Columbia River Basin landscape as part of a broader, continental natural history that emphasized the categorization of plants and animals into a known and regularized outline. The system strove to create, as one scholar has called it, a “general table of relations” for what we find in the world. Carrying two illustrated volumes of Linnaeus’s works with them on their westward journey, Lewis and Clark applied the taxonomist’s system to record an impressive list of newly named flora and fauna species in the Columbia River Basin. Among the dozens of animals the explorers added to the Linnaean matrix were Clark’s nutcracker, mountain goat, Franklin’s grouse, Townsend’s chipmunk, candlefish, and whistling swan. They cataloged a similarly impressive list of flora, including huckleberry, bittersweet, camas, broadleaf arrowhead and yarrow.

Because of these two methodological perspectives, Lewis and Clark saw the landscape in a much different way than the natives they encountered. They focused on specifics and recorded what they hoped to find—answers to geographical questions, newly observed flora and fauna, Indian languages and social relations. More importantly, at least in applying the Linnaean system, they reported what they discovered on the Columbia as part of a universal catalog that promised to reduce the world to a systematized, measured place. Distinguishing one plant from another in large part meant counting its parts—stamens, petals, leaves—and measuring its height and

By the 1880s dozens of salmon canneries dotted the lower river, each one vying for available salmon and sending their product to market in brightly labeled cans.
On the lower river, fishing techniques included horse seining operations, such as this one near Sand Island, that brought nets full of salmon to shore, dragged by teams of workhorses.

conformation. The method "enabled discovery through observation," as Pamela Regis has concluded, "but like all methods, it defined what would be observed and how."

Lewis and Clark came as visitors and, in Tuan's terms, they composed pictures of the landscape that portrayed the environment as fundamentally a place of utility, where human action was seen as separate from the landscape rather than part of the landscape.

Throughout the journals, the explorers related their observations to a known and utilitarian world, and consistently in their journal and field note entries they ignored activities and evidence that depicted things beyond their experience and imagination. Jefferson had instructed them to record details on religious belief among the Indians, for example, but there is scant information in the captains' journals on the subject. When these details are recorded, the information is often tinged with bewilderment or disgust. On October 9, 1805, along the Clearwater near present-day Spalding, Idaho, for example, Clark wrote:

"A woman faind madness etc. etc. Singular acts of this woman in giving in Small potions all She had & if they were not received She would Scarrify her Self in a horrid manner etc."

What was likely an expression of spiritual belief and the acting out of religiously informed behavior was cast as "faind madness," her belief system ignored in Clark's dismissive "etc. etc." Beyond their experience and comprehension, the spiritual world of Indian people escaped notation in their copious detailing of the Columbia River landscape, while they meticulously described the Indians' technologies, commercial relationships, wealth, personal habits, and willingness to trade. The unexpressed meaning is unmistakable. For the explorers, the spiritual life of native people, especially when it exposed animistic beliefs, existed outside of the anticipated relationships between Indian and non-Indian people. Engaging with the natives through the spirit world had no functional meaning for the captains.

Part of the captains' neglect of Indian spiritual life was due to their preconceived ideas about Indian belief systems, which had permeated Enlightenment culture for more than three generations. Jefferson and other like-minded scientists understood indigenous peoples more as part of the environment and a legitimate subject for natural history than as comparable human communities. Lewis and Clark followed this viewpoint, noting the numerical strength of Indian groups, their relative positions and comparative behaviors and relationships to each other, much in the way they described and categorized plants and animals they encountered.

Native peoples, in short, were listed and described as part of a larger matrix of natural history in the Columbia River Basin. Embedding Indians in the natural world had profound implications, for it identified them as part of the material environment and thereby more malleable, functional, and utilitarian than Lewis and Clark saw fellow Euro-Americans. Ironically, listing native peoples as part and parcel with the environment acceded with the Indians' own world view, but for the captains and their Enlightenment cohorts, making
humans part of natural history had a much different meaning. The physical maps drawn by the captains reveal their commercial and instrumentalist orientation perhaps better than any other documents related to the expedition. There were several cartographic missions included in Jefferson’s instructions to Lewis and Clark. There were concerns about territorial claims made by Great Britain’s fur-trading activities, especially the importance of drainages east of the Continental Divide that might originate in British possessions north of the 49th Parallel. In addition, Lewis and Clark hoped to sort out the pattern of rivers represented only in an imagined cartography as depicted on Nicholas King’s map of 1803. The maps that the leaders compiled at Fort Clatsop during the winter of 1805-06 focus on the physical relationship among the river courses in the Columbia River Basin, partly from observation and partly from information they acquired from native peoples. In the end, they misinterpreted the courses of the present-day Snake, Willamette and Clark Fork rivers while they documented the mainstream of the Columbia and Clearwater rivers with exceptional accuracy. This was especially true at critical points along the river, as at the mouth of the Snake and The Dalles-Celilo area.

The information provided on the maps, the intimate cartography of specific places, and the misunderstanding of the larger drainage patterns reflect Lewis and Clark’s principal orientation toward rivers and the landscape. They saw most of it as part of a commercially oriented world. The course of the rivers, their patterns of confluence, and their potential for trade all amounted to a geography of power in which the cumulative importance of a river system was most palpable at its estuary—where it joined the waters of the world. For Lewis and Clark, the power and conformation of the Columbia system became most important and most instrumental at its mouth, where they spent a horrible winter but where they also recommended building a major trade entrepot.

The differences between the native maps of the rivers and Lewis and Clark’s cartographies are distilled in their respective views of water. Indian people in the Columbia River Basin honored water as the source of life, as the most important of sacred foods. The rivers brought water to the people and existed as both a physical reality and as part of an enchanted universe where the material and spiritual worlds commingled and coexisted. The Euro-American viewpoint also assigned importance to water for human sustenance, but it added the power of work and utility to its definition and did not include a sacred role. The difference and the change of perspective is what social geographer E. V. Walter calls a "topomorphic revolution." Revolutionary changes in the structure of spaces, Walter argues, redefine place by radically changing the "system of mutual immanence" that exists between people and their environment. Such change affects, among other things, how sustenance is related to residential patterns, how wealth is determined in society, and how landscapes are understood. Adopting a Euro-American viewpoint on the Columbia River as a causeway of extractive commerce, for example, reorders nearly all relationships with the river that were understood by native populations. More importantly, though, this topomorphic revolution vested transportation value in the water itself. Such valuation led directly to the assumption that human engineering could improve upon nature. For native peoples who used the river for transportation, the water itself never became objectified.

The toponymic revolution on the Columbia, which began during the early 19th century, expanded quickly and gained enormous power by mid century. Lewis and Clark, David Thompson, Hudson’s Bay Company traders, and other mappers of the region increasingly defined the place in instrumentalist terms. The Dalles-Celilo area, for example, ceased being an enchanted and cultural place—where fishing merged easily with spiritual life—but rather became a strategic and commercial place—where the flow of goods was the truest measure of the river’s power. This instrumentalist viewpoint mapped out a geography of power, as cultural geographer Cole Harris labels it, in which the Euro-American patterns of exchange, political relationships, and evaluations of status were laid over the landscape. The Hudson’s Bay Company established central trading forts that were supplied from distant ports by maritime transport and connected them to interior outposts for the extraction of furs. The system fed toward a central entrepot, where power concentrated and could be wielded throughout the company’s claimed territory.

The Hudson’s Bay Company’s invasion of the Columbia River Basin was only the beginning of a process of domination by Euro-Americans that has continued to the present day. The fur men and the latter-day settlers would not have accomplished their goals so rapidly, of course, had not the advance agents of this toponymic revolution—virulent pathogens—swept the region, decimating native populations. In what anthropologists call the Northwest Coast cultural region, the native population declined by more than 80 percent between 1774 and 1870. Although the loss of life east of the Cascade Mountains was relatively less, smallpox, measles, diphtheria, tuberculosis and other diseases left Indian groups physically, culturally and spiritually wounded, making them much less resistant to the invading Euro-American forces. Many of the

The Hudson’s Bay Company’s invasion of the Columbia River Basin was only the beginning of a process of domination by Euro-Americans.
Indians who survived the pestilential onslaught became participants in the establishment of the new geographies of power in the region, first in the fur trade and then as hired laborers for white entrepreneurs.

The rapid overlaying of this geography of power engendered similar additional overlays by Euro-Americans during the first half of the 19th century. By the 1850s the Hudson's Bay Company had begun its retreat to British possessions north of the 49th parallel and American entrepreneurs had put steamboats on the lower Columbia River as adjuncts to an active economic development of the region. The river served the steamboat men as a wondrous source of income and exorbitant profits. The Columbia, as seen from the instrumentalist perspective of entrepreneurial investors such as the incorporators of the Oregon Steam Navigation Company, looked like a way to wealth, not like a homeland. A generation and more later, the descendants of those incorporators and their fellow non-Indian residents of the Columbia River Basin could see the landscape as home, understand it empathetically, and identify themselves with the place. Nonetheless, the viewpoint was distinct from the native perspective, where place was seen as the locale of spirit and not as mostly a means to wealth. The invading population brought with them patterns of land use and viewing the land that had been developed in other places and for other purposes. In the most essential ways, the new residents of the Columbia River Basin translated the newly discovered landscape into a known place by imposing geographical understanding from another place. The topomorphic revolution on the Columbia came with the outsiders.

The changes that continually remade the Columbia landscape during the century beginning in 1850 added newer perspectives, newer patterns of use and applications of power. Engineers looked at the river as a place to be controlled, altered and harnessed. The Columbia's powerful current and volume of water became the focus of investment as well as a characterization for the river itself. By the time the Columbia River Gorge Scenic Act passed Congress in the mid 1980s, the image of the river had become a collage of competing portraits, ranging from a "working river" of hydroelectric turbines and towboats to a "recreational river" of sports fishing and windsurfing.

Behind these newer perspectives on the Columbia, as the justification for the protective legislation made clear, was an older and much more distant image of the river as an unmitigated place, where Indians fished at Celilo Falls and the water ran unimpeded to the sea. The irony is inherent in the Scenic Act's attempt to freeze the gorge into a romantically understood place, a landscape of nature and history that possesses the intrinsic qualities to evoke the Columbia's earliest history. In the midst of modernity, the Scenic Act suggests that the Columbia is still the river Sahaptin speakers called Nch'i Wana, but its rules and regulations remind landowners in the gorge that the Columbia is every bit the Great River of the West that early entrepreneurs and contemporary engineers have defined.

Embedded in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Act is this binocular-like perspective on the river that draws strength from both viewpoints: the native and the visitor. The legislation and politics that surrounded its enactment remind us that no place has a singular cultural meaning and that there are many ways of looking, many ways of "seeing" a river.

William L. Lang is professor of history at Portland State University and director of the Center for Columbia River History. Lang is the author or editor of six books on Pacific Northwest history. Another version of this essay will appear in Asia and Pacific Northwest Landscape, edited by Jackie Hiltz and Karen Gaul (Baltimore: M. E. Sharpe, forthcoming, 2000).
Climbing Mount Stuart, 1883

The Society's Special Collections recently received two volumes of diaries kept by Richard U. Goode, a topographer for the Northern Transcontinental Survey in central Washington Territory in 1883. Full of interesting details, the diaries were kept for the benefit of his fiancée in Norfolk, Virginia, so that she might better understand his work. The page illustrated here describes Goode's ascent of Mount Stuart in order to obtain a good view of the surrounding topography.

Mr. Tweedy & myself started out ahead. Red saying he would see how we made it before he tried it, especially as he had moccasins on, which would make his feet very cold and besides he could not get as firm a foothold as we could with our nailed boots. We got along well enough for the first 25 or 30 feet, digging away with our hands and kicking our feet well into the holes to make sure we had a firm hold. Soon however the cramped position we had to stand in and the constant strain on our muscles as well as our nerves began to tell on us and we did not advance with as much effect and confidence as we first did. Our hands soon began to get numb from such frequent plunges into the snow and before we had gotten half way they were tingling & stinging as if a thousand needles were sticking into them. Our position now really began to be a very trying one.

They did make it to the top, and the climb was only one of many adventures the party had between April and November 1883.
For the Hudson’s Bay Company, working to influence the future was just a matter of good business. Historians readily acknowledge the HBC’s impact on even the most rudimentary aspects of everyday life. To be sure, the HBC unabashedly shaped politics, commerce, transportation, and the development of Euro-American settlement across North America. In the Pacific Northwest, especially north of the Columbia River, this was particularly true. Beginning in the 1820s and continuing through the 1840s, the HBC was the dominant presence of Euro-American civilization in the Pacific Northwest.
However, in the early 1840s this picture began to change. Instead of consolidating its position in the lower Puget Sound region, the HBC began to lose ground to other forces of change, particularly the tide of American westward expansion. The story of Steilacoom Farm illustrates the HBC’s struggle for dominance and foreshadows its eventual complete withdrawal to north of the 49th parallel by 1869.

In an attempt to strengthen British claims north of the Columbia River, the HBC and its agricultural subsidiary, the Puget Sound Agricultural Company, gambled on the future by promoting the immigration of Canadian and Scottish tenant farmers in 1840 to an area approximately six miles north of the company’s Fort Nisqually. For a number of complex reasons, described at length below, that venture failed by late 1843. Afterwards, an English gentleman farmer named Joseph Heath spent the next four and a half years contributing to the site’s development.

Following Indian troubles at Fort Nisqually in the spring of 1849, a contingent of the United States Army was sent to establish a garrison on Puget Sound. Steilacoom Farm was selected because of the improvements made there both by Heath and the earlier immigrants. Through this ironic turnabout of events, a site originally created to strengthen American military presence and control in the Puget Sound region.

Since 1821 the British Hudson’s Bay Company had served as the principal employer and government for Euro-Americans living in the Pacific Northwest. During the 1830s and 1840s the region was being settled through “joint occupancy,” which gave citizens of Great Britain and the United States equal rights in settling the Oregon Country. However, official HBC policy discouraged Americans from settling north of the Columbia River—

territory that was coveted by both countries. With the arrival of hundreds of Americans emigrating across the newly opened overland trail, this policy became increasingly difficult to enforce. The HBC had to find a way to counter the influx of American settlers or else be forced to forfeit its prized domain, a prospect of no small significance to the company or the British Parliament.

Other serious problems also demanded the HBC’s attention. During the late 1830s fewer furs were being gathered in the Columbia Department and the demand for furs was declining internationally. Northward, the Russian American Company and the HBC were in the process of settling their long-standing differences with regard to territorial and fur trading influences. Their compromise stipulated that the HBC would be allowed to trade along the Pacific coast as far northward as the Stikine River (British Columbia), establish a northern trading post, and conduct trade with the local natives. In return, the HBC would supply Russian traders with agricultural goods at cost plus 2,000 land otter skins per year for the life of the treaty (1840 to 1850). With this settlement, the HBC could turn its attention to the American threat along the lower Columbia River.

As a result of an HBC policy that encouraged Americans to settle south of the Columbia River once they had arrived at Fort Vancouver, large numbers of Oregon Trail pioneers staked homestead claims in the Willamette Valley. This slowed American settlement of Puget Sound as long as the number of newcomers remained low. However, American politicians increasingly delivered patriotic speeches laced with rhetoric espousing Manifest Destiny and “sea to shining sea” nationalism, which was taken to heart by many individuals looking for a new life in the Far West. The tide of newcomers rose steadily to a flood. In England, government officials and the HBC’s directors continued to quietly support the Columbia River as the best natural boundary between the two nations. A contest for land was in the making, and HBC officials were searching for solutions.

One of these officials was Dr. John McLoughlin, chief factor of the HBC’s Columbia Department, who resided at Fort Vancouver. He favored local, privatized, large-scale farming and proposed that independent (non-employee) farmers be encouraged to produce grains, vegetables and livestock as private businessmen and then sell their produce at lower-than-importation cost to the HBC. The idea of agricultural pursuits within the context of the fur trade was a new concept to the HBC’s governors, one that was initially perceived as an unnatural combination. They clearly objected to Dr. McLoughlin’s time and talents being spent on anything other than the fur trade.

With the new Russian contract pending and the prospect of importation costs increasing, McLoughlin’s
ideas were eventually accepted—with several important alterations. The HBC governors agreed to establish a new agricultural division that would be financed and managed exclusively by HBC officials. The groundwork was soon laid for the Puget Sound Agricultural Company (PSAC) or, as it was also called, the Puget Sound Association.

Two sites north of Fort Vancouver were chosen for PSAC activities: Cowlitz Farm (near Toledo), founded in 1839 for agricultural purposes, and Fort Nisqually on Puget Sound, which had been an active HBC post since 1833. By 1840 the company's hierarchy transferred HBC lands, buildings and operations at Cowlitz and Nisqually to the PSAC, officially keeping fur trade jurisdiction at each site by maintaining a single storehouse, trade shop, and separate set of account books. In essence, Hudson's Bay Company personnel, supplies, trade routes, structures and policies became those of the PSAC.

Concern over the "American problem" continued to grow during the early 1840s, both in the Columbia Department and at the company's headquarters in London. The HBC's governors were determined to use the PSAC as a means to colonize the territory north of the Columbia River with farmers who were loyal to the Crown. If successful, Britain would have greater justification in claiming the land when the treaty expired. Some members of the HBC's hierarchy expressed concern over this plan, including Chief Factor McLoughlin, who in 1840 commented:

As the Cowlitz plain is not so extensive as we were given to understand and we are obliged to furnish so much grain to the Russians, and require so much for the Hudson's Bay Company, in all about 13,000 bushels [of] wheat annually, I hope that you will send no settlers till we are prepared to receive them—situated as we are we cannot make those who may come as comfortable as they would expect and I know from experience that if we fail in the first outset to fulfill the most insignificant part of their agreement, however impossible it may be for us to do so from unforeseen circumstances beyond our control, still they will make no allowance, get discontented & it will be impossible ever afterwards to satisfy them.

A contract was drawn up allowing each immigrant farmer to lease PSAC property. This entitled the HBC to "one-half of the increments" in the farmer's stock and "one-half of his agricultural produce." Settler John Flett noted that each family was to receive a house, barn and fenced fields, with 15 cows, 1 bull, 50 ewes, 1 ram, and oxen or horses, farming implements and seed.

With the contract signed, 21 families set out from Red River on a 2,000-mile trek. The entourage, comprised of 116 people, 50 carts, 7 oxen, 2 cows and 60 horses, arrived at Fort Vancouver on October 13, 1841. Flett recalled that when Sir George Simpson, the HBC's North American governor, met the group, he admitted that the PSAC's agreement with the settlers could not be completely fulfilled. Simpson reportedly told them that the company did not have the promised horses, barns or plowed fields and that the settlers were free to go where they wished. Flett noted that four possible destinations were offered: California, where settlers would receive the standard HBC outfit of supplies; the Willamette Valley, where no company help would be given; Cowlitz Farm, where they would receive some help; and Puget Sound, where the original contract would be honored.

Following almost a month's stay in the vicinity of Fort Vancouver and serious deliberation by Red River settlers, 14 families, accounting for 77 individuals—principally mixed-blood English and Scots—selected Nisqually on Puget Sound. Another seven families (38 individuals), all of whom were French Canadians and descendants of Indian-European marriages, set off for Cowlitz.
Farm, while one family turned south toward California. The Willamette Valley option was not exercised at this time.

The Cowlitz contingent received the necessary seed and agricultural implements but not the livestock. Regarding this group, which had a better reputation as hunters than farmers, Governor Simpson wrote, "From their previous habits of life, having devoted more of their time and attention to the chase than to agricultural pursuits, it was not likely they would turn to good account any stock that might be placed in their hands."

The Nisqually contingent, including the families of John Tate, James and Alexander Berston, Henry Buxton, Horatio Nelson Calder, John Cunningham, David Flett, John Flett, James Flett, William Flett, Toussaint Loyalle, Charles Richard McKay, and Archibald Spence, reached Puget Sound on November 8, 1841. The families of John Johnston, William Baltra and John Otchin—former HBC agriculturists from Fort Vancouver—and John Spence, another Canadian settler, joined the Red River party at Nisqually within two months' time. The colonizing experiment had begun.

In anticipation of the need to locate the best farm sites for the Red River settlers, Chief Factor James Douglas journeyed from Vancouver to Nisqually with the Red River group's leaders several weeks in advance of the main party. Of the many sites visited, Spanueh [Spanaway], Muck and Steilacoom were identified as the best. Regrettably, records linking families to specific farm sites have not survived.

The typical Red River family consisted of a married couple (one or both of mixed blood heritage) about 25 years of age. Each family had approximately three children whom, it was reported, "looked cleanly and all either spoke French or English." Approximately 11 families arrived on foot or horseback at Fort Nisqually on that cold, wintry Monday afternoon. Animals not used in transporting humans were harnessed with packsaddles piled high with each family's possessions—beds, chairs, tools, casks and cases of food, bags containing pots and pans, chests, blankets, kettles, spare oxen yokes, clothing and household goods. It is likely that the three milk cows that had survived the trek were brought to Nisqually.

Disheartening news greeted the settlers when they arrived on Puget Sound. The necessary preparations had not been made; there were no barns or plowed fields prepared for the families. Further, Angus McDonald, a "new hand" who had just been given charge of Fort Nisqually, announced that the HBC could not readily supply the promised houses, fences, plows or teams of cattle. This was despite McLoughlin's instructions to McDonald to "let [the settlers] have fourteen wild cows with
their calves [and to each settler] that has already [been] given them, each one [is to receive] a tame cow and calf, one bull, and two oxen and fifty ewes with their lambs." Additionally, McDonald was ordered to "afford every assistance in his power to the settlers without deranging the business of the place." As things unfolded, it became clear to the settlers that McDonald was simply not up to the task.

William McNeill, captain of the steamship Beaver, was at Nisqually during this period. He reported to Chief Factor Douglas that the settlers reacted to the shortcomings at Nisqually by demanding that "some person [of authority should] come from Vancouver to regulate things so far as concerns themselves." When neither McLoughlin nor Douglas responded to their plea, the settlers realized that nothing would come easily from the HBC. Incensed by this apparent disorganization and lack of cooperation, John Flett and Charles McKay returned to Fort Vancouver and stayed through Christmas to forage for cattle and the necessary iron and wood with which to make plows. The others, heavily dependent on the fort's personnel for provisions and supplies until they

---

The Red River party was to have been the first of many colonizing efforts that would help balance the American influx into the Pacific Northwest.

established their own homes and farms, grew increasingly frustrated. John Flett recalled that "there here was much discontent; and loud murmurings were heard. Several at once left the [Puget] Sound district in disgust."

Flett's and McKay's determination eventually paid off. By the beginning of February 1842 all the remaining settlers had received one bull and the materials with which to create a complete plow. Flett's early attempts to obtain a milk cow, "either as per [the] agreement or for money," remained unsuccessful. While cows and sheep were difficult to acquire, pigs, horses and the aforementioned bulls were available through the PSAC.

While McKay and Flett crisscrossed the Cowlitz Portage gathering equipment and livestock, the remaining settlers began the laborious task of building homes for their families during three of the Puget Sound region's coldest and wettest winter months. During this period they were forced, for security's sake, to camp in close proximity to or within the confines of the fort.

By the end of the first week following their arrival, the Red River settlers were complaining about their diet. Culinary offerings at Fort Nisqually were limited to what the land, sea or company stores could provide. And during the winter of 1841-42, the company was running low on local and imported foodstuffs. Because of its natural abundance and low cost, everyone at Fort Nisqually consumed a steady diet of fresh, dried and salted salmon, which was acquired from the local Indians and served with a redundancy that must have challenged the dullest of palates. Substitutes such as fresh beef, venison, elk, mutton, and duck rarely visited the dinner table, being too expensive or difficult to obtain to be eaten regularly. The addition of grains and vegetables in the form of peas, "Indian" corn, turnips, potatoes, wheat, coarse biscuit, oats and barley did afford some variety. Their larder also housed such sundries as molasses, "California grease," sugar and salt.

Unlike their HBC counterparts at Fort Nisqually who regularly partook of the wine, ale or rum, the settlers rarely imbibed spirituous liquors. The only exception to this was Henry Buxton who purchased a bottle of rum on July 1, 1842, perhaps celebrating his decision to leave Puget Sound in the fall. Personal consumables such as twist tobacco and whale oil for lamps frequently show up on most of the personal accounts.

For those settlers who made it through that first winter on the sound, attention quickly turned to the business of agriculture. Early on, Sir George Simpson's fear that the Red River settlers could not take care of livestock may have been warranted. On January 12, 1842, James Flett's bullock died from what one record identified as "bad treatment." The next day John Tate's ox was "strangled by the Yoke." By mid July of that same year, Horatio Calder and John Spence were blamed for the death of a team of oxen, also reportedly "strangled in the yokes."

While incidents such as these with the HBC's "wild cows" were anticipated—largely because the animals were not fully domesticated—the settlers' ability to successfully handle other PSAC livestock, as well as their own cattle, hogs and horses, disproves at least in part Simpson's assertions. In all known records there are no other incidents of animals dying while under the settlers' care. On the contrary, the animal husbandry skills exhibited by some of the settlers not only benefitted themselves but the PSAC as well. The ever-struggling Angus McDonald noted early in 1842 that Fort Nisqually had "12 entire Horses, ten of which would have been castrated 'ere now could a [single] person be found fit to do it." In early April, perhaps redeeming his earlier mishap with the ox, John Tate answered the call by assisting in the creation of 10 new geldings and 30 steers for the PSAC.

When not working their own farms, or when the need was great (e.g., harvest or shearing time), a number of Red River settlers were employed by the PSAC at Fort Nisqually. While some cut planks with pit saws, others made salt butter and flour for the crews of the Beaver and the schooner Cadboro. Threshing wheat and winnowing peas for the company was a common labor among the settlers, as was collecting bark (for buildings) and providing general labor around the fort. Some even trapped and hunted, although a majority
of the day’s catch was first shared amongst their own and then other settlers’ families, and lastly given as payment against their PSAC accounts.

Throughout their stay the Canadians assisted the PSAC personnel in many cooperative ventures. Whether sharing in the expense and effort of poisoning wolves that threatened their combined livestock, or assisting in apprehending Indians who raided their sheep and cattle herds, the settlers and the fort’s inhabitants often joined forces in facing adversity.

Farming the Nisqually prairie proved less than fruitful. All the settlers, including those at Steilacoom, who attempted to farm the infertile combination of glacial till and sandy loam, found it incapable of sustaining any kind of “reasonable” crop, with the exception of peas and potatoes. They tried to raise peas, barley, hay and wheat, but reaped little for their efforts. This was more a testament to the sterility of land than the farmers’ lack of skill.

The records of the Red River party families after 1843 bear testimony to their ability as farmers. According to the census records of 1850 and 1870, John Johnston, Michael Wren, the Buxtons and William Balstra seem to have done very well on their farms. Their lands were devoted to raising stock, especially cattle and crops, particularly wheat.

After working the land for a short time, some of the Red River settlers judged that it held little potential. During the spring of 1842 six families broke their contract with the HBC and abandoned their farms for a brighter future in the Willamette Valley. Following the harvest in September another five families vacated. By late summer 1843 the rest of the families decided to leave Puget Sound and join their friends. Even the offer of a full-time position with the HBC could not keep Toussaint Loyalie from turning south with his family.

All in all it was an experience fraught with disappointments for both the settlers and the company. With every complaint and countercharge addressed numerous times since their arrival, the Steilacoom contingent joined the last of the settlers and left Nisqually for the rich, fertile and free land of the Willamette. John Flett recalled that “at the end of three years all had left, getting nothing for their labor or their improvements.”

The Red River party was to have been the first of many colonizing efforts that would help balance the American influx into the Pacific Northwest. In actuality, the short-lived experiment was such an utter failure that the HBC would never again repeat the effort. Now seen as “dangerous to the economic interests of the Hudson’s Bay Company,” wholesale HBC-sponsored colonization ended.

In retrospect, several factors played a direct part in this debacle. First of all, the impossible contractual arrangement for both parties lies at the center of the failed venture. Clearly, the HBC never adequately prepared for the settlers’ arrival, and once they arrived, the company failed to commit (in a timely manner) whatever limited resources it had toward fulfilling its contractual obligations. On the other hand, the settlers were viewed as “a most extravagant set,” with some holding the opinion that it
Joseph Thomas Heath was a gentleman farmer engaged by the Puget Sound Agricultural Company to farm on shares at Steilacoom Farm, which had been established by one of the Red River settlers. After years of frustration and failing health, he died in 1849.

would take three years for a number of the settlers to pay their expenses for one year. Conspicuous consumption of this nature earned them, from one tight-fisted Scot, the reputation of being "insolent and thriftless."

Secondly, the HBC's unyielding hierarchy must share the blame. McLoughlin and Douglas both tried to rectify the situation from Fort Vancouver, but neither took personal responsibility for its success, leaving that to Angus McDonald at Fort Nisqually. McDonald, an unseasoned leader with lack of vision, resources, and personnel, found himself awash in a sea of confusion.

While the settlers' inadequate agricultural skills have often been targeted as a reason for failure, according to historian Marian Honnen Hockett, these skills proved quite adequate when put to use in the Willamette Valley. Douglas MacTavish, a clerk at Fort Vancouver, revealed a more truthful agricultural shortcoming when he described the Nisqually plain, stating that it was "barren and sterile in the extreme, and has more the appearance of a rough shingley beach than soil, I am afraid [the Red River settlers] will never do much ...." The land selected by James Douglas and the party's leaders, while being the best Nisqually could offer outside of the company's fields, proved to be poor for agriculture, especially when compared to the Willamette Valley soil.

Lastly, Hockett explains, "It becomes quite evident upon reading histories of the Hudson's Bay Company, that positive or negative judgment of colonists was based on how cooperative they were with the company. If the Red River settlers were complaining much, making demands, and actually leaving the company's jurisdiction, there would be much basis for [the company's] frustration over [the] settlers' lack of cooperation." Conversely, the settlers no doubt noticed the HBC's profound lack of cooperation, creating an intolerable and frustrating situation for the settlers as well—a situation that would make them all willing to risk a move to an American settlement. As a result, they lost confidence in the HBC and saw little hope for a future in the Puget Sound region.

These factors, coupled with expectations by both parties that were higher than what the experiment could hope to produce, resulted in the disappointments being greater than anyone could have imagined.

Following the Red River settlers' departure to the Willamette Valley, the HBC's leaders considered any other attempt at en masse colonization futile...
culture to sell. Farming, considered an honest and respected occupation, offered Heath a rare opportunity to regain his lost position, wealth and dignity.

On September 21, 1843, agents of the Puget Sound Agricultural Company met with Heath who, having no capital of his own, was required to procure a surety bond of £1,000 and submit to these harsh terms: passage was to be paid in advance and in cash (£21); upon arrival, he would be placed in possession of one of the company's farms with a prearranged amount of livestock and "implements of husbandry." The buildings would be valued at cash price while the livestock and equipment would be valued at a standard, "regionally fixed" price. Heath would be charged interest at the rate of 5 percent annually on these valuations as well as on any cash advances he might require to make the operation a success. Annual accountings of the farm's financial status were to be made, itemizing any amount of profit realized. However, any loss Heath might suffer, no matter what the cause, would be added to his debt to the HBC.

Even before the ink was dry on the contract, Heath was packing his belongings and within three days was sailing westward aboard the HBC's bark Cowlitz toward an unknown future on the northwest coast of North America. Heath must have made a favorable impression on the PSAC agents—they wrote to Dr. McLoughlin that

Mr. Joseph Heath, an experienced agriculturalist, has gone out by the Cowlitz with the intention of taking a farm on the Puget Sound Company's land. A duplicate of his agreement is forwarded herewith. We hope that his great practical acquaintance with farming in all its branches will be of essential service to the settlement.

Following a long voyage and a two-week respite at Fort Vancouver, Heath rode 70 miles on horseback from Cowlitz Farm, arriving at Fort Nisqually late in the evening of June 22, 1844. This ride across the Cowlitz Portage, Heath later claimed, was "a performance of no frequent occurrence." He was greeted by Angus McDonald's successor, Dr. William Fraser Tolmie, who had just returned that same day from a trip to Grande Prairie and Cowlitz Farm. Later that week, in search of a home for Heath, both men inspected the farm sites abandoned by the Red River settlers. Before making a decision, Heath traveled to Fort Victoria to inspect the agricultural potential of Vancouver Island. Preferring his options on Puget Sound, he returned to Nisqually. Dr. McLoughlin noted on November 23, 1844, that "Mr. Heath has selected a spot on the Nisqually Plain, where the Red River settlers were, and is going to make preparations this winter to put in what grain he can in the ground. Next year he intends to take his sheep and cattle."

Within three weeks he had moved into the Steilacoom farmhouse, a Red River frame cabin built in a style of construction that was utilized at HBC posts across North America. This technique is also referred to as post-on-post, post-on-sill, or the French Canadian Style. The structure, according to Heath in 1844, allowed "the winds from the four quarters of Heaven free admission."

In 1844 the Steilacoom site consisted of 30 partly cleared acres of prairie land,
three half finished hewed-beam structures, plus a small split-rail corral enclosing one of the buildings intended for a barn. To make the farm site habitable, Heath employed local Indians and wives of the fort's French Canadians as housekeepers, shepherds and farm hands. As with most contractual arrangements in the country, wages were paid in supplies and goods rather than currency. Problems with his employees kept Heath continually vigilant, frustrated and looking for new hired help. Tolmie often provided skilled carpenters to assist Heath during major construction projects. By 1848 the number of buildings and other improvements at Steilacoom Farm had substantially increased.

The refurbishing and raising of structures was continual during Heath's four-and-a-half-year occupancy. In addition to refurbishing the existing barn, stable, dwelling house and small corral, Heath successfully erected nine other structures, while adding 91 tilled acres (and fencing for same). These efforts were highly regarded by James Douglas, who reported: "He is an active, painstaking man and is making every exertion in his power to improve and render the farm he occupies productive, but from the natural sterility of the soil, his exertions have not been crowned with the success they deserve."

Undaunted by the soil’s shortcomings, Heath worked in the fields and with the livestock, struggling against poachers, wolves, diseases such as the "scab," and inclement weather. His efforts at raising sheep provided wool returns of 1,308 pounds in 1845, 1,008 pounds in 1846, 256 pounds in 1847, 585 pounds in 1848, and 633 pounds in 1849. Following his death, Heath's livestock and standing harvest were inventoried at 16 horses, 126 cattle, 586 sheep, 427 bushels of wheat, 87 bushels of peas, and 58 bushels of potatoes.

In 1846 Heath learned from Tolmie that the boundary treaty between Great Britain and the United States established the 49th degree of latitude instead of the Columbia River as the dividing line. He lamented, "I must now look out for a new place of settlement and have to commence de novo, and which, after all the trouble and labor I have had, is quite disheartening." But the treaty settlement of 1846 played no part in Heath's departure from Steilacoom Farm. On March 7, 1849, less than five years after he had arrived on Puget Sound, Joseph Thomas Heath, at age 44, died of pneumonia aggravated by a troublesome heart condition.

Throughout his struggles, Heath exhibited an abiding sense of responsibility, resourcefulness and industry in his work and daily habits. Other than the occasional horse race near the fort, or an Indian shell game on the beach, Heath’s gambling was limited to the chances of having a successful crop, increasing his flock of sheep, and staying alive. With a practical education in agriculture, animal husbandry skills and a determination to succeed, Heath represented the HBC's ideal settler.

The Treaty of 1846 was the beginning of the end for HBC/PSAC operations in what is now Washington. Following Heath’s death, the company abandoned Steilacoom Farm. In May 1849 a large, heavily armed contingent of Snoqualmie Indians, who had previously threatened the Euro-American and Indian populations at Fort Nisqually and Steilacoom Farm, became involved in a combative incident at the fort's northern gate. During the fracas, which included knife play and an exchange of gunfire, two Americans visiting the fort were wounded; Leander C. Wallace eventually died from his wounds. Oregon Territorial Governor Joseph Lane, on hearing of the incident, requested of Dr. Tolmie not to furnish the Indians with ammunition and...to cause the hostile tribe who have committed the late outrage, to be informed that any repetition of the like conduct will be visited promptly with their complete destruction—that our force, which will be immediately increased, is at this time amply sufficient for an immediate expedition against them and that the moment I am informed that any injury has been committed by them upon your people, they will be visited by sudden and severe punishment.

Governor Lane's increased support arrived shortly thereafter on board the USS Massachusetts. Among this large United States Army contingent was Company M of the First Artillery. In August 1849 Major Hathaway, Captain William Bennett Hill, and several junior artillery officers visited Puget Sound in search of a site to garrison troops. According to the official records of Fort Nisqually, Heath's abandoned farm "received the preference on account of the number of buildings already erected there." The site was immediately rented to the United States government by the PSAC at a rate of $50 per month.

The following year, HBC headquarters was officially transferred to Fort Victoria on Vancouver Island, British Columbia. By 1869 all remaining company operations were removed north of the 49th parallel, never again to return to American soil.

Steven A. Anderson is director of the Renton Historical Museum. He served as director of Fort Nisqually Historic Site in the 1980s and continues to research and write on topics relating to the Hudson’s Bay Company’s involvement in the Puget Sound region.
The next Methodist cleric arrived at Steilacoom City in 1835, well after the permanent American settlements in Tumwater and Olympia were established. The Methodists were not the first American settlers on Puget Sound. The first American to settle on Puget Sound arrived from Illinois via New York, Cape Horn, the Sandwich Islands, the Columbia and Cowlitz rivers, and Cowlitz Portage, having taken six months to complete their journey. Mission school classes were taught by Chloe A. Clark, who arrived in the summer of 1840. Miss Clark came alone but soon married William Willson in the first American marriage ceremony on Puget Sound, which was conducted by Reverend Richmond.

My letter is not designed to damage the reputation of the Bush-Simmons party that settled in Tumwater after traveling the Oregon Trail. That was a remarkable feat. They simply were not the first American settlers on Puget Sound. Nothing should diminish Leslie Willson’s arrival and settlement without wagons six years before Bush-Simmons.

In August 1842 Richmond abruptly took his family back to Illinois because of family illness requiring his medical skills. Six months earlier, Mrs. Richmond had given birth to the first American born on Puget Sound. The baby was kidnapped by an unnamed Native American who was caught but never punished. It is believed that he was the arsonist who torched the mission building while it sat vacant, awaiting Richmond’s replacement.

Mrs. Willson became the preeminent educator at the Methodist Oregon Institution, later known as Willamette University—the first university west of the Rockies. The Willsons left Puget Sound, but they did not leave Oregon.

Because of the sudden departure of the Richmond family and the burning of the mission, the Methodist Mission Board did not replace the Nisqually Mission staff. That does not mean they were not first, in many ways! The next Methodist cleric arrived at Steilacoom City in 1853, well after the permanent American settlements in Tumwater and Olympia were established. The Methodists were much more successful with the later, permanent American settlers than with the native population.

—Dr. Jerry V. Ramsey

David Nicandri’s response:

My argument with Dr. Ramsey is one of interpretation and semantics, not historical accuracy per se, as I do not contest any of his stipulations yet continue to stand by my characterization. My desktop dictionary describes a “settler” as “a person who settles in a new country or colony.” “Settle” means “to migrate to and set up a community in,” or “to make stable or permanent,” or “to take up permanent residence.” Further, a “settlement” is “a new colony or a place newly colonized,” or “a small or isolated community or village.” I believe a fair reading of Dr. Ramsey’s description of the Methodist missionaries who sojourned in or near Fort Nisqually beginning in 1839 does not qualify them as settlers within the conventional meaning of the term or the strictly semantic meaning of the term.
Honor in the House
Speaker Tom Foley
By Jeffrey R. Biggs and Thomas S. Foley.
Reviewed by Michael Treleaven, S.J.

Representative government in America has become a system of incumbency government. Failure to win re-election is so rare that its event is widely noted and well remembered, especially, of course, for the Speaker of the House. For 30 years Thomas S. Foley, a Democrat, was eastern Washington’s member of Congress. In 1994 the largely conservative and Republican voters sent George Nethercutt to the House in Foley’s place. Today it is Nethercutt’s conversion to incumbency government that makes news.

This biography autobiographical provides some insight into the contemporary life of representative democracy. The book discusses the motivations that brought Foley to seek office, those roles and steps he took in his legislative career, and the changes he saw in the ideological and partisan competition in America during the last third of the 20th century. He came into Congress with the aid of Washington’s two remarkably influential senators, Henry Jackson and Warren Magnuson, at a time when President Johnson was launching his Great Society initiatives. Congress was still bringing federal projects to the Northwest, and civil rights, racial injustice and the Vietnam War were beginning to divide Americans from one another. At the apex of his career, Foley was dismissed by his constituents after his own party and president had failed to win any health care reform measure, had become seriously divided over NAFTA, and had offered the public no clear message to explain such a division. The public’s mood had shifted since 1964, and eastern Washington was not an especially solid foundation for weathering the gale.

Honor in the House provides readers with a reflection on American political change and how this plays out in an incumbency democracy. Biggs and Foley recognize the shifts in voter affections, and they note the rise of confrontational and ideologically committed politics, especially with the younger GOP House membership, which they find has diminished the national legislature in the public’s eye as well as reduced its capacity to legislate bipartisan compromises. They also note, in accounting for the 1994 defeat, that Foley was hurt by his constituents’ anger toward Congress as a whole, which urged them to vote Republican, as well as their hopes for successful advocacy and representation, which in other circumstances might have protected his seat. His opponent offered constituency service plus the “Contract With America’s” often popular, often symbolic propositions. When those in leading federal roles become suspect where policy questions are concerned, and when Congress itself is derided, constituency service by a new figure does indeed become attractive to voters.

Quoting Edmund Burke, the authors ask if American politics has become so hostile an activity that it is only a poisonous battle in which candidates dare not challenge conventional wisdom or their constituents’ interests, or call for sacrifice for the general welfare. Biggs and Foley are right to censor the attack style of the new right in American politics, but the reality remains that on key policy questions Democrats failed to bring in reforms that a broad coalition of the public might support. Their opponents have likewise failed. What remains of Foley’s legacy is considerable in terms of legislation and continuing public service as ambassador to Japan, and especially in his example of integrity, his respect for opponents, and his magnanimity in both victory and defeat. This volume should help all citizens of the United States, of any party, ask what role compromise and civility should play in their democracy.

Michael Treleaven, S.J., is chair and assistant professor of political science at Gonzaga University. He has a special interest in the politics of the Pacific Northwest and western Canada.

Historical Atlas of the Pacific Northwest
Maps of Exploration and Discovery
Reviewed by Robert C. Carriker.

With the Lewis and Clark bicentennial fast approaching on the historical horizon, who could not be interested in the exploration of the Pacific Northwest? Currently, the one ingredient still missing from the best laid plans for the bicentennial is perspective. Meriwether Lewis and William Clark were not the only men to fantasize about the Columbia River and the northern Pacific Coast. Nor were they the only explorers of the 19th century to provide profound geographic revelations about the Oregon Country. Canadian scholars have done their part to bring perspective to the process with their recent modest celebration on the accomplishments of Sir Alexander Mackenzie. Another Canadian, Derek Hayes of Vancouver, British Columbia, is now making his contribution with the publication of the book under review.

Hayes’s commentary on each of the maps and charts in his
Historical Atlas of the Pacific Northwest is concise and accurate. Some maps are printed small, some large; some are in black and white, others in color; but all receive careful treatment from the design craftsmen at Sasquatch Books. Equally important, Hayes is eager to share the trail he blazes, providing the reader with text notes, an index, a clear table of contents and a bibliography, as well as the names of the research institutions where he located the maps. An immensely useful map catalog provides the title and source for each of the 322 cartographic gems covering the states of Alaska, Washington and Oregon, plus Yukon Territory and the province of British Columbia.

The earliest map shown and commented on by Hayes was hand drawn in 1593; the most recent map in this outsized volume was engraved in 1919. In between, all the famous names in the history of Northwest exploration are considered—Cook, Vancouver, Fremont, Ogden, and so on—as well as the not-so-famous names of Zalteir, Du Halde, Ac-ko-mok-ki (Blackfeet), and others. A suitable companion to this work, and one that adds even more perspective to the subject, is the award-winning Atlas of North American Exploration: From the Norse Voyages to the Race to the Pole, by William H. Goetzman and Glyndor Williams (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992, 1998). Like the Hayes volume, it is authoritative in style, yet it contrasts and supplements the Hayes maps, which are reproductions of originals, because its maps are uniformly presented in the same, modern cartographic style that shows present boundaries and cities in muted gray. Together these two large format books are indeed a dynamic duo.

Robert F. Jones is correct in his judgment, as even a cursory review of the history of Northwest exploration are considered—Cook, Vancouver, Fremont, Ogden, and so on—as well as the not-so-famous names of Zalteir, Du Halde, Ac-ko-mok-ki (Blackfeet), and others. A suitable companion to this work, and one that adds even more perspective to the subject, is the award-winning Atlas of North American Exploration: From the Norse Voyages to the Race to the Pole, by William H. Goetzman and Glyndor Williams (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992, 1998). Like the Hayes volume, it is authoritative in style, yet it contrasts and supplements the Hayes maps, which are reproductions of originals, because its maps are uniformly presented in the same, modern cartographic style that shows present boundaries and cities in muted gray. Together these two large format books are indeed a dynamic duo.

Robert C. Carriker is professor of history at Gonzaga University. He most recently codirected, with William Long, Great River of the West: Essays on the Columbia River for the University of Washington Press.

Annals of Astoria
The Headquarters Log of the Pacific Fur Company on the Columbia River, 1811-1813
Reviewed by Hugh Andrew Crowe.

The Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale University contains arguably the most respected collection of first-person journals on frontier Oregon Country that is held by East Coast repositories. New Haven, Connecticut, is not, however, the only source for Pacific Northwest manuscripts. Dr. Robert Jones, a Fordham University professor of history, demonstrated that when in 1993 he edited Astorian Adventure: The Journal of Alfred Seton, 1811-1815 from a manuscript preserved at Rockefeller Archive Center, Pocantico Hills, New York (COLUMBIA 8/2:47).

Seton's journal came to light in 1947 during the renovation of Washington Irving's home in Tarrytown, New York, and it helped fill in some of the blanks in the picture of fur trade activity at Astoria, the frontier settlement situated at the mouth of the Columbia River. Now Jones has edited another Astoria journal, this one penned by Duncan McDougall, a business partner of John Jacob Astor in the Pacific Fur Company. McDougall's three handwritten notebooks today reside in the library of the Philip H. and A. S. W. Rosenbach Foundation in Philadelphia. Washington Irving used the McDougall manuscript in preparing his two-volume history, Astoria (1897). So did James P. Ronda when writing his equally mesmerizing Astoria & Empire (1990). In the early 1980s a University of Pennsylvania professor began editorial work on the journal, but nothing came of it until Jones took over in 1995. At last, nearly 190 years after McDougall made his final notation, the journal has been published.

Jones does not consider McDougall's manuscript a true journal because it is not the record of one person's impressions, thoughts and activities. Rather, he says, what McDougall wrote is a record of the allocation of company manpower, economic activity, and the status of the post from the time the ship Tonquin passed the Columbia River bar in 1810 until Astoria's assets were transferred to the North West Fur Company in November 1813. Thus Jones's subtitle to the book is: The Headquarters Log of the Pacific Fur Company on the Columbia River. Clearly, Jones is correct in his judgment, as even a cursory review of the entries will confirm. By any name, it is a remarkably complete account of daily activity at the trading post. Jones's numerous annotations are just as remarkable. In fact, the footnotes are the strength of this book. If ever another Astoria journal surfaces in an obscure archive, this reviewer highly recommends that it be set aside to be exclusively edited by Professor Jones, for you can do no better.

Brother Hugh A. Crowe is a New Yorker who frequently travels in the Pacific Northwest. He teaches at the prestigious Archbishop Molloy High School in Briarwood, New York.

Address all review copies and related communications to:
Robert C. Carriker, Department of History, Gonzaga University, Spokane, WA 99258
Discover the Northwest.

Edna and John
A Romance of Idaho Flat
Abigail Scott Duniway
Edited by Debra Shein
In Abigail Scott Duniway’s groundbreaking novel Edna and John (1876), we follow the heroine as she travels by wagon from Missouri to the gold fields of Idaho to find success in business, the courage to leave an abusive alcoholic husband, and an eventual career as a political activist. Underscoring women’s struggles in an era when social and legal codes empowered only men, this is an atypical western. Editor Debra Shein provides an insightful addendum to the book, explaining the life and times of its suffragist author.
244 pages • photographs • notes • bibliography
$19.95 paperback

Farallon
Shipwreck and Survival on the Alaska Shore
Steve K. Lloyd
In January 1910, the Farallon ran aground in Cook Inlet, Alaska. Documented by passenger and amateur photographer John E. Thwaites, the 38 castaways struggled to survive on a desolate coastline with meager provisions, inadequate clothing, and little hope of timely rescue.
192 pages • photographs • maps • notes • bibliography • index
$18.95 paperback • $35 hardback

Indian Summers
Washington State College and the Nespelem Art Colony, 1937-41
J.J. Creighton
Modeled on the American Scene art movement of the 1930s, Washington State College (now Washington State University) established the Nespelem Art Colony in 1937. This is the story of students and instructors who took up residence in and around Nespelem, the headquarters of the Coeur d’Alene Confederated Tribes in Washington, recording Native American history through their art.
144 pages • illustrations • photographs • notes • bibliography
$22.95 paperback • $35.95 hardback

Clarence C. Dill
The Life of a Western Politician
Kerry E. Irish
Washington politician Clarence Dill is best known for lobbying FDR to construct Grand Coulee Dam. Nationally, he is famous for his leading role in writing the Federal Radio Act of 1927 and the Federal Communications Act of 1934, which still governs radio and television broadcasting in this country. This first-ever biography reveals Dill’s deserved place as one of the Northwest’s most influential political leaders.
264 pages • photographs • notes • bibliography • index
$22.95 paperback

Iron Pants
Oregon’s Anti-New Deal Governor, Charles Henry Martin
Gary Murrell
A general at the turn of the century, Martin became an archconservative politician in the 1930s and served as Oregon’s governor during the New Deal. Although a Democrat, he was politically juxtaposed to FDR and other Democrats of the era. The book explores U.S. foreign policy and diplomacy, U.S. military history, and issues of race and class as they emerged during the late 19th and early 20th centuries in the life of one of Oregon’s most controversial politicians.
250 pages • illustrations • photographs • notes • bibliography
index
$22.95 paperback
Main Selection Military Book Club

**To Hell With Honor**
*Custer and the Little Bighorn*
By Larry Sklenar

The image of the famous “last stand” of the Seventh U.S. Cavalry under General George Armstrong Custer has metamorphosed into myth. Sklenar offers a fresh perspective and wholly new conclusions about one of the most enduring mysteries in American history—the 1876 Battle of the Little Bighorn.

**$29.95 Hardcover Now**

---

**Regeneration through Violence**
*The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860*
By Richard Slotkin

This book, the first of his trilogy on the mythology of the American West, shows how the attitudes and traditions that shape American culture evolved from the social and psychological anxieties of European settlers struggling in a new world to claim the land and displace the Native Americans.

**$24.95 Paper Now**

---

**Traders’ Tales**
*Narratives of Cultural Encounters in the Columbia Plateau, 1807-1846*
By Elizabeth Vibert

Fur trade records, the earliest accounts of the Native peoples of northern North America, have long been mined for information by historians and researchers. Vibert explores the assumptions behind the traders’ views—assumptions shaped by culture, gender, social class and race. Shedding new light on the nature of colonial cultural relations in areas that became Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana and British Columbia, she illuminates the ways in which racism and ethnocentrism are constructed historically.

**$16.95 Paper Now**

---

**The United States Infantry**
*An Illustrated History, 1775-1918*
By Gregory J.W. Urwin

American infantrymen served their country in the fury of battle with muskets, rifles, bayonets and bare hands. Urwin narrates the history of these men from their colonial origins through the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, Indian Wars, Spanish-American War and finally to the fields of France in World War I.

32 color and 111 b&w illustrations with 8 maps

**$15.95 Paper Now**

---

**Mountain Scouting**
*A Handbook for Officers and Soldiers on the Frontiers*
By Edward S. Farrow with Foreword by Jerome A. Greene

Mountain Scouting, among many other things, is a valuable instruction guide for caring of horses, shooting accurately, fixing broken bones, warding off diseases, crossing rivers, locating a water supply, carrying firearms and baggage, setting up a camp, posting pickets, cooking (including recipes), and offers advice on proper clothing, bedding, tents and rations.

**$12.95 Paper Now**

Visit our new website:
www.ou.edu/oupress
Through June 18, 2000
in recognition of the bicentennial of his death

Pushed into obscurity by the myths that surround him—including one about a certain cherry tree—George Washington has become an elusive character, as have the things he fought for, which today we generally take for granted: independence, nationhood and liberty.

Get to know the real man behind the myths through paintings by John Trumbull, Gilbert Stuart, and Charles Wilson Peale, manuscripts in Washington’s hand, decorative arts, architectural plates, personal correspondence and other documents.

Special thanks to the Virginia Historical Society, the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association, Washington & Lee University, the Smithsonian Institution, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and Colonial Williamsburg.

WASHINGTON STATE HISTORY MUSEUM
1911 Pacific Avenue
Tacoma, WA 98402
1/888-BE-THERE
www.wshs.org

Calling all Georges! $1 off admission for all visitors who share the same first name as the “father of our country!”

Admission is free, as always, for members of the Washington State Historical Society
(Membership information is available by calling 253/798-5902 or on our web site)

The board of trustees and staff of the Washington State Historical Society wish to express their sincere gratitude to long-time members Mr. & Mrs. Philip S. Hayes for their generous support of this exhibit.
We would also like to thank and welcome our newest promotional partner, First Community Bank.
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