Black Powder Firearms—Key to the Survival and Success of the Lewis & Clark Expedition
Seattle’s Women Teachers of the Interwar Years
*Shapers of a Livable City*
Doris Hinson Pieroth

This lively and well-written narrative describes the contributions of a remarkable group of women who dominated the Seattle public school system in the early years of the twentieth century and helped to produce well-educated citizens who were responsible for the widespread philanthropic, volunteer, and municipal activities that came to characterize the city. Details drawn from local newspapers and school publications, and quotes from interviews conducted with many of the teachers involved, help demonstrate the influence of these teachers who helped make the modern Seattle the livable place that it remains today.

A McLellan Book
Clothbound, $30.00

Frontier Cattle Ranching in the Land and Times of Charlie Russell
Warren M. Elofson

Drawing upon the artwork, short stories, and legend of Charlie Russell, Warren Elofson debunks the myth of the American “wild West” and the Canadian “mild West” by demonstrating that cattlemen on both sides of the forty-ninth parallel shared a common experience. He examines the lives of cowboys and ranch owners during the free-range era, with its oversized spreads, drunkenness, prostitution, gunplay, and rustling in both localities.

Clothbound, $30.00

Rogue Diamonds
*Northern Riches on Dene Land*
Ellen Bielawski

When diamonds were discovered near Yellowknife in Canada’s Arctic, international mining companies almost immediately began to stake claims to traditional hunting and fishing grounds of the Native Dene. Ellen Bielawski describes the negotiations between the First Nations, the Inuit, the mining companies, and the government, from closed-door meetings in town to sacred ceremonies on the land.

“...true power of this book lies in Bielawski’s unique northern voice, and acute rendering of a life on the land and the healing power of old ways.” — Toronto Globe and Mail

Paperback, $24.95

Driven Wild
*How the Fight against Automobiles Launched the Modern Wilderness Movement*
Paul S. Sutter

Foreword by William Cronon

“Sutter ably demonstrates that all four founders of the Wilderness Society feared that roads and cars were destroying the last remnants of American wilderness, abetted by government’s willingness to encourage modernization and tourism. Nicely written; extensively referenced.” — Choice

Weyerhaeuser Environmental Books
Paperback, $24.95
(Also available in cloth, $45.00)
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In Defense of Alexander Ross

As a WSHS member I have collected COLUMBIA magazines going back to volume 1, Spring 1987. Up to now there has not been a need to respond critically to the contents of this very worthy and respected publication. For the first time an article unjustly attempts to detract a deceased man, specifically H. Lloyd Keith’s recent characterization of Alexander Ross in “The Adventure Narrative as History,” COLUMBIA, Summer 2004. The surprising effort to discredit Ross for not rising above the rank of clerk smacks of elitism. What is the minimum rank required to be truthful? Chief factor? Sergeant? Professor? Implying that Ross qualifies as one of Percy Adams’s “travel liars” is simply out of bounds. Adams’s book, Travelers and Travel Liars, 1660-1800, is about fakes and hoaxes such as Patagonian giants, the mythical Northwest Passage, and inaccurate maps of the Mississippi Delta in 1683. Trying to link the book with Alexander Ross and the 19th century is a far stretch best left alone. Adams himself wrote that there are “hundreds of true travel books.” Is Alexander Ross in the true category? H. Lloyd Keith would have us believe that the desire to sell books motivates authors to be untruthful. Well, there go most of the world’s authors! Should Alexander Ross be condemned for not knowing more about coastal trade? Why should he if he spent most of 15 years in the interior Columbia Basin? His specialty was inland trade, not coastal. Did Ross give a date of another man’s arrival a few months different than it actually was? If so, big deal. He was a fur trade clerk, not a court clerk. Most of his dates do check out. Was Ross critical of the large company he worked for? Absolutely—many people are. Just ask employees of Boeing, the United States Army, and the Department of Social and Health Services to get an earful of sarcastic comments about how those organizations operate. Was Ross biased and opinionated? Of course he was. His personal feelings become evident to even the dullest reader. Did Ross record events, people, and places in the Columbia Basin during a period when very few others did likewise? Yes. And that is the rare and precious information that he left the people of the world who were born after him.

—Jo N. Miles, Granger

Ross Rebuttal

When I set out to write my article, my intent was to establish that there is reason to suspect Alexander Ross’s The Fur Hunters of the Far West of distorting historical accounts in the Columbia between 1813 and 1821 and that the prudent reader should take this into account. I did this by applying the criteria Percy Adams supplied for evaluating travel narratives in his book, Travellers and Travel Liars, 1660-1800. While it is true, as Miles points out, that Adams limited his analysis to a period earlier than that covered in the Ross narrative, there is nothing inherent in the criteria themselves that requires such a limitation. Vanity, cupidity, and prejudice can be found in travel narratives after Adams’s arbitrary 1800 cut-off date as well as before it. Further, while Adams emphasized narratives whose authors intentionally wrote to deceive, he also acknowledged that accounts written with no such intention can also result in misleading the public when an author’s unconscious “motives” infest the content of the narrative. Vanity, cupidity, and prejudice are not discrete criteria that force an either-or choice; rather, they are continuous in character and allow for degrees of distinction. The question, for example, is not whether Ross was biased for, as Miles points out, “Of course he was.” But were his biases sufficiently egregious to distort the history he set himself up to write? A close reading of Alexander Ross’s Fur Hunters, using these criteria, finds much of what he wrote wanting. For a man who set himself up as the historian of the North West Company’s “Adventures to the Columbia,” Alexander Ross was remarkably uninformed regarding the company’s activities, business strategies, and marketing problems. While it is true, as Miles states, that Ross spent most of his time in the interior, he did not restrict Fur Hunters to his personal observations but claimed knowledge of and passed judgment on the entire enterprise, coastal as well as interior. His facts as well as his assessments of company resolve are not reliable. Miles states that “most of his dates do check out,” but, actually, they do not. Where it is possible to compare with other published accounts (Gabriel Franchère and Ross Cox, for example) they show considerable variability. Unpublished documents confirm his confusing of dates and blending of events. As Miles asserts in her letter, any single instance of an incorrect date or a confusing of events is no “big deal,” but the cumulative effect of so many of them is to distort the record and impugn the reliability of his entire narrative.

Having said all this, let me emphasize that my object was not to “unjustly...detract a deceased man” nor to characterize him as a “Munchausen,” irreparably mendacious in all he wrote. As I state explicitly in the article, “I do not suggest Alexander Ross was an outright fabricator, nor do I think he intentionally misconstrued the facts or misled his readers.” Those who continue to use Ross’s Fur Hunters uncritically are the object of my concern. The inaccuracies and distortions in Fur Hunters continue to be incautiously accepted as an accurate record regardless of whatever Ross’s intentions may have been. Lacking published alternatives, writers of the history of this period in the Northwest have had to rely on Ross’s work and assume he got it right. There are archival records that can help set the record straight, but few have consulted them. The result is that the same inaccuracies continue to pass from one generation of readers to the next. Because Fur Hunters is the only published source for the period between late 1817 and 1821, it must be read by students of Northwest history and cannot yet be relegated to historical romance, but it should be used with caution. It is this caveat I would urge to those who view Alexander Ross’s Fur Hunters as a source of “rare and precious information.”

—H. Lloyd Keith

Problematic Hanford Photo

As a former resident of a three-bedroom prefab and a “B” house and a 1955 graduate of Columbia High School, I feel I must point out that there are a number of problems with the use of the photograph on page 29 of the Summer 2004 issue captioned, “City of Richland, HEW Village, 1944.” The photograph was taken no earlier than 1948. On the left end of the high school is the “new” gym (the “old” gym, built with the original building is just to the right of the “new”) and in the back of the building are additions on the central wing and right wing. According to the school district, these additions and the gym were built in 1948.

In the middle ground there are pre-cut houses mixed with the original prefabs—soon after the war empty prefabs were removed, but with the cold war new housing was required, and the pre-cuts were placed on the vacant lots. Farther back is a gap behind the prefabs/pre-cut mix and a second tier of houses, which were built about 1948 and later (also pictured in the article but not alphabet houses, and the “ranch houses” in the extreme background (mentioned in the article but not the original alphabet houses). The two authors identify themselves with “Q” houses, which also are not mentioned in the article.

—Philip Beach, Eatonville
Elected Office and the Case of Mark Litchman, One of Washington’s Jewish Political Pioneers

By Adam Halpern

In the year 2000 a Jewish senator from Connecticut nearly became vice president of the United States, while in the local Democratic primary Jewish insurance commissioner Deborah Senn finished second in her bid to become Washington state’s first Jewish senator. This prominence of Jews in elected politics is emblematic of the important role Jews currently play in the national political scene. The presence of Jews in national elected politics, however, has not always been so common. Moreover, prior to the 1950s, Jews rarely held elected office in this state. With so much success in other spheres of American life, why did Jews historically fail to win elected office throughout the United States, and why have they been particularly absent from Washington’s political history? The story of Mark M. Litchman, a politically active Seattle attorney who aspired unsuccessfully to elected office, can help us answer these questions.

In the early 20th century, when the state’s population numbered about 1 million, there were fewer than ten formal Jewish congregations. Jews began arriving in greater numbers, some from distant parts of the United States and others from as far away as the Island of Marmara in Turkey. Among these new arrivals was Mark M. Litchman.

Before coming to Seattle, Litchman spent his first 21 years traveling the world. Born in New York in 1887, Litchman left the Lower East Side in 1902 to become a naval apprentice and, ultimately, the youngest veteran of the Spanish-American War at age 14. He spent his remaining teenage years sailing from port to port in Europe and even around Cape Horn in South America.

By the time Litchman arrived in Seattle his extensive travels had forever changed him. Reflecting on his early experiences many years later, he commented that as a teen he had gained “both a heart and a viewpoint for the underdog, and my early ideal...to become a lawyer for the downtrodden.” After he passed the bar in May 1913, this is exactly what he became.

As a young attorney Litchman argued a number of important cases. He secured election filing rights for Socialist Party candidates, fought for free tuition at the University of Washington, and helped establish the eight-hour work day in the lumber industry. He also successfully defended the Seattle Union Record, labor’s daily newspaper, against charges of sedition in addition to founding and serving as the first president of the Seattle Labor College. The pinnacle of his early legal career, however, came in 1926 when he won a longshoreman’s case before the United States Supreme Court, which paved the way for passage of the Federal Harbor Workers Compensation Act.

Litchman continued to fight for workers, arguing two more important cases in 1933. He successfully represented 100 picketing fruit workers in Yakima, and then in a later case defended the constitutionality of the Old Age Pension Act. In merely 20 years of practicing law, Litchman had gained a reputation as an excellent orator and an important labor lawyer, winning the nickname, “The Little Giant.”

Due to his successes in the courtroom as a people’s advocate, Mark Litchman was undoubtedly well-qualified to be a superior court judge. He filed to run in the 1934 primary election for King County Superior Court Position 15. Joining four other candidates, Litchman finished fourth in the September 11, 1934, primary.

Two years later Litchman was even better qualified to serve as a superior court judge, and therefore he decided to run again, this time challenging Judge Roscoe Smith for King County Superior Court Position 12. In the two years since the 1934 election, Litchman had added a year of experience as the Washington State Legislature’s legal advisor to his already impressive list of credentials. Given his extensive experience as an advocate of citizens and workers, he secured endorsements from Senator W. R. Orndorff, and Lumber and Sawmill Workers Local Union of Snoqualmie No. 2545.

With his added experience and increased knowledge of the campaign process, Litchman finished second in the September 8 primary, advancing to the November 3, 1936, general elec-
tion. Nevertheless, on November 4, 1936, the Seattle Times reported that Judge Roscoe Smith had been reelected to Position 12, receiving more than twice as many votes as Mark Litchman. The newspaper provided no analysis of Litchman’s unsuccessful Superior Court bid, but given his expertise and experience it is interesting that the final results were not closer.

The most apparent explanation is that Roscoe Smith’s greater name recognition and financial backing from influential conservatives was too much for Litchman to challenge. In addition to Litchman’s difficult task of unseating a well-financed incumbent, it is possible that his strong labor views were too progressive for Seattle in 1936.

Still, upon deeper exploration into the 1936 election, an entirely different explanation arises: anti-Semitism. There were three parties that ran candidates for every statewide and congressional office in 1936—the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, and the Christian Party. The Christian Party ran on an explicitly anti-Semitic platform, promising to “Shovel out Communism and International Capitalism, both Jew Controlled.” While Christian Party candidates didn’t win more than a handful of votes, it is alarming that it was the only party in Washington State to rival the breadth of the Democratic and Republican parties. Though often subtle, anti-Semitism clearly had a foothold in Washington politics of the 1930s. Only three months after the general election, for example, Seattle City Council member David Levine found himself fighting against Windemere, a residential development that was open “only to gentiles and white people.” This anti-Semitism may have had some effect on Litchman’s attempt to become the first Jewish superior court judge in Washington State.

Despite Litchman’s unsuccessful superior court campaigns, he finally became a public servant in 1938 when he was appointed to the state senate. Nevertheless, he decided not to stand for reelection in 1940. In previous elections Litchman was not able to overcome the difficulties of defeating wealthy incumbents and the forces of anti-Semitism by running with progressive political views. These challenges had most likely also kept other aspiring Jewish politicians out of elected office. Historically, Jews have not only failed to win elections in Washington and across the country, but perhaps more importantly, they have often decided not to run for public office, convinced that “Jews make better staff people.” Over the years Jews have been politically influential behind the scenes, both as staff people and financial supporters of politicians, but they have often declined to enter elections as candidates. In 1940, given Litchman’s increased name recognition and experience in campaigning,

JEWISH POLITICIANS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Despite the fact that in 2002 there were 10 Jewish senators and 27 Jewish representatives in the United States Congress, from 1776 until 1974—a span of almost 200 years—only 12 Jews served in the Senate and only 11 were elected governors. Washington has mirrored this national pattern, having sent only one Jew to Congress and elected no Jewish governors. The last Jewish head of Washington was Edward S. Salomon, who was appointed territorial governor in 1870. Seattle’s lone Jewish mayor, Bailey Gatzert, left office in 1876. Other Jewish mayors served the smaller communities of Olympia, Port Townsend, Ellensburg, and Elma, but all except Harry Robinson of Elma completed their terms before 1925.

Although Washington’s only Jewish congressman, John Miller, served in the House of Representatives from 1985 to 1992, Jews have dotted the state’s political landscape since its admission into the Union in 1889. David Levine was a Seattle City Council member from 1931 to 1962 and was the council’s president for a record ten years. Bernice Stern was the only woman elected to the King County Council in its inaugural election in 1960. She became the council’s first female chairperson in 1978.

Several Jews have also served in the state legislature, including Harry Rosenhaupt, Max Newman, David Levin, Mark Litchman, Jr., Bob Perry, David Cowan, and currently Adam Kline. In addition to Jewish state representatives, Washington Jews such as Charles Horowitz, Sollie Ringold, and Bobbe Bridge have been superior court, court of appeals or state supreme court judges. Still, compared with Oregon, where Jews have been governors, congressmen, mayors, and speakers of the state house of representatives, the absence of Jews in Washington’s elected politics is startling.
he might have become an elected state senator if he had only chosen to enter a third political race. Yet, like so many other Jews of his day and a number of Jews since, he decided elected politics was not for him.

Mark Litchman spent his final 20 years continuing to champion community causes, most notably as the director of the King County Housing Authority, president of Americans for Democratic Action, and as a board member of both B’nai B’rith and the Seattle Chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union. He also founded and was a commander of the Seattle post of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

Finally, throughout his life Litchman was a prolific lecturer and writer, writing both fiction and nonfiction and numerous articles to state and county bar associations. Quite ironically, in a piece he published in the Jewish Transcript about the “Contributions of Jews to Human Progress” in the realm of statesmanship, he hardly mentioned American Jews, instead choosing to focus on biblical and European Jews. It is instructive that even he, a former candidate for superior court judge and an appointed state senator, had little to say about American Jewish statesmen, leaving his own political aspirations as an American Jew shrouded in mystery.

OPPOSITE PAGE: A very young Mark Litchman poses for a photo in his navy uniform.

BELOW: An older Litchman congratulates his son, Mark, Jr., on his first day at work in the Washington State Legislature.

Unfortunately, with Mark Litchman’s death in 1960, it is now nearly impossible to completely unravel the mysteries behind his 1934 and 1936 superior court campaigns and his later appointment to the Washington State Senate. If he were here today, we would undoubtedly grill Litchman with a series of questions, attempting to better understand his experiences as a Jew running for elected office in the state’s early years. Why did he chose to run for office? How did his being a Jew affect this decision? What role did anti-Semitism play in his election bids?

Although it is impossible to turn back the clock to interview Mark Litchman, historians can turn to other members in the Jewish community to ask them similar questions. It is for this reason that undertakings such as the Washington State Jewish Historical Society’s newest oral history project, a project focusing on Jews in politics, is so important. It is the voices, histories, and insights of former and current Jewish politicians that will help historians better understand the difficult paths of our state’s Jewish political pioneers, bringing greater clarity to the rich Jewish history of Washington State.

Adam Halpern, a native of Olympia, is a member of the Washington State Jewish Historical Society and has been a contributor to its newsletter, Nizkor, in which this article was originally published in September 2003.
A delightful irony of the ever-pressing need to modernize building systems to provide viable working environments in older buildings is that the best way to approach the design is often to delve deep into the building's original design and history. If the building is a National Historic Landmark like the Washington State Legislative Building, such rehabilitation may be subject to the secretary of the interior's "Standards and Guidelines for the Restoration of Historic Properties," which encourages respect for the original materials and features that form its character.

These features are typically identified and ranked as of greater or lesser significance in a historic structures report. It may be my prejudice, but it often seems that the ascription of historic significance in such reports focuses too much on the social or political rank of the occupants and reflects the art history training of many who write them. It is rare to see a detailed description of the support systems of an older building—the plumbing, wiring, heating, and ventilation. It is rarer still to find them ascribed significance anything like that given the grand public spaces with

**Figure 1.** Architects Walter Wilder and Harry White designed the Washington Legislative Building in such a way as to make its mechanical support systems nearly invisible. Shown here are the dome and east wing of the newly constructed capitol building, c. 1927.
By Christopher Tavener

their marble flooring, ornate plaster work, gold leaf, and faux painting.

Of course, these systems tend to be invisible and, unlike the grand entrance porticos and dome that grace the crown jewel of Washington's historic structures, may seem to have demanded little design effort by the architects Wilder and White. Nothing could be farther from the truth, and a careful study of these hidden systems greatly informs their modernization during the current rehabilitation effort.

The latter part of the 19th century and early part of the 20th saw a great increase in the size of many types of buildings—factories, hospitals, schools, and government offices. Central areas of such buildings could not be adequately ventilated by perimeter fenestration (i.e., the arrangement, proportioning, and design of windows and doors in a building). At the same time, the relation of ventilation to health had become apparent in the treatment of the sick and wounded in the Crimean War and the American Civil War, and ventilation systems began to appear in hospitals and schools by the end of the 1860s.

Early systems often relied on steam to drive the fans that circulated the air. Consequently, they tended to be large, centralized systems, sited near the coal-fired furnaces in the basement, and required initial ducts of considerable size which then split into smaller fingers that drove their way up inside the building walls. They lent themselves to central heating since a large steam radiator could be placed across the main duct downstream of the fan. These systems were expensive as they did not circulate, but exhausted warm air from windows or roof vents. Slightly more sophisticated systems, returning and mixing old warmed air to the fresh air intake, began to appear as the advent of electricity allowed decentralized fans to be installed to manipulate air flow. This was commonplace by the 1920s when the final design of the legislative building began, and its ventilation and air-tempering system followed this general pattern.

The warm air system began with twin air intakes, one for each wing. They resided in an area of the fifth floor roof on the southern, sunnier side of the dome, hidden from view and protected from wind and driving rain by the bulkheads of the south rotunda stairs and the portico atop the main south entry. The air was drawn down to twin fan rooms on the first floor through shafts hidden behind the marble finishes at the southeast and southwest corners of the rotunda. These shafts are each...
The long path of the delivery system ensured that the air arrived silently, without aural or visual impact on the restrained classical form of the great high-ceilinged offices...

Downtown of the fans at the first floor, within the fan rooms, enormous steam radiators heated the air, which was forced by the fans into a tunnel that runs beneath the first floor for the entire perimeter of the building, except under the monumental north stairs (Figure 3). This tunnel made effective use of the building's evolution, occupying the space between the outer limits of the foundations completed for the first design by Ernest Flagg and the larger outline demanded for the second by Wilder and White. At 70 locations around the tunnel the warm air rose through slots in each pier supporting the massive two-story columns of the colonnades that define the façades of the wings, into shafts built on the inner face of the piers, to reach grilles beside each French window on the second floor and below each window on the third (Figure 4). The long path of the delivery system ensured that the air arrived silently, without aural or visual impact on the restrained classical form of the great high-ceilinged offices around the perimeters of these two floors. Since these offices were open-plan spaces, an astounding contrast to the modern cubicle, the air provided at the perimeter could refresh and warm every part of the room as it was drawn to the grilles of the return air system on the opposite wall, mentioned above.

The system continues. In each wing the plenums connect through, north to south. The south shafts drew the return air down to the south first floor fan rooms, but the north shafts drew off part of the air in the plenums as exhaust air. The fans in

---

**Figure 3. Plan showing perimeter tunnel and column penetrations below the first floor of the legislative building.**
two north first floor fan rooms forced this air out past the ends of the tunnel into the basement garage, providing warmth. But it was exhausted, along with any fumes, by two more large fans placed under the monumental north stairs. These fans also sucked fresh air into the garage through the ornamental grille work in the upper part of the doors at the entrances into the garage and forced the mixture up twin shafts on each side of the north stair portico to exhaust louvers facing onto another fifth floor roof court on the north side of the dome, a twin of the court where the intake louvers are found. By this time, even without recirculation, a particle of air could have traveled 200 yards through shafts within the building, but only 30 feet within an office space.

It is easy to see that what is called the “mechanical system” is often interrelated with what is typically considered architecture—the planning and appointment of spaces. Interestingly, Norman Johnston, in his masterful discussion of the evolution of Wilder and White’s design, notes that when the decision to expand the legislative building beyond the Flagg foundations led to a redesign in 1923, “part of the added building width was added to introduce solid masonry walls on either side of the portico, their planes stepping forward to frame it handsomely as well as adding a visually much more satisfying foundation for the platform and the sequential levels of the dome itself.”

These solid masonry walls are also the enclosure for the exhaust shafts. In addition, the “strongly classical Roman” two-story Doric colonnades that dominate all façades of the wings, also function—perhaps not intentionally—to simplify the mechanical systems (Figure 1). They provide almost continual shade for the windows. Analysis undertaken for the rehabilitation shows that they cut the heat load on the windows behind them to about 50 percent of what would normally be anticipated for the area of glazing. As a result, enough cool air can be provided to the perimeter offices to counter the addition of computers, copiers, and other heat-producing machinery, without enlarging the original tempered-air ductwork.

The symbiosis between the legislative building’s architecture and mechanical systems extends beyond the elevations to the plans. Wilder and White spread working offices with access to windows in broad strokes around the perimeter of the wings on all four floors and placed vaults, storerooms, elevators, and mechanical rooms requiring less ventilation in the central areas on the first and to some extent the second floor.

However, central areas were given over to significant assembly spaces—the legislative chambers, the public galleries on the fourth floor above them, the former changing and toilet rooms (now dining rooms and kitchens) for the representatives and senators on the floor below, and, finally, the public cafeteria in the first floor octagonal space under the rotunda. These were provided with a separate mechanical system, as intricately woven into the building fabric as the first. Fans hidden in the great square base under the drum supporting the dome drove air out into the
The original mechanical systems...were intricately woven into the structure, architectural features, plan, and use of the building.

The original mechanical systems...were intricately woven into the structure, architectural features, plan, and use of the building.

There are several notable, overall characteristics of the original mechanical systems. First, they were intricately woven into the structure, architectural features, plan, and use of the building. Second, despite their extraordinary meanderings, the systems were almost invisible. Third, also related to the meanderings, they must have been quiet. Fourth, they made controlled and limited use of dropped ceilings, unlike many modern delivery and return systems. There were no dropped ceilings in perimeter rooms, except on the fourth floor. Last, on the first and fourth floors, and to a lesser degree on the floors between, the systems relied on windows for fresh air in office spaces.

These are mentioned for the following reasons. One is to highlight abstract virtues, like invisibility and silence, which join the concrete expression of the original design in forming the character of the building and which must be respected when modernization/rehabilitation occurs. Another is to make the point that a design for the upgrade of mechanical systems that reuses the principles, opportunities, and spaces of the original system is likely to have a less negative impact on the historic spaces it serves than one that does not. A third is that the original mechanical systems in the legislative building were carefully matched to different uses of space, and to the extent that their routes and logic are integrated into a modern system, limitations on plan changes may have to be accepted.

Beyond this, serious and respectful rehabilitation of a mechanical system demands and affords a wonderful opportunity to reinvestigate the success and subtlety of the original design effort, of the marriage between form and function. It also provides a chance to redress, to some small degree, the neglected history of the silent, hidden partners of the architectural stars.

Christopher Tavener is an architect with Einhorn, Yaffee, Prescott, Architects and Engineers, Albany, New York, the architects responsible for the technical components of the legislative building's current rehabilitation. Tavener has specialized in studies and renovations of public buildings and building systems from West Point Military Academy to the the Montezuma Hotel in Las Vegas, New Mexico, from the campus of MIT to the American Chancery in Canberra, Australia.
Rescuing the Destitute

The Salvation Army in Spokane, 1891-1920

By Annika Herbes

On the evening of August 22, 1891, the Salvation Army marched down the streets of Spokane promptly at 7:30. Brass music penetrated the ears of the idle migrant laborers relaxing and playing poker in the saloons. Women and children began to peer through windows and cracked doors of wooden shacks. Slowly people emerged and began following the band until it stopped at the corner of Riverside and Howard. To their surprise the band was composed of three women in blue uniforms and a solitary man in a red shirt. A few words were spoken and then their march proceeded to a rented meeting hall at Howard and Main. Intrigued, the people followed them into the cramped, poorly ventilated building. The Salvation Army then "opened fire" and launched into an evangelical meeting. By the end of the meeting two people had accepted Christ, and the Salvation Army had set its foot in Spokane.

The Salvation Army started in England in 1865 as a reaction to the growing disparity of wealth created by the industrial revolution. The organization quickly grew and spread to other countries, including America. Between 1879 and 1899 an average of 29 new churches, called corps, were opened each year throughout America. In 1891 three trained ministers, Ensign (Adjutant) McAbee, Captain Long, and Lieutenant Tilden were commissioned in Seattle to open a new corps in Spokane. Initially, these three women were ignored or threatened by local inhabitants after they marched into Spokane in August 1891. In a year-end summary in 1892 the newspaper recounted the city's reaction: "A year ago a forerunner of the Salvation Army... attempted to establish barracks in Spokane and was driven out of the city." The group did not leave and tensions continued to grow. The conflicts provoked in Spokane from 1891 to 1920 by the Salvation Army's attempts to rescue the destitute provide a glimpse at the difficulties involved in creating an organization amidst class animosity. While the middle class despised the Salvation Army's tactics and the labor unions vehemently disagreed with its message of salvation, both groups eventually accepted and supported the Salvation Army in Spokane.

Class Conflict in Spokane

In 1891 Spokane faced a number of problems, including a growing class conflict. Prior to the 1889 fire the downtown district was filled with saloons, gambling establishments, female boardinghouses, hotels, banks, shops, and stables that served the migrant laborers searching for entertainment between employment in the fields, mines, and forests. For many of the upper class citizens who resided outside of downtown, Spokane Falls was the epitome of "sin city." When the fire of 1889 destroyed this district the middle class saw an opportunity to reconstruct Spokane both physically and morally. They started by shortening the name to Spokane. They made it difficult for "sinful" establishments to obtain permits to reestablish themselves and prohibited the construction of wooden buildings of any kind. Consequently, most gambling houses, single men's residences, and employment offices were forced upriver. The red-light district moved to a shantytown near the railroad tracks and then farther upriver.

Despite these legal successes, a few civic leaders called upon the mayor, chief of police, and city council to purge the city "of the dangerous classes.... They...
city "of the dangerous classes . . . They are a clog in the wheel of progress and impart to the city an air of ‘toughness’ that repels many intending investors." In January 1890 a self-appointed citizens' group started the Law and Order League in a vigilante effort to deal with the situation. When league members began nighttime raids, social chaos ensued.

This climate was the backdrop for the Salvation Army's entrance into Spokane, yet the city was idealized in the organization's publication, War Cry, on September 12, 1891, "The Salvation Army has invaded Spokane . . . It is one of the finest cities of the northwest. The people have long been praying for the Salvation Army to come to Spokane. The Lord has answered their prayers and we are here."

The key to solving the problems of downtown Spokane, according to the Salvation Army, was to deal with the root causes. If people would accept salvation, they would be transformed from the inside out. The key to solving poverty was evangelism and love rather than labor unions or economic development.

Pounding drumbeats were interspersed with a blaring horn and a clanging tambourine. Up and down the street they marched, trying to attract the attention of crowds to lure them into an evangelistic meeting. Minstrel shows and circus routines were used to attract attention. Instead of liturgical services the soldiers of salvation combined music, exhortation, personal testimonies, brass bands, and skits. People in the crowd spat tobacco on the rental hall floor and prostitutes socialized near the door.

Middle class Christians adamantly opposed the "desacralized" and "secularized" evangelical tactics of the Salvation Army. They feared that the Salvation Army would unleash
Salvation Army's worship music and entertainment were tools of the Devil. While these techniques were intolerable to some, they were successful among working-class men and women. During its first two years in Spokane the Salvation Army enlisted 200 members. The combination of music halls, saloons, and camp style meetings appealed to people who had been rejected by other Christians because of their lack of propriety and riches. One edition of the War Cry explained the philosophy behind the organization's approach to evangelism. "It ought not be forgotten that the Army is composed of a very peculiar class, drawn from the lower strata of society, and that it is on this same class they are striving to operate." While the Salvation Army could win over those who were economically distressed, legal powers were in the hands of its opposition.

The city government of Spokane repeatedly condemned the Salvation Army's tactics. In February 1892 the group's bass drum was declared a nuisance and barred from the streets. The Salvation Army was also instructed to avoid Howard Street because one sick person on the street was annoyed at the noise created by the band. In the same year an article appeared severely criticizing parents who allowed their children to participate in the Salvation Army's marches. After a bold and provocative essay by J. Rushford defending the Salvation Army against these attacks, the public debate about the organization disappeared from the local papers. In the meantime, however, an incident occurred that would plaster the name of the Salvation Army on the cover page of the Spokesman Review.

On May 5, 1893, Captain Ida Bennett was preparing for a routine visit to the Spokane County Jail when David Hoskins murdered her. According to a subsequent article in the War Cry, "The infatuated man was in love with the Captain and because she refused to encourage his suit, he killed both her and himself it is thought in a fit of insanity." Bennett became venerated throughout the Salvation Army as a martyr and a model for serving the poor. For a short period of time Spokane mourned with the Salvation Army over the loss of a dedicated minister and her work was admired in community publications.

In 1897 another conflict erupted between the city and the Salvation Army. The city passed an ordinance prohibiting any activity that would frighten horses or interfere with traffic flow. One clause forbade public musical performances without prior permission from the mayor. On July 1, 1897, police officers arrested members of the Salvation Army who were holding an outdoor meeting at their usual location. All the way to the police station the Salvationists sang and played music, trailed by hundreds of spectators. Eight band members were charged with disorderly conduct, and their trial was scheduled for the following week.

Ensign Barnes was outraged at the way the city was trying to drive the organization out by minimizing its work and vowed to fight the ordinance all the way to the nation's capital. Six days later the city council proclaimed its support for the ordinance by unanimously voting to revoke the monthly appropriation of $15 to the Salvation Army Rescue Home. If the group would not follow the rules, it would not be supported. The Salvation Army wavered in its opposition. The street corner was not as important as community support for social programs. Brigadier Howell composed a letter to the Spokesman Review in which the Salvation Army agreed "not to attempt again to use the disputed corner of Riverside Avenue and Howard Street for religious services, whether they won or lost in court." All cases were dismissed, and the issue of public meetings was closed until 1909.

Despite periodic legal problems with the city, the Salvation Army managed to serve the poor and destitute in Spokane. It was famous for its creed of "Soup, Soap, and Salvation." The Salvation Army believed that the Gospel could not be preached to a person who was dying of hunger. In 1897 they opened a food and shelter depot at 709 Front Avenue called "the Haven," which provided sleeping accommodations for 50 men. The cost was 10 to 20 cents daily depending on the quality of the room. Meals were provided at the starting price of five cents. For those who could not afford the inexpensive prices, work was available in the adjacent wood yard. One of the administrators of the building explained the Salvation Army's principle in putting aid recipients to work. "In this institution we aim at disposing charity without pauperizing those who receive it. One of the things we insist on here is that applicants for rooms show a willingness to work... A man who refuses to work gets nothing here."

The Haven was almost self-sustaining, contained a free employment agency, and received only a five dollar grant from the county every month. In 1897 the Salvation Army began providing a free Christmas dinner to the poor at the Haven. People received clothing, extra food, and gifts to brighten their Christmas. That first year some 500 people attended the dinner. The number dropped to 400 in 1898, but in the following years it steadily grew as more people discovered the Salvation Army's programs. The organization was beginning to establish its presence, and mainstream
churches began to accept the Salvation Army as a powerful provider of social services.

The Salvation Army also opened Liberty Home, a residence and maternity hospital for women who were pregnant out of wedlock. One of the leaders of the city, E. M. Hepburn, declared,

All good Christians look with delight and thankfulness upon the wave of purity, self sacrifice, and love that follows the Salvation Army everywhere. A rescue home necessarily forms a part of city life, and we are proud to see those amongst us who, like Christ, consider themselves lowly and of no reputation that they may help the fallen... This aggressive work is undoubtedly the ideal kind of Christianity.

In 1911 a fire destroyed Liberty Home, forcing the Salvation Army to relocate the service to a rented building at 13th and Perry Streets. Residents of this upper class neighborhood did not approve of having in their backyard what had earlier been lauded in the press as an ideal Christian work.

Liberty Home quickly became a thorn in the side of the South Hill community. In September 1911 the Liberty Park Improvement Club filed a suit against the home and provided notification that the Salvation Army must vacate the premises. The club asserted that the “class of inmates are objectionable to the residents.” Two months later the suit went to trial. A number of residents testified to the negative impact the home had on the area, and the judge agreed with them. The home annoyed the residents of the area and depreciated the neighboring property. Upon handing down the judgment that the Salvation Army must move, the judge commented on the reasons for his decision: “The cries of women in agony and the wails of infants in distress have been wafted over the neighborhood; that women awaiting maternity move around the porches of the house and in the yard, in plain sight of all who pass.” The residents of South Hill did not wish to find themselves in the company of those the Salvation Army was ministering to.

Free Speech Fight of 1909

Despite the Salvation Army’s ministry to the working class, labor unions felt threatened. Both the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) and the Salvation Army fought for control of the workers’ souls in downtown Spokane. These two groups advocated different approaches to social change. The IWW taught that violent methods must be adopted immediately to improve working conditions. In contrast, the Salvation Army promoted the virtues of meekness and humility. Listeners were instructed to accept hardship in this life for the promise of a reward in heaven. These conflicting messages eventually led to a confrontation between two bands during the Free Speech Fight of 1909 in Spokane.

In 1908, in response to growing protests by the Wobblies against employment agencies, Spokane passed an ordinance forbidding street meetings in business districts. The Salvation Army complained that once again it was being forced off the streets, the avenue central to its work. The city then amended the ordinance in the summer of 1909 to allow the Salvation Army to preach and hold street meetings. The Wobblies howled in protest and started a band of their own. They took the lyrics of a few of the Salvation Army’s most popular songs and changed them to fit their own perspective. Harry McClintock, a Wobbly song leader, wrote a song with the following lines to mimic the Salvation Army’s song, “Revive Us Again.”

The Salvation Army continued to serve the women of Spokane after Liberty Home on South Hill was closed. Eventually they opened the Spokane Women’s Home and Hospital (left), which was directed by Adjutant May Wilmer (inset).

OPPOSITE PAGE: From the beginning the Salvation Army in Spokane provided disaster relief services for union strikers, soldiers, and anyone in need throughout the Inland Empire.
Why don't you work like other folks do?
How the hell can I work when there's no work to do?
Hallelujah, I'm a bum, Hallelujah, bum again,
Hallelujah, give us a handout to revive us again.

Another song mocked the Salvation Army's focus on eternal rewards rather than the union's immediate goals of better working conditions and higher wages. Joe Hill wrote the following lines:

You will eat, bye and bye
in that glorious land above the sky;
work and pray, live on hay,
you'll get pie in the sky when you die.

The Wobblies also adopted a strategy of non-violent conflict to protest the city's suppression of free speech. Some 600 Wobblies from throughout the West were mobilized to join the Free Speech Fight in Spokane. The tussle continued for four months, during which time 1,200 people were arrested at a cost of $250,000. The cost outweighed the benefits. On March 4, 1910, the City of Spokane released all of the prisoners and the governor pardoned all of those held on conspiracy charges. Anyone—Salvationist or Wobbly—would be free to speak on the streets. Ironically, the Wobblies, who had spited the Salvation Army's goals, solved the public assembly problem that had tormented the evangelists for 20 years. After the Free Speech Fight of 1909, the Salvation Army faded from the headlines.

**Shifting Opinions**

In the first decade of the 20th century the Salvation Army began to purchase property and construct permanent structures in Spokane. By 1905 national corps populations were stabilizing, the first generation of members was bequeathing substantial inheritances to the organization, and many of its leaders believed that property ownership was an essential step in becoming a stable, respectable force in America. Eventually, in 1919, the Salvation Army was able to break ground on a central services building at Main on Trent Street. The first floor of the building contained two auditoriums. The second floor housed the headquarters for all branches of the Salvation Army's work in the region, including a free clinic and a lawyer. The third floor was a workingman's hotel. Furnished, comfortable sleeping quarters were available at a nominal cost. The Spokane community donated funds for this building in the wake of increasingly positive national publicity and the international prestige the organization garnered during World War I.

The turning point in national public acceptance for the Salvation Army came in 1906. In the aftermath of an earthquake and fire in San Francisco, the organization provided large-scale, systematic emergency relief. The public was impressed with the self-sacrifice and compassion the Salvation Army demonstrated and responded by enthusiastically donating to the red kettles placed throughout the city. In 1911 Theodore Roosevelt declared, "There are few serious thinkers nowadays who do not recognize in the Salvation Army an invaluable social asset, a force for good which works effectively in those dark regions where, save for this force, only evil is powerful."

Later that decade 30,000 trained Salvationists worked for the Red Cross in Europe during World War I. Female Salvationists (called Lassies) provided medical services, held religious support and evangelistic meetings, and baked a variety of sweets for the soldiers in huts near the front lines. The most notable baked good was the fried doughnut. The troops fell in love with the services and the sincere love demonstrated by the Lassies. Letters home praised the Salvation Army, and after the war veterans became some of its firmest supporters.

In Spokane the Salvation Army led a community fund-raising campaign to send ambulances to France. The citizenry rallied behind the Salvation Army's program by engaging in a number of fund-raising pursuits. More than 100 musicians marched along Riverside Avenue and collected over $300. A group of women collected $900 in one day from downtown businesses. A number of companies, spurred on by a generous contribution from Weyerhaeuser, made substantial contributions of their own. The Elks put on a parade, musical shows, and a dance. This campaign is significant in the history of the Salvation Army in Spokane because in earlier years such a drive would have been met
Ceremony at Howard and Main Streets commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Salvation Army's "soup, soap, and salvation" crusade in Spokane, 1941. By this time the organization had established itself as the city's leading social service providers.

The Salvation Army is the greatest element for good in the entire community.... The story of the Salvation Army's work over the last 50 years would fill volumes with altruistic achievement in the city's realm of social service work. It has been on the job 365 days and nights a year, rain and shine. It has been the city's pioneer cornerstone in social service work and achieved a record of practical Christianity with its crusade of "soup, soap, and salvation" that no other agency has approached.

After World War I the Salvation Army achieved a place in the hearts of Americans, including the citizens of Spokane. Its war service moved it to the front of all American philanthropies. While the Salvation Army gained popularity as a social service, this came at the expense of its identity as a strong evangelistic force, and it was now less threatening to labor unions. In Spokane the conflict over ministering on the street in 1897 was one of the first signs of evangelistic decline. Protecting and expanding social services dampened the fire of street corner ministry. The Salvation Army was still at war with the evils of society, but it minimized active proselytization.

Amidst class animosity the Salvation Army was able to establish itself as the city's leading provider of social services. In a summary of the work it performed in Spokane in its first 50 years, Joel E. Ferris proclaimed, Today the Salvation Army continues to provide for the needs of the unfortunate in Spokane. Its visibility is most apparent during the holiday season when kettles are still employed to gather donations for those in need. The Salvation Army in Spokane currently provides a number of services, including a family shelter, foster care receiving program, community center, family services, thrift center, summer camp, Christmas shopping for children, and an annual Thanksgiving turkey distribution. Although it is no longer a zealous evangelical force, the spirituality of the organization is demonstrated by the works and services it renders to the community.

Annika Herbes recently returned from a year of teaching history in a public high school in Budapest, Hungary, and is currently a law student at Gonzaga University in Spokane. She is also an active member/volunteer of the Spokane Corps of the Salvation Army.
The morning and evening air is like wine...

Thus land dealers Thomas G. Thomson of Spokane and Theodore Reed of Moscow described the air in the Palouse country. In this 1905 pamphlet listing various tracts they offered for sale, Thomson and Reed sang the praises of the marvelous Palouse in glowing terms. Perhaps there was a bit of hyperbole, but there was much to attract farmers from the eastern and midwestern states. “Sunstroke is unknown.” “Palouse cherries are the best in the world, no exception.” “No fertilizers are used, not even manure, though it is not claimed that the soil will produce 25 to 50 bushels of wheat per acre forever without assistance.” “All plows are right hand.”

A ranch “152 acres, 9 miles east of Palouse, 76 acres in cultivation, balance pasture. House, barn, orchard, spring...” could be had for $1,600. Or, “480 acres, 2½ miles north of Pullman. All in cultivation. 1½ story frame house, fair barn, 2 wells, windmill, small orchard...” was priced at $11,000.
THE BLACK POWDER ARMS OF LEWIS & CLARK

By Mark Van Rhyn

Standing in a silhouette, one with an arm outstretched, the other holding a long rifle, Meriwether Lewis and William Clark are immortalized on the trail signs bearing their names. Although a stylized pose, it reveals much about the men and their expedition of discovery. Courage, fortitude, and a determination to open a continent, all are symbolized in a simple brown profile. Aside from their silhouettes, the most identifiable accouterment is, fittingly enough, a black powder rifle—a bulwark of their expedition.

If Lewis and Clark were the vanguard of American western expansion, then black powder weapons were the tools that allowed them to succeed. Without the rifles and smoothbore muskets, the Corps of Discovery would have foun­dered along the lower Missouri River and never have reached the Mandan-Hidatsa villages in 1804, let alone the Pacific Coast in 1805. Food and protection, the primary and perpetual issues of daily life, depended on guns. Exploration and Indian diplomacy, two vital aspects of their orders, were ultimately dependent on the firepower their weapons conveyed.

Although historians have discussed the value of Lewis and Clark's Native American studies and the wealth of their zoological and botanical discoveries, the Corps of Discovery was, above all, a military unit. President Thomas Jefferson had more practical matters than anthropology and science in mind when he authorized Lewis on June 20, 1803, to explore the Missouri River and its principal tributaries in hope of locating "the most direct and practicable water communication across the continent for the purposes of commerce."

To help fulfill this mission, Jefferson authorized Lewis to draw supplies, arms, and munitions from the War Department, to appoint a second in command, and to secure from American troops "by voluntary agreement" enough men to complete the exploration. Jefferson anticipated that ten to twelve men would be sufficient for the task. Lewis's preparations underscored the necessity of armaments. His list included rifles, powder horns and pouches, bullet molds, wipers (also called gun worms), ball screws (to remove jammed bullets in rifle muzzles), gun slings, extra parts, and tools for repairing arms. Lewis further ordered 500 "best flints," 200 pounds of "best rifle powder," and 400 pounds of lead from the federal arsenal at Harpers Ferry, Virginia (now West Virginia).

By April 1803 Lewis informed Jefferson, "My Rifles, Tomahawks and knives are prepared at Harper's [sic] Ferry, and are already in a state of forwardness that leaves me little doubt of their being in readiness in due time." Of particular note were the rifles, a new breed of weapon for the American professional soldier. Differing from the standard smoothbore American military musket, they were shorter, of smaller caliber, had rifled barrels, and were the prototypes of the first United States military rifle, the Model 1803 (Figure 1, page 20).

Rifles were not new to the American frontier. Indeed, many pioneers possessed rifles of several types, including those that would become famous in American folklore as the Kentucky long rifle. By the 1770s, the American rifle was recognized as a significant weapon. But rifles were not common weapons in the United States Army, and commanders in the late 18th and early 19th centuries were not anxious to make them so.

Due to the nature of the barrel, they considered rifles inferior to smoothbore muskets for general military use. First, rifles lacked a bayonet lug. Second, rifle barrels took their name from rifling (spiral grooves, or internal grooves), which gave the projectile a spin that increased accuracy, distance, and hitting power. While those were admirable traits in a weapon, the rifling had a significant drawback; it made loading the weapon more difficult.

Due to these perceived difficulties, military leaders favored the non-rifled musket. Although considerably less accurate than the rifle (a non-rifled musket was virtually useless beyond 100 yards), the smoothbore was preferred because of its ease of loading, consequent rapid rate of fire, and ability to carry a bayonet.

OPPOSITE PAGE: Lewis frequently departed from the main body, often exploring for the best travel routes. Carrying his Model 1803 rifle, Lewis was as well armed as anyone west of the Mississippi River.
Volley fire and the bayonet charge were the accepted infantry tactics, and American officers (like their European counterparts) stressed their value. But Americans were familiar with rifles, which had a somewhat successful history on Revolutionary War battlefields. National politics, influenced by cultural norms, influenced the army's development, and the rifle played a role in the land force. In 1799 Congress passed an act to augment the army, providing for additional infantry and cavalry regiments, a battalion of artillery and engineers, and a regiment and a battalion of riflemen. By definition, riflemen were armed with rifles, but the nation lacked a facility to produce the new weapons. Production at the national armories eventually met the demand, but an interim supply was needed. The government contracted with several Pennsylvania gun makers to produce rifles until a standard type could be developed.

While identifying specific guns is impossible, rifles made under such contracts may have accompanied Lewis and Clark. In a recent article Steven Allie stated that their rifles were contracted Pennsylvania arms, with shortened barrels, new locks, and swivels added for slings. Allie concluded that the expedition rifles were similar in appearance to Model 1803s and that they were possibly the initial design used to develop the 1803 rifle.

However, it is more likely that the expedition's principal rifle was not a contracted weapon. In 1800 and 1801, Harpers Ferry armorners experimented with full-stocked rifle development, and the new design was advanced by 1803. Secretary of War Henry Dearborn placed the onus squarely on Harpers Ferry Superintendent Joseph Perkins's shoulders in 1803: "You will be pleased to make such arms & iron work, as requested by the Bearer Captain Meriwether Lewis and to have them completed with the least possible delay." Lewis arrived at Harpers Ferry on March 16, and indicated his rifles were ready by April 20, so Perkins and his armorners must either have rapidly developed a weapon that met Lewis's requirements or had prototypes already designed. Whether modified contract rifles or a new design, these rifles were the forebears of the Model 1803.

Several historians have speculated on the Model 1803 design. Berkeley Lewis and G. W. P. Swenson asserted that the rifle was an "imitation" of the old German jager rifle, with a short barrel, large caliber, and using a large powder charge. David F. Butler believed that the design "was much closer to the commercial Pennsylvania designs than it was to the standardized Model 1795 Springfield musket" (Figure 2). Most of the arsenal's master craftsmen had backgrounds in Pennsylvania gunsmithing, and German smiths initiated rifle development in that region in the middle of the 18th century. The influence was unavoidable.

Charles Winthrop Sawyer described the rifle as a "cross between the heavy carabine of the French, the short gewehre of the Germans, and the strongly individual American all-purpose rifle." He called it the "Model 1800," although no such official designation existed, and indicated that using 90 to 100 grains of fine-grained rifle powder provided a velocity of about 2,000 feet per second. Given Lewis's order for "finest rifle powder," Sawyer's description seems accurate.

In Guns of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, Ruby Hult evaluated Sawyer's misidentification of the Model 1800. Organized prior to the Louisiana Purchase, the expedition was to be of foreign territory, and the Corps of Discovery could be viewed as an armed invasion by Spain or France. Proof of weapons produced in American arsenals was discouraged, and markings common to later Model 1803 rifles were not on the expedition's guns. The prototype Model 1803 must by Sawyer's "Model 1800." Hult's analysis makes even more sense considering the expedition's time frame. Because of Lewis's tight time schedule, nonessential markings would have been left off.

Dearborn confirmed the rifle's development and production on May 23, 1803, directing the manufacture of "a suitable number of judiciously constructed rifles manufactured at the Armory under Your [Perkins's] direction." The rifle barrel was not to exceed 33 inches, with a caliber of .52 to .54, or "carrying a ball of 1/30 of a pound weight." Barrels were to be round to within ten inches of the breech, then octagonal, and half-stocked, the wooden stock stopping where the barrel changed shape. Steel ramrods must be "sufficiently strong for forcing down the ball without binding." Dearborn advocated a short rifle, believing it superior to the traditional long rifle in loading time and in diminished fouling: "I have such convincing proof of the advantage the short rifles [have] over the long ones... in actual service as to leave no doubt in my mind of preferring the short rifle..." Where Dearborn got his "convincing proof" is unknown.

Satisfied with his rifles, Lewis wrote, "I shot my guns and examined the several articles which have been manufactured for me at this place; they appear to be well executed." Lewis's acceptance of the prototype rifles likely contributed to Dearborn's decision. Perkins and Dearborn suggested minor modifications, and the rifle was standardized on December 2, 1803, with an initial order for 4,000.

Skeptical about the Model 1803 as a useful weapon, Stuart E. Brown, Jr., argued that the expedition's 15 rifles may not have been manufactured in Harpers Ferry and that they were likely not Model 1803s. Noting that gun slings were not intended for a half-stocked rifle, he concluded the rifles must have been full-stocked. However, a sling for a half-stocked prototype rifle could have been designed. Given the army's later acceptance, some type of sling was available. Lewis specifically requested gun slings in his original list, and they appeared on the final Harpers Ferry invoice. Since Lewis's list has been given the arbitrary date of June 30, 1803, the exact date is unknown, and Lewis's activities at Harpers Ferry cannot be placed in proper context. Perhaps Lewis ordered the slings after he saw the rifles, and Harpers Ferry artisans retrofitted them. The 15 rifles obtained at Harpers Ferry were undoubtedly prototypes of the Model 1803 rifle adopted by the United States Army in December.
Figure 1. The corps' most powerful shoulder weapon, the prototype of the .52 caliber Model 1803 rifle, gave hunters enough firepower to kill big game with a single shot (excepting the grizzly bear).

Figure 2. The army's standard shoulder arm, the Model 1795, packed a considerable wallop but little accuracy. Beyond 50 yards, hitting a man-sized target with a smoothbore musket was a difficult proposition.

Figure 3. Favored by many corps members, the Kentucky rifle was highly accurate and a fine hunting piece. Its only weakness was its relatively light caliber (around .30), which sometimes limited effectiveness against big game.

Figure 4. Records fail to identify specifics, but Lewis possessed two pairs of pistols on the expedition. One set was likely the Model 1799 of .69 caliber, very powerful at close range but heavy and cumbersome.

Figure 5. Loaned to Lewis by Isaiah Lukens, the air rifle may have been a repeating weapon with a magazine that mechanically dropped balls down the barrel after each shot. Never mentioned as a hunting piece, it served as a tool of Indian diplomacy.

Figure 5a. The air reservoir held a surprising amount of propellant power. Fully pressurized, it could fire 40 shots without repumping.

Figure 6. Each pirogue mounted a swivel blunderbuss, a large defense weapon of about two-inch caliber. Essentially massive shotguns when loaded with musket balls or other shot, the swivels were strong disincentives to potential enemies.
What of the rest of the expedition’s weaponry? Again, records are scarce, but an examination of the permanent party composition reveals that the remaining weapons must have been a combination of Kentucky-style rifles, United States Model 1795 muskets, and fusils.

The first identifiable Corps members are the so-called “nine young men from Kentucky,” the civilians recruited as Lewis moved down the Ohio River. John Colter and George Shannon joined Lewis on the river. Clark recruited William Bratton, Joseph Field, Reubin Field, Charles Floyd, George Gibson, Nathaniel Pryor, and John Shields, and they joined the expedition when the leaders met at Clarksville, Indiana, on October 14, 1803. While the journals contain no references to armament, young frontiersmen eager for adventure would be armed, their weapon of choice being the “Kentucky” rifle (Figure 3).

The second group, the army “volunteers,” came from Fort Massac and Kaskaskia (both in Illinois), and South West Point, Tennessee. George Drouillard, a civilian, and Joseph Whitehouse, whose military unit is unknown, joined from Fort Massac. John Collins, Patrick Gass, John Ordway, Peter Wiser, Alexander Willard, and Richard Windsor arrived from Kaskaskia, members of either the First Infantry Regiment or the artillery, while Hugh Hall, Thomas Howard, and John Potts reported from the Second Infantry Regiment at South West Point. The other soldiers, Robert Frazer, Silas Goodrich, Hugh McNeal, John Thompson, and William Werner, arrived from unknown units. As they were infantry or artillermen, the soldiers likely carried the Model 1795 smoothbore musket rather than contract “long rifles.”

The Model 1795 musket was the army’s standard shoulder weapon, based on the French Model 1763. A .69 caliber, smoothbore gun with a 44.75-inch barrel and an overall length of about 60 inches (size varied because the guns were handmade and no two were identical), it included a 15-inch long triangular bayonet.

The final corps members included Pierre Cruzatte and François Labiche, recruited at St. Charles, and the Charbonneau family and Baptiste Lepage, recruited at Fort Mandan. Their weapons are not identified, but they likely carried muskets or fusils.

Fusils, or “fusées” as Lewis and Clark wrote, were short, light, smoothbore weapons favored by Indians and French officers, frequently used as personal weapons by British, French, and American officers, fusils arrived along the Missouri in large quantities for Hudson’s Bay Company Indian trade. Clark noted that Toussaint Charbonneau possessed an “elegant” one, lost in a flash flood on June 29, 1805.

Exactly what Clark, Clark’s slave York, or Lewis carried is uncertain. Clark mentioned a “small rifle” on several occasions, which indicated a Kentucky-type piece with a smaller caliber. Recording a day’s hunting in August 1804, Clark and John Ordway both noted that Clark failed to kill an elk: “I fired 4 times at one & did not kill him, my ball being Small I think was the reason.”

Two months later Clark recorded using his “Little gun” while buffalo hunting. The “little gun” fired a smaller ball with a lighter charge than the Model 1803, thus being less effective on large game.

Clark may also have carried a fusil, writing in the summer of 1805 that, “I Gave my Fuzee to one of the men & Sold his musket for a horse which Completed us to 29 total horses.” Since he still had his “small rifle” on the Pacific Coast, Clark started with a second shoulder weapon. Given the nature of the trip and Clark’s experience, two personal guns is not an unreasonable assumption.

Since slaves did not own guns, York’s weapon, cited only in the context of an accident in May 1805, was probably one of Clark’s, possibly his “small rifle.” A buffalo overran the expedition’s camp, and in the melee, York’s weapon sustained a bent barrel.

Lewis frequently mentioned a rifle but did not identify the make or model. Carl Russell stated that Lewis “seems to have been partial to the long rifle as a personal arm” but offered no substantiation. Given that both captains led hunting trips or hunted on their own, they probably carried the best rifle available for their needs, which was the prototype Model 1803 with its large caliber and hitting power.
Black powder shoulder arms were not the corps' only weapons. Lewis possessed pistols and his "big medicine," the air rifle. The pistols' make and model are unclear. On May 21, 1803, Israel Whelen, purveyor general, received an invoice from Robert Barnhill for "1 Pair Pocket Pistols, Secret Triggers $10." The bill was paid with Barnhill's notation, "The within Pistols were delivered by me to Capt'n Meriwether Lewis." Pistols with secret triggers were not standard military fare, as they were smaller weapons (both in size and caliber), often hidden in a coat pocket or sash for personal protection.

The May 1803 "Invoice of Articles" from the Harpers Ferry arsenal indicates "1 P. [pair] Horseman's Pistols" issued to Lewis, which were almost certainly Model 1799s (Figure 4). Manufactured by Simeon North of Berlin, Connecticut, they were .69 caliber smoothbore weapons (the same caliber as the standard musket, thus simplifying supply) based on the French army's 1777 pistol. North produced about 2,000 in 1799 and 1800. Designed for saddle holsters, the pistols weighed more than three pounds each and were 14.5 inches long, packing a considerable wallop at close range.

In March 1804 Clark recorded that he loaded "a small pair Pistols" in anticipation of trouble. Gary Moulton believed that Clark may have been concerned over the court martial verdict of John Shields, John Colter, and Robert Frazier on March 29, or over the potential for theft of supplies due that evening. Whatever caused Clark's alarm, this is the only time he documented potential use of pistols. A "small pair" intimates a set like the Barnhill hidden trigger models.

Clark referred to pistols twice again, in a trade with the Shoshone in August 1805 and in a gift exchange with the Nez Perce in April 1806. Traded for a horse, the first gun was identified only as "my Pistol," its origin unclear; the second pistol's ownership was equally unrecorded. If the "small pair" mentioned above was Clark's, the pistols were likely a set. If they were Lewis's, they were the Barnhill pistols.

While not a black powder weapon, any work on Lewis and Clark's armament must include the air gun built by Isaiah Lukens of Philadelphia and loaned to Lewis by its creator (Figure 5). A .31 caliber weapon looking much like a Kentucky rifle, the air gun was a hunting piece, designed to shoot small game (as large as deer) without making a sound. A pneumatic air reservoir in the weapon's butt provided the propellent power. Holding 900 pounds per square inch pressure and requiring upwards of 1,000 strokes to fill, the air supply lasted for up to 40 shots. Lewis's gun featured a screw mount on the pump that allowed the shooter to fasten it to a tree and rock it with a shoulder, easing the loading process (Figure 5a). The balls loaded singly through the brass barrel, much the same as a rifled musket, albeit without the powder charge. Never mentioned as a hunting weapon, the air gun figured prominently as a tool in diplomacy with Native Americans.

Lewis used the air gun to demonstrate American ingenuity and engineering, and firing it became an integral part of council meetings. Astonished at its power and silence, Indians called it "big medicine," and its ability to intimidate Native Americans was noteworthy: "Capt. Lewis fired his Air Gun which astonished them [the Nez Perce] in Such a manner that they were orderly and Kept at a proper distance during the time they Continued with him." Such a weapon was both an effective demonstration of American manufacturing and a valuable component of the corps' diplomatic mission.

The air gun caused the expedition's first accidental injury. On August 30, 1803, while on the Ohio River, Lewis demonstrated its power to a civilian group outside St. Louis. Firing seven shots, he impressed the spectators with its effectiveness. The gun was then passed around, and a gentleman named Blaze Cenas accidentally discharged it. The round struck a woman standing 40 yards away in the head. While the wound looked serious, it proved superficial.

Armament was not limited to personal weapons. The larger vessels had gun mounts; both pirogues had swivel-mounted blunderbusses (Figure 6), and the keelboat held a swivel-mounted cannon (Figure 7, page 26), the queen of the expedition's armament. Essentially shortened, overgrown muskets, the two blunderbusses were not government manufacture. First suggested to Lewis by Clark in an April 1804 letter, they must have been purchased in St. Louis, possibly from a firm already active in the Missouri fur trade. Carl Russell stated that two types were common to the river: one about 25 to 30 inches long with a 22-inch bell-shaped barrel and a two-inch smooth bore; the other a larger, heavier musket style. Firing small shot or several musket balls, they were large shotguns, valuable for close-in defense. Larger than the blunderbusses, the swivel cannon had a similar bore diameter and was in the one-pounder class of armament, meaning it fired an...
irons of one pound as a normal load. It also fired a substantial load of musket balls or buckshot and was another, even larger, close-range shotgun.

Ordway described the value of these boat-mounted weapons in the Teton Sioux confrontation on September 25, 1804: “The large Swivel loaded immediately with 16 Musquet Ball in it. The 2 other Swivels [the blunderbusses] loaded well with Buck Shot. Each of them well manned.” Sixteen musket balls of .54 caliber, plus two loads of buck shot (.30 caliber in today’s standards) represented a massive amount of shot from three guns. Facing three large weapons and the corps’ shoulder arms, the Lakota backed down.

Ammunition was a prime concern throughout the expedition. Lewis ordered rifle powder and lead from Harpers Ferry, obtaining 20 pounds of lead and 125 musket flints, but received only 50 pounds of “finest rifle powder.” The government purchased 52 lead canisters for powder from George Ludlam and 123 pounds of English canister powder, plus 53 pounds of “dbl. Seal” powder in papers from Beck and Harvey of Philadelphia. In December 1803 Lewis secured 75 pounds of “public” powder from army supplies (likely at Kaskaskia). This powder was probably of a coarser grain than rifle powder and was used for the Model 1795 muskets, the fusils, the blunderbusses, and the cannon.

In all, the corps carried at least 301 pounds of powder and 840 pounds of lead, plus the ammunition the men brought when they joined. An additional 50-pound keg of powder was shipped for Indian presents. At 30 rounds to the lead pound for the Model 1803 rifles, the corps had more than 25,000 rounds of ammunition, certainly an adequate supply of powder and ball.

Weapons were of paramount importance in the men’s day-to-day existence, giving them a sense of security, protecting the members when they took observations, recorded findings, and charted the unexplored wilderness. Rifles (and the smoothbore muskets, used as shotguns) helped gather the zoological specimens desired by Jefferson and American scientists. Most importantly, firearms formed the foundation for relationships between the corps, the wilderness, and the Native Americans.

Proper relations required discipline; and Lewis and Clark established military policies and procedures, including weapons and ammunition care. Black powder weapons were especially susceptible to water hazards; wet powder will not combust and can mean death. In April 1805 a barrel fell into the river, dampering almost 30 pounds of gunpowder. “The powder we regard as a serious loss, but we spread it to dry immediately and hope we shall be enabled to restore the greater part of it. This is the only powder we had which was not perfectly secure from getting wet.” Inspecting it three days later, they found it “almost restored” and replaced it in the keg.

Lewis’s “elegant” design of four pounds of powder stored in eight pound lead kegs, stopped by wax-sealed corks, solved the moisture problem. Preparing for the return trip in February 1806, Lewis described the powder as “perfectly dry as when first put in the canestars, altho’ the whole of it from various accidents had been for hours under water.”

Water was also hazardous to 19th-century iron. Early guns had some protection via browning, a process that coated and theoretically sealed the iron, but browning was imperfect and patches of rust appeared. The corps struggled with wet weapons for two years, never finding a satisfactory solution. Their only option was to regularly clean their guns. In September 1803 Lewis ordered a stop to clean and oil guns, knives, and tomahawks—the first of numerous such occurrences to dampen moisture’s insidious attack.

Weapons inspections began in May 1804, as arms were regularly checked, cleaned, oiled, and put in proper working order. The four enlisted men who kept journals recorded a number of arms examinations in May, June, July, and August 1804, but such notations decreased after early August and are intermittent thereafter; either they became less frequent, or they became so routine as to not warrant recording.

Frequent inspections did not mean trouble-free guns, and problems dot the journals. The first mishap occurred on July 29, 1804, when Alexander Willard lost his gun (Ordway states it was his rifle) in “Bower’s R.” when attempting to cross on a log. Men in the white pirogue returned to help him recover it, and Reuben Field finally dove into the creek and brought it up from the deep mud.

Fortunately, such incidents were rare. On June 29, 1805, Clark, Toussaint Charbonneau, Sacagawea, and baby Jean Baptiste, caught in a flash flood during the Great Falls portage, sought shelter in a ravine but were almost washed away. Scrambling to escape, Charbonneau lost his gun (the fusil mentioned earlier), shot pouch, powder horn, tomahawk, and Lewis’ wiping rod. Clark saved his rifle while pushing Sacagawea (who held the baby) up the ravine’s bank with one hand.

While losing guns was uncommon, damaging them was not: Richard Windsor burst his gun near the muzzle during the return trip, and the barrel was cut down; Lewis had the air rifle resighted and repaired; Clark’s “small rifle” was rebored; Hugh McNeal broke the lock of his musket over a grizzly bear’s head; George Drouillard and Nathaniel Pryor damaged rifles, requiring repair and parts replacement from the Harpers Ferry extra locks. Repairing them was usually easy, but required skill: “but for the precaution taken in bringing on those extra locks, and parts of locks, in addition to the ingenuity of John Shields, most of our guns would at this moment [March 20, 1806] be entirely unfit for use; but fortunately for us...they are all in good order.”

Occasionally, gun problems were due to an oversight. In September 1805 Clark had a bad hunting day, firing at a large black-tailed deer seven times, with seven misfires. He noted it was a singular event, as his gun had never misfired that many times before. Closer examination showed a loose flint, not a malfunctioning weapon. Fortunately for Clark, his target was a peaceful and apparently inattentive buck, rather than an aggressive bear.

Even in the hands of experienced frontiersmen, guns were dangerous tools.
Lewis was twice the victim of unfortunate marksmanship, once when Robert Frazier fired at some ducks sitting on a pond. Ricocheting off the water, the shot narrowly missed the captain. Lewis's wounding at the hands of nearsighted Pierre Cruzatte was more serious. His reaction reveals his dependence on his weapons. Fearing he had been wounded by Indians, Lewis returned to his party: "I now got back to the perogue as well as I could and prepared my self with a pistol my rifle and air-gun being determined as a retreat was impracticable to sell my life as dearly as possible." Cruzatte's return eased his mind.

The intriguing aspect of this incident is not the wounding but rather Lewis's actions, entering the pirogue and preparing his rifle, a pistol, and the air gun. The only journal entry for the air gun as anything other than a curiosity for the natives, it showed Lewis's trepidation. Since loading the air gun was neither simple, nor rapid, Lewis must have been very concerned about an Indian attack.

The pistol is another interesting element. Lewis had at least four pistols on the expedition, so why does he note only one in this dire situation? Worried enough to load the air gun, he surely prepared all his black powder weapons. Since he loaded only one pistol, it appears he possessed but one. Given that, Lewis's statement supports the idea that the two pistols Clark had (one traded to the Shoshone, the other given to the Nez Perce) were Lewis's.

What, then, of the other pistol? Lewis was shot after the corps separated to explore the Marias and Yellowstone rivers, and it follows that the armament was also divided, leaving Clark in possession of the other pistol. With Clark's fusil traded and York likely using his "small rifle," he had only his Model 1803 rifle—logically, Lewis would lend him a pistol. Two being lost via trade, Lewis had only one left.

Firing weapons were vital, but they were of small worth if not properly used. Lewis and Clark made sure the men shot with precision, but to conserve ammunition they allowed only one practice shot per day per man. Ordway taught off-hand firing, using a 50-yard target, and the best shot each day earned an extra gill of whiskey.

Common during the 1803-04 winter camp on the Mississippi River, shooting contests included the expedition's members and outsiders. George Gibson won the first recorded contest on January 1, earning one dollar, a not inconsiderable sum for a private who earned thirteen dollars a month. Reubin Field won the January 16 contest, along with a "pr. Leagens." The final contest was May 6, as they prepared to head west, with "Several of the Country people In Camp Shooting with the party all git beet and Lose their money." Practice, contests, and hunting along the way proved beneficial; Lewis commented "that most of the party have become very expert with the rifle" by the beginning of the return trip.

Lewis and Clark insisted that the men be proficient with weapons. During the winter of 1803-04 the captains encouraged limited target practice and competitions in their Mississippi River camp. Most became expert with the rifle.
Shooting practice had a physical element, but also a mechanical one. On April 7, 1806, the captains “made our men exercise themselves in shooting today and regulate their guns found several of them that had their sights moved by accident, and others that wanted some small alterations all which were completely rectified in the course of the day.” Working weapons required attention, and regular inspections and practice insured that corps members had clean guns in good working order.

Guns were a crucial tool in Indian relations. Jefferson instructed Lewis to treat the Indians with “friendly and conciliatory manner” but to concentrate on commercial aspects of their relationship with the United States. Black powder weapons proved a prime commercial source because every tribe sought guns, powder, and lead as prized trade items. While Lewis and Clark forbade trading guns (a stricture broken to obtain horses), they encouraged the Indians’ desire for weapons and played upon it. Promises of future trade, including guns, were major inducements for cooperation and peaceful relations, and gifts of small amounts of powder and shot demonstrated American friendship. Ammunition (and the promise of more, along with guns) was a prominent part of Lewis and Clark’s diplomacy.

American rifles showed the Indians what might come in trade. The few guns owned by Native Americans were typically cheap British smoothbores, inaccurate beyond 50 yards. Shooting exhibitions using the Model 1803 or the Kentucky-type rifle displayed a technology that both excited and frightened Indian observers. The rifle’s distance and accuracy made smoothbores less desirable and profoundly impacted tribal relations. When the Mandans, Hidatsa, Shoshones, and Nez Perce could get rifles, they had less to fear from the smoothbore-equipped Tetons and Blackfeet. A firepower revolution was at hand, and American allies stood to be the first to benefit.

By manipulating Native Americans’ desire for firearms and ammunition, the captains laid the groundwork for a commercial enterprise to compete with both the Upper Missouri trade of the Hudson’s Bay Company and the Columbia River trade of British and American seamen. Historian James Ronda noted that the new system included “well-established posts and dependable delivery schedules. And always in the background, visible but rarely mentioned, were guns and ammunition…. They were not reluctant to promise firearms to potential customers and allies,” providing a foundation for later traders and fur trappers who used guns, powder, and shot as prized currency on the high plains and in the Rockies.

Figure 7. The expedition carried a swivel-mounted cannon on the keelboat, the largest piece of ordnance on the Missouri River. Smoothbore, it could fire either a large solid shot or a group of musket balls.
The corps’ power of arms was both a diplomatic necessity and a deterrent to aggressive behavior, but it precluded meeting some tribes. Native Americans repeatedly fled from party members when first spotted, and the corps quickly learned to set aside their arms when initially meeting indigenous peoples. Contact with the Shoshones, Nez Perce, and Flatheads occurred only after party members laid down their weapons, demonstrating their peaceful intentions.

Weapons gave the Corps of Discovery, a small force in a potentially hostile environment, a technological edge over possible human opponents as well as nonhuman occupants. Food was an ongoing concern. Red meat was the staple, and the corps consumed massive amounts. Each member devoured up to nine pounds per day, supplemented by fruits and vegetables found along the way. Such quantities required daily hunting trips, usually led by one of the captains. And the hunting was good, at least across the Great Plains and into the foothills of the Rockies.

The mammalian population fed the corps. May 1805 exemplifies their hunting (and eating) habits: they killed at least 23 buffalo, 20 elk, 7 bear, 35 beaver, 37 deer, 2 antelope, 2 wolves, 8 bighorn sheep, and 1 goat. The total of 136 animals killed averaged over four per day. Some of these kills may have been for specimens—the journals are not always clear on what was eaten and what was preserved.

Some modern environmentalists have criticized the corps for excessive hunting, but evaluating 1805 activities by 21st-century standards is unfair. Game was so plentiful and the company was so attuned to living off the land, that any comparison is fallacious. The early 19th-century high plains offered a cornucopia of edible delights that no man could resist, and the numbers of animals were staggering: Ordway noted “great numbers of buffalo in every direction. I think 10000 may be Seen at one view.” Thirty men, even armed with the best rifles, could not injure such a herd. The game appeared inexhaustible, and may very well have been so, considering the technology of the times. Buffalo were not hunted to near extinction until the 1870s and 1880s, when breech-loading rifles, more quickly fired and farther ranging than the black powder weapons available to Lewis and Clark, allowed systematic slaughter.

By the standards of the day, corps members were not wasteful hunters. Nonetheless, they undoubtedly killed more than they could possibly eat. Sometimes they killed buffalo only for tongues and lump ribs, considered the best parts. Unconcerned about hunting on the plains, Lewis commenting, “it is now [summer 1805] only amusement for Capt. C. and myself to kill as much meat as the party can consume; I hope it may continue thus through our whole rout, but this I do not much expect.”

By late 1805, Lewis’s fear was confirmed. Crossing the Bitterroot Mountains, the corps encountered a period of hunger that continued throughout the rest of their trek to the Pacific Ocean and their stay at Fort Clatsop. In October 1805 the men killed only 12 deer, 6 squirrels, a coyote, and a sea otter for food. Infrequently mentioned as food in May, birds became a common journal entry. Hunting was unproductive, food scarce, and the company would have starved if not for dogs (82 purchased for food during the month) and the occasional horse.

Lewis commented as they began the return trip in spring 1806, “Our dependence for subsistence is on our guns, the fish we may perhaps take, the roots we can purchase from the natives and as a last alternative our horses...yet nobody seems much concerned about the state of provision.” Lewis knew the land of plenty and himself awaited them, and after crossing the Rockies and returning to the Great Plains, “game is so abundant and gentle that we kill it when we please.” Only one animal belied Lewis’s optimism: the grizzly bear.

The Corps of Discovery was the first group of white Americans to meet Ursus arctos horribilis. The journals record over 90 incidents involving grizzlies between April and September 1805 on the outward journey and May to August 1806 on the return trip. Aside from some bumps and bruises (to say nothing of fractured egos), the Corps of Discovery emerged intact. The same cannot be said for the bears. Although the exact number is impossible to determine, the corps killed at least 55 grizzlies, while another 22 were wounded and escaped. A few bears were shot for specimens, others for defense, and some for sport, but most were killed for food. Bear meat is especially fatty, containing vitamins not available in lean meat, and bear fat was a vital nutritional supplement.

Killing a grizzly bear was not an easy undertaking. Without the Model 1803 rifle, it would have been almost impossible. The military smoothbore possessed sufficient power to kill but was so inaccurate as to be virtually useless against game. The Kentucky type rifle was more accurate but lacked the musket’s hitting power. Designed for smaller game, the bullet was too light to damage a 500-pound bear unless the hunter was a superlative shot. Even a head shot might not penetrate the bear’s skull. The military rifle possessed the requisite power and accuracy to bring down a grizzly, although it often took several shots.

When food was sufficient, security became the prime concern. Shoulder arms provided the safety margin for the corps to meet its mission. Its arms gave it a firepower edge that intimidated even the strongest Native American bands. The promise of guns with superior technology made the corps many friends.

Thomas Jefferson gave Meriwether Lewis a specific goal: to explore the Missouri River and find a route across the North American continent to the Pacific Ocean, opening the West to American commerce. Lewis, his friend William Clark, and a small group of soldiers and frontiersmen achieved that goal in a spectacular manner. But they could not have done so without black powder arms. Fortunately for them, the right tools were available.
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Acquiring financial security had been a priority for the Clarks ever since the debts of brother George Rogers Clark almost sank the entire family.

"I assure you that the married State makes me look about my Self and excites a disposition to accumulate a little for a future day," William told his brother Jonathan. As early as 1794 he had described to his brother Edmund his dream of building a mercantile business on the Mississippi River. Now, in St. Louis as the government official in charge of the Indian trade, Clark saw his opportunity.

This portrait of William Clark was painted by Joseph Bush, c. 1817, eight years after the death of Meriwether Lewis.
He envisioned a far-flung trading enterprise that would buy merchandise cheaply in Baltimore or Washington and ship it down the Ohio on flatboats. The goods would be stocked in Louisville, from where they could be sent on to the main retail store in St. Louis. Government barges could be used, upon availability. Clark pointed out that the plan required two stores, so he could restock faster than his competitors—otherwise, he noted, "My principal plan will be [kn]ocked in the head."

Clark hoped to go into business with his brother Edmund and his nephew John Hite Clark, Jonathan's eldest son, who were operating a store in Louisville. "It is now the time to Speek candidly to each other," he wrote to John, "let us Say what we Can do, what we wish to be done & what we will do, for my part I have Said what I Could do, will to be Connected with you[r] uncle Edmond & yourself equally in a S[t]ore at Louisville and this place." Promoted to a position of influence and newly married, Clark felt the joint pressures of need and opportunity. "I must be doing Something, and I know of nothing which appears So certain as mercantile business, and no time is to be lost."

While waiting to start his trade business Clark was struggling to manage his investment in human property. His relationship with York was becoming fractious. His lifelong companion was chafing over being separated from his wife. In the fall Clark gave York permission to accompany the beautiful and accomplished (but still unwed) Ann Anderson on her return to Louisville. York remained a few weeks afterwards to visit his wife, but Clark refused to let him stay longer and hire himself out. "He is Serviceable to me at this place, and I am determined not to Sell him, to gratify him," he told Jonathan. "If any attempt is made by York to run off...I wish him Sent to New Orleans and Sold, or hired out to Some Severe master...."

A month later, Clark had grown so exasperated with York that it took Lewis's intervention to prevent him from selling York down the river. "Govr. Lewis has insisted on my only hireing him out in Kentucky which perhaps will be best.... I do not wish him again in this Country until he applies himself to Come and give over that wife of his."

Clark remained "vexed and perplexed" by the unwillingness of both Indians and enslaved blacks to conform to his way of life. He complained that his slaves "wish to go on [in] the old way. Steal a little take a little, lie a little, Sco[w] a little pour a little, deceive a little, quarrel a little and attempt to Smile, but it will not all answer." He wondered to Jonathan about selling "all the Old Stock except Ben." Irritated by the "capers" of one of his father's former slaves, Easter, Clark gave her what he termed "a verry genteel whipping"—and then worried that he would have to pay her midwife's fee when she gave birth to a baby four days later. He gave up completely on Scippio and Juba, placing this advertisement in the Missouri Gazette on February 22, 1809: "I wish to SELL two likely NEGRO MEN, for Cash. WILLIAM CLARK."

The Mississippi froze over completely in the winter of 1808-09. Children skated and sleighed, and townspeople drove wagons and horses across the ice to the Illinois bank. A full two months went by without any mail or newspapers from the East; William laid in cords of firewood and killed "19 fat Hogs" for his provisions. He and Julia had moved out of the quarters Lewis had rented for them—which was converted into Webster's Eagle Tavern—and purchased a one-acre lot near the center of town with an apple grove and a stone wall facing the river. "It answers my purpose," said Clark, "as Commerce is my Object."

Nine months pregnant and homesick, his wife Julia "takes a little cry and amuses herself again with her domestic concerns," William reported. Then, on January 10, 1809, she gave birth to their first child, a boy. The delighted father pronounced him to be "a stout portly fellow"—but after 11 days still had not decided on his name. The new
Manuel Lisa was a St. Louis entrepreneur and business partner of William Clark in the St. Louis Missouri Fur Company.

parents may have been given pause by the long Clark tradition of naming firstborn sons either “John” or “Jonathan.” When the baby was christened by Catholic Bishop Benedict Flaget he was given neither of those names. The boy would instead be Meriwether Lewis Clark, in honor of his godfather, formally fusing the two names that had already become inseparable. He would be called simply “Lewis.”

In the early months of 1809 Clark turned again to his most pressing public obligation, to send the Mandan chief Shehek-shote back to his tribe. Sheheke’s safe return was both a national obligation and a practical necessity to prevent the Upper Missouri tribes from aligning with the British. Moreover, Clark and Lewis saw a way to organize the trip that would combine government policy with their own increasing interest in the private fur trade.

St. Louis businessman Manuel Lisa had returned from his 1807-08 expedition with a rich supply of peltries and promises of far greater profits to be reaped in the fur trade near the Rocky Mountains. In March, Lisa joined with Clark and a consortium of leading citizens to form a commercial fur-trading venture called the St. Louis Missouri Fur Company. The other partners included Pierre Chouteau and his son Auguste Pierre, the Kaskaskia merchants Pierre Menard and William Morrison, Andrew Henry, Sylvestre Labbadie, Wilkinson’s nephew Benjamin Wilkinson, and Lewis’s brother Reuben, whom Clark had appointed a subagent to Indians on the Missouri River. Clark’s dual role as both Indian agent and Indian trader was not unusual—the British operated similarly—but it began to generate criticism from other entrepreneurs.

Governor Lewis then contracted the federal government to pay $7,000 to the St. Louis Missouri Fur Company to guarantee the successful return of Sheheke to his home. With most of the company’s start-up costs covered, Lisa planned a two-pronged expedition. An armed force of 125 men, including 40 militia, would escort the chief. A parallel commercial group of 150 fur traders and engage’s would build trading posts and forts on the Upper Missouri. Clark would act as the company’s St. Louis agent. He made plans to build a commercial warehouse on his property and use it to supply both government factories and private traders. He would also receive the furs shipped down the river in packs, airing and beating them to remove moths and worms, and sending them on to New Orleans and markets in the East. “I have not the Smallest doubt of Suckcess,” said Clark, who bought one share in the new company and tried to sell others to his brothers.

The construction of Fort Osage had cleared the Missouri River for American traders, but Indian resistance remained intense on the Upper Mississippi. British merchants from the Michilimackinac Company still controlled trade with the tribes and used their influence against the Americans. The United States agent at Prairie du Chien, John Campbell, who had rented his St. Louis house to William and Julia, was killed in a duel with the British trader Redford Crawford. The Missouri Gazette reported afterwards that Crawford had “grossly insulted” Campbell as a means of instigating the duel in order to kill him.

In the spring rumors swept down the river that the Shawnee brothers Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa were renewing their efforts to organize the northern tribes in opposition to the Americans. A worried Clark wrote to Secretary of War Henry Dearborn, “The Indian prophets have been industriously employed...attempting to seduce the Kickapoos, Saukeys, and other bands of Indians residing on the Mississippi and Illinois river, to war against the frontiers of this country.” Clark began preparing for the worst. The new Fort Bellevue (later Fort Madison), built on the Mississippi near today’s Iowa-Missouri border, proved to be so poorly defended that Clark guessed the Indians “could with great ease jump over” its pickets. In April the government trader stationed there wrote nervously that the entire nation of Sauks was camped directly across the river from him. Clark and Indiana governor William Henry Harrison both braced for a Sauk attack they predicted would soon result from “the British interference with our Indian affairs in this country.” Apparently, they could not imagine that the Indian nations would want to organize a resistance on their own, without help and instigation from Europeans.

Clark and Lewis responded to growing public alarm by calling up the local militias. The decision was not welcomed by local citizens who wanted the regular army to come to their defense. Even before then, Lewis had made himself unpopular among the newly arrived Americans by attempting to evict those whites who had settled illegally on Indian lands. Further, some inhabitants began to question the propriety of the two highest-ranking officials in the territory assigning public funds to a company they owned. Rudolphe Tillier, the former factor at Fort Bellefontaine, asked Madison, “Is it proper for the public service that the U.S. officers as a Governor or a Super
Intendent of Indian Affairs & U.S. Factor should take any share in Mercantile and private concerns[?].”

Lewis's biggest problem was his relationship with his second-in-command, Territorial Secretary Frederick Bates. Appointed by Jefferson, Bates had served competently as acting governor for a year while awaiting Lewis's arrival in St. Louis. He drafted a set of laws for Louisiana Territory, which became the first American book published west of the Mississippi, and busily set about sorting through the thicket of overlapping Spanish land claims.

But the men were almost too much alike. They were both stiff, slightly humorless, punctilious bachelor Virginians. Both were nonplussed by the lively French Creole society of St. Louis. “Our Balls are gay, spirited and social,” Bates wrote to his brother, “The French Ladies dance with inimitable grace but rather too much in the style of actresses... to me they would be more interesting with a greater show of modesty and correctness of manners.”

Their relations soured on their first working day together—Lewis ordered Bates to hand him a full report in writing on Indian affairs—and soon grew worse. Bates wanted to promote hunting, trading, and settling by whites in Indian country; Lewis wanted to restrict hunting, trading, and settling until the Indians were brought to heel.

“We differ in everything; but we will be honest and frank in our intercourse,” Bates wrote his brother Richard. “I lament the unpopularity of the Governor; but he has brought it on himself by harsh and mistaken measures. He is inflexible in error...”

Soon the two men were no longer speaking, except on matters of public business. A particularly embarrassing scene resulted when they encountered one another at a ball in St. Louis. Bates described it to his brother:

[Lewis] drew his chair close to mine.... There was a pause in the conversa-

tion—I availed myself of it—arose and walked to the other side of the room. The dances were now commencing. He also rose—evidently in passion—retired into an adjoining room and sent a servant for General Clark, who refused to ask me out as he foresaw that a Battle must have been the consequence....

Despite all his formidable gifts of compromise, Clark was unable to broker an accommodation between the two men. Lewis began steering more and more official business away from Bates to Clark, while Bates continued to criticize Lewis's policies and appointments. “His habits are altogether military,” said Bates, “he never can I think succeed in any other profession.”

Lewis was beginning to show signs of strain. In the late spring, as Chouteau and Lisa prepared to return Sheheke to his native people, Lewis gave them a letter of instruction that was startlingly vindictive. All the tribes should be treated in a friendly manner, Lewis said, except for the Arikaras. They should be “severely Punished,” even if it were necessary “to exterpate that abandoned Nation.” Lewis told Chouteau to force the Arikaras to turn over the warriors who had killed the men of Pryor’s party. If the tribe did not produce those particular individuals, it should be made to deliver an “equivalent number.” Then, Lewis said, those hostages should be “shot in the presence of the nation.”

The parties under Chouteau and Lisa left in separate groups in May and June. Though depleted by numerous desertions, they joined at Fort Osage to make a combined force of 150 soldiers, traders, Indians, Creole boatmen, and free blacks. One keelboat of Americans was commanded by Reuben Lewis, Meriwether's brother. It was the largest expedition to ascend the Missouri to that date.

Lewis's relationships with his superiors in Washington City were deteriorating. Jefferson had already written Lewis several mildly chastising letters about his delay in preparing his journals for publication. But Jefferson was now out of office and Frederick Bates now had the ear of the new administration of President James Madison.

In August 1809 Lewis received a letter from Madison's new secretary of war, William Eustis, that devastated him. Eustis began by complaining that the government had not been consulted in advance about Chouteau's mission. Specifically, he objected that the contract with the St. Louis Missouri Fur Company combined “commercial as well as military objects,” that “the object & destination of this Force is unknown,” and that it was commanded by an official who had been originally appointed to a different position (Pierre Chouteau was agent to the Osage Indians).

Then came the crushing blow. Eustis stated that the government would not honor additional payments Lewis had made to Chouteau and the others for expenses beyond the $7,000 already contracted. News of the rejection of Lewis's bills had the immediate effect of precipitating a run by the governor's creditors on all of his debts, which were considerable because he...
had borrowed heavily to buy land in the region. Unable to raise the cash to pay his creditors, Lewis was pushed into near insolvency.

On August 18, 1809—his 35th birthday—the deeply distressed Lewis replied to Eustis that he would travel to Washington to clear his name. "Be assured Sir, that my Country can never make 'A Burr' out of me," he said, reflecting his and the nation's continued preoccupation with the western conspiracy. "She may reduce me to Poverty; but she can never sever my Attachment from her."

Before he departed, Lewis gave Clark and two other friends the power of attorney to settle his loans by selling off his property holdings. In effect, Lewis was resorting to the measures Jefferson hoped would be forced on the Indians: he was lopping off his land in order to pay off his debts to the government. By this time rumors had reached St. Louis that Lewis would not be reappointed as governor, and many people thought he would not be back. "He is a good man, but a very improvident one," said his friend William Carr. "I apprehend he will not return."

It had been a difficult time for many of the men of the Corps of Discovery. Even Clark was chastised by Eustis, who vacated a half-dozen appointments in the Indian office, including one given to the expedition's blacksmith, Alexander Willard. The reliable George Drouillard had been jailed after Lisa's expedition and charged with murder for shooting a deserter who had later died. (Drouillard was found not guilty after jury deliberation of 15 minutes.) Some of the men of the expedition immediately cashed in the land grants they received as rewards from the government. Lawyer William C. Carr purchased one grant of 320 acres "lately issued by the Secretary of War to the followers of Lewis & Clark." He paid for the land not with cash, however. The price was one slave.

After Eustis told Clark that "it does not appear to be necessary that the expense attending our Relations with the Indians in the Territory of Louisiana should be four times as much as the whole expense of supporting its civil government," Clark decided he too needed to pay a visit to Washington. He would travel a different route than Lewis in order to take his wife and infant son to visit her family in Virginia.

Clark would be haunted by his final meetings with Lewis. He told Jonathan that on August 25 his friend had expressed his distress "in Such terms as to Cause a Cempothy which is not yet off." Yet, Clark assured his brother, "I do not beleive there was ever an honester man in Louisiana nor one who had pureor motives than Govr. Lewis." Ever hopeful, he predicted. "I think all will be right and he will return with flying Colours to this Country."

Lewis left St. Louis on September 4, four days after the recalcitrant Osage band on the Arkansas River finally signed the 1808 treaty. Clark observed with satisfaction that it would "extinguish the Indian title to more than 200 miles square of the finest country in Louisiana."

Meanwhile, Clark was making arrangements for his own trip. He finished relocating his family to his new house and dispatched a government boat to New Orleans loaded with packs of shaved deerskins and hatters' furs from the factories at Fort Osage and Fort Madison.

A warm letter arrived from Jefferson, who wrote from Monticello to thank Clark for his donation of mastodon bones which "have given to my collection of Indian curiosities an importance much beyond what I had ever counted on." Jefferson added a note of congratulations to Clark on his growing family:

"While some may think it will render you less active in the service of the world, those who take a sincere interest in your personal happiness, and who know that by a law of our nature we cannot be happy without the endearing connections of a family, will rejoice for your sake as I do. The world has, of right no further claims on yourself & Govr. Lewis, but such as you may voluntarily render according to your convenience or as they may make it your interest."
The contrast with Madison and Eustis's attitude could not have been sharper.

On September 21 a festive crowd had gathered in St. Louis to witness the public hanging of a convicted murderer. A week later, Clark began his overland trip east, riding alongside a carriage with Julia and their eight-month-old son. They were accompanied by a slave couple, Scott and Chloe, and their daughter Rachel. Although York had returned to St. Louis, he no longer traveled with his owner. In May, Clark reported that York was "insolent and sulky. I gave him a Severe trouncing the other day." Later, he sent York to the "Caleboos" for an unnamed offense. After again threatening to sell or hire out York, Clark complained, "I cant Sell negrows here for money."

Public accommodations on territorial roads were rough and egalitarian. Most homeowners on the principal routes boarded travelers to supplement their income. A high official might share a room with the innkeeper and his wife. Outside of Kaskaskia, the scene of George Rogers Clark's first triumph in 1778, William and Julia found no food at all at one boarding-house. So the man who had once hunted grizzlies killed two chickens.

"Mrs. Clark & Cloe Cooked a good Brackfast, and we proceeded on," Clark wrote in his pocket journal. They sometimes stayed with friends. Clark was popular in Illinois territory, and in April the citizens of St. Clair County, Illinois, had petitioned the president to name him their governor.

They crossed the Ohio at Shawnee town and visited Jonathan Clark's daughter Nelly and her husband Benjamin Temple in Russellville, in today's Logan County, Kentucky. During the visit, Julia took down Nelly's recipe for "green Sweet Meats:"

"Let your [cu]cumbers or muskmelons (or such fruit as you wish) lay in salt water until they turn yallow. Then boil them in spring water until they Cook plump. If they will not green as deep as you want them throw a small bit of alum in while boiling. Have your cirrup ready to lay them in before they get cold or else they will all draw up. The ginger must be soaked well before it is put in."

After encountering "many families all going to Louisiana," the party arrived at Jonathan's house at the Falls of the Ohio at sunset on October 12. It was a bittersweet reunion. The previous March George Rogers had stumbled and fallen senseless near a burning fireplace at his cabin at Point of Rocks. No one really knew whether he had been blind drunk or had suffered a stroke. But his badly burned right leg had become gangrenous. On March 25 George Rogers had been carried to Dr. Richard Ferguson in Louisville, who amputated his leg above the knee. Believing that martial music might distract him during the operation, members of his regiment gathered outside and played Yankee Doodle while the old soldier purportedly "kept time by humming the tune."

William and Julia spent two weeks visiting Jonathan and his family at Trough Spring and the Croghans at Locust Grove (where George Rogers had moved). They may have also visited John J. Audubon, then living in Louisville with his family. By October 26, though, the couple had repaired their often-broken carriage and continued their journey. They were traveling on a road familiar to Clark from the days of his militia campaigns. They went first to Colonel Richard Anderson's house, Soldier's Retreat, in Middletown, and then headed for Frankfort.

During a stopover at Shelbyville, William picked up a copy of a Frankfort newspaper, the Argus of Western America. His breath stopped. Meriwether Lewis was dead. The newspaper said he had cut his throat with a knife. Clark somehow pressed on to John Shannon's tavern, near Peytona in today's Shelby County. There, in a pub room crowded with drunks, he wrote an anguished letter to Jonathan: "I fear O! I fear the weight of his mind has over come him, what will become of my his
paprs?" Clark was at the beginning of his life without Meriwether Lewis.

After leaving St. Louis in early September 1809, Meriwether Lewis had made his way slowly down the Mississippi to the fourth Chickasaw Bluff and Fort Pickering, the post he had once commanded. He was in terrible condition, drinking heavily and taking pills laced with laudanum, an opiate. He had scrawled a will into his notebook, leaving his land holdings (his only assets) to his mother Lucy Marks.

When his boat arrived at the fort on September 15 the crewmen informed the commanding officer, Captain Gilbert Russell, that Lewis had tried twice to kill himself. Russell ordered Lewis detained until his health improved.

The next day Lewis wrote a semi-coherent letter to President James Madison, explaining his intention to travel overland to Washington on the Natchez Trace, by way of Nashville, rather than risk being stopped by British warships on a sea voyage from New Orleans. His once-precise handwriting was large and loopy, riddled with strikeouts and misspellings. James Neelly, the agent to the Chickasaw nation, found Lewis again "appeared at times deranged in mind." He was talking deliriously about his protested drafts and, as Clark learned later, had gotten the idea that "he herd me Comeing on, and said he was certain [I would] over take him, that I had herd of his Situation and would Come to his releaf."

What Lewis could not have known was that, during the week he was at Fort Pickering, Pierre Chouteau had finally delivered Sheheke safely to his people at the Mandan Villages on the Upper Missouri. Ironically, the mission that had precipitated Lewis's difficulties had been at last completed.

On the evening of October 10 Lewis arrived at Grinder's "Stand" (the local term for an inn), about 70 miles short of Nashville. Sometime after midnight he fired two bullets with his pistols. One grazed his skull and the other penetrated his chest. "I have done the business," he told Mrs. Grinder. He died shortly after dawn on the 11th.

It was suicide. That was the unequivocal testimony from the scene by Neelly, Pernier, and Mrs. Grinder. Clark immediately came to the same conclusion—"I fear the weight of his mind has over come him"—as did Jefferson. Historians and writers have since sought to assign Lewis's actions to the depressive effects of diseases ranging from alcoholism or malaria to syphilis acquired from the Lemhi Shoshone. Others attribute Lewis's suicide to lifelong bipolar illness.

What is remarkable, regardless, is how much Lewis accomplished in the face of his problems. For the final six years of his life, Lewis found in William Clark the necessary mediator between his brilliant but remote personality and a world he could measure but not grasp. Clark had already performed a similar service for another dysfunctional national hero, his older brother George Rogers.

Lewis's isolation became more pronounced during the expedition's return, with the result that Clark assumed more and more of the daily leadership. Perhaps when Lewis first arranged for them to all reside under the same roof in St. Louis he had hoped things might continue as they had before. But when Clark committed himself to a new partner, his wife Julia Hancock, Lewis had been left to his own devices, without his stabilizing center.

This letter was penned by William Clark to his brother Jonathan soon after he "herd of the certainty of the death of Govr. Lewis."

Landon Y. Jones was managing editor of People Magazine for eight years and wrote for and edited People and other Time/Life publications for 37 years. He is a board member of the National Lewis & Clark Bicentennial Council and author of The Essential Lewis & Clark.
"ALL FOR AL" was the slogan heard as western Washington Democratic Party leaders boarded the train for the state Democratic convention in Spokane held April 13-15, 1928. Party members were united behind Al Smith even before the convention began. In the above photo, C. C. Dill, United States senator from Washington, leans against the railing on the right side of the platform, hat in hand. He was one of the few delegates opposing Smith's nomination. Dill went on to the national Democratic convention in Houston despite his opposition to Smith. The national election in November was a political disaster for the Democrats—Herbert Hoover tallied 58.2 percent of the popular vote. In Washington the total was 335,000 votes for Hoover and 135,000 votes for Smith, giving Hoover an overwhelming 68 percent margin of victory in the state.
The rugged glacier-filled mountains surrounding Alaska’s Disenchantment Bay did not go unnoticed by those seeking a more advantageous route to the interior of Alaska and the Yukon. In September 1897 a party of eight men was photographed in Sitka prior to their departure on the steamship *Dora* for Yakutat. They were among a group of 25 whose goal was to enter the goldfields by way of a “new and easy” route. Sitka merchant W. R. Mills supplied the men with a letter of introduction to Richard Beasley, manager of Mills’s store in Yakutat, instructing him to furnish the party with guides as far as the summit. Whether these men were successful in reaching their destination remains unknown.

Two months after the departure of the aforementioned Van Horne party, a Professor E. K. Hill arrived in the Alaskan capital from the Tlingit village of Yakutat. Hill, originally from Seattle, had reportedly spent the previous two seasons at Yakutat and provided the *Alaskan*, Sitka’s weekly newspaper, with the following report:

### Alaska’s Nunatak Glacier Route to the Klondike

**BY WILLIAM ALLEY**
An entirely new and easy route has already been surveyed from the extreme northeastern point of Disenchantment Bay nearly straight to Allesk [sic] river over about 40 miles of glacier which when covered with snow furnishes an easy and safe route for transporting supplies on sledges... Whether or not the route up the Allesk and across to the White river is passable has never been determined but no doubt will be discovered the coming summer.

Because any prospectors taking the regular steamers to Yakutat would first stop at Sitka (where they would undoubtedly leave a portion of their money behind in the purchase of food, supplies, or hotel accommodations), the Alaskan was quick to point out the tremendous advantages of this "easy and safe" route. In an article titled, "A Chance for Sitka," the Alaskan emphasized the disadvantages of other routes to the interior and described the Yakutat route as being considerably shorter. The Alaskan informed its readers:

Regarding the new inlet as will be seen by our table of distances given below, the journey is only 425 miles to the mines, and that, too, over rolling grassland! No mountains to ascend, no passes to plod through, probably no deep mud fields to wade across, and, most certainly, no great extremes of cold to endure.

The fact that there had as yet been no firsthand accounts of the nature of the terrain beyond the coast range did little to diminish the enthusiasm of the Alaskan's writers.

The northeastern point of Disenchantment Bay described by Professor Hill was most likely what is known today as Nunatak Fjord, a steep water-filled canyon connected to Russell Fjord, which ends at the tidal face of the Nunatak Glacier. This glacier has receded approximately six miles since the days of the gold seekers and is now divided into two glaciers, East Nunatak and West Nunatak. In 1897-98, however, these two branches of the glacier were joined. A small land tongue on the south side of the nunatak provided access to the glacier.

Native traditions held that the Nunatak Glacier had long been used by Tlingits venturing into the interior to hunt and trade with other tribes. The glacier itself was named in 1891 by Israel C. Russell, professor of geology at the University of Michigan, during his second visit to the region. From his vantage point at Cape Enchantment, opposite the opening to Nunatak Fjord, it appeared to Russell that the ice completely surrounded the adjacent hill.

The Nunatak Glacier provided access to what Professor Ralph S. Tarr of Cornell University would later describe as a "through glacier," a mountain valley filled with glacial ice crossing the divide of a mountain range. The glacier's western tributary (now known as West Nunatak Glacier) served as just such a highway of ice across the coast range, providing access into the interior near the Alsek River.
This glacial route to the Alsek River was clearly preferable to ascending that river from its mouth at Dry Bay. Explorer E. J. Glave, accompanied by Jack Dalton, had descended the river in 1890. He described the Alsek as a "wild and dangerous river." Where the river penetrates the coast range it is almost cut off by the imposing bulk of the Alsek Glacier and the ice it discharges, posing a substantial barrier to anyone attempting to pass that way. Moving up against the current of such a river, as the members of the Boundary Commission field teams would later learn, was an exceedingly difficult proposition.

In February 1898 a large party of about a hundred men and one woman decided that they would seek their fortunes by way of this "safe and easy" Nunatak Glacier route. These Argonauts came from all around the country and had, like so many others, converged upon Seattle to prepare for the voyage north.

One contingent was made up of a group of New Yorkers who had incorporated themselves as the New York and Bridgeport Mining Company. This party was established when Arthur Dietz advertised in a New York newspaper for partners in an Alaskan mining venture. In all, 18 men eventually joined together and departed by train for Seattle, where they planned to purchase their outfits. While en route to Seattle, Dietz and his party met up with two other parties of men who had boarded their train in St. Paul, Minnesota. One group went by the name of the Gopher State Mining Company of Minnesota; the other called itself the St. Paul and Minnesota Mining Company. These groups had retained George Rennicks as their guide. Over the course of their trip west they all became good friends and later embarked together for Yakutat.

Once in Seattle these men joined the thousands engaged in the business of provisioning themselves for the journey north. Seattle at the height of the gold rush was a bustling community where, it seemed, anything needed for the journey north was for sale. Sixteen years later Dietz cynically described the city as

... a maelstrom of raving humanity driven half insane by the desire for gold... Money was plentiful and fabulous prices were asked for everything. Every scheme, legal and illegal, mostly illegal, ever devised by mortal to separate a man from his money was run 'wide open'... I think sometimes that almost as much money was left in Seattle by the gold seekers as was ever recovered those two years. The real gold mine was in Seattle.

Despite the dangers posed by frauds, pickpockets, and other nefarious sorts, the group determined to try the Nunatak Glacier route soon purchased the requisite supplies for the trip. The next step was to secure passage on a vessel going north. Unfortunately, all of the regular boats were already booked well in advance. In discussions with a United States Customs inspector, however, it was learned that there was an old brig moored to a dock in Tacoma that was, for a price, available for charter. This ship was the Blakely, owned by the Oceanic Fish Company of Seattle.
The Blakely had seen service as a fishing vessel in the Bering Sea prior to being condemned by the government in 1896. She was a 140-foot-long brigantine with a 20-foot beam. Dietz and party were told she could be made seaworthy and manned for a mere $5,000.

As the Blakely appeared to be the only means available for reaching their destination without undue delay, Dietz and his associates, including the parties from Minnesota, decided to seek additional passengers to help defray the cost of putting the Blakely back in service. In addition to a sizeable party from Dennison, Texas, there were also a number of individuals who signed on. One such was William Alexander Thompson. Born in Montreal, Thompson had spent his youth in New Jersey before moving to Chicago. He had recently arrived in Seattle from Clinton, British Columbia, where he had been employed as a ranch hand.

Dietz and the Minnesotans also recruited a group hailing from Connecticut. These men, led by a Captain Wilkenson, had incorporated as the Worcester and Northwestern Mining and Trading Company and had hired as their guide a Professor Hill of Seattle. It is quite possible that this is the same E. K. Hill who had spent two seasons at Yakutat. It was later reported, however, that the Worcester group would be unable to sail on the Blakely after all; apparently, their outfits had been seized by the sheriff pending the settlement of a suit filed by the steamship company they had originally signed on with.

Carpenters were quickly hired to begin work on the Blakely and a tug was engaged to tow her to a berth at Seattle's waterfront. In a mere eight days the previously "condemned" vessel was declared ready by her master, Captain McAfee. In addition to the required repairs to the ship, additional berths and a deck house amidships, as well as additional bunks in the forecastle, were hastily added. Each set of bunks was built three high, with room for two men in each. Thompson, not wishing to spend the duration of the voyage in a hold that undoubtedly still reeked, at best, of old fish, sought out the purser to ensure that he received

This topographical map shows Yakutat Bay (in the upper left corner), which leads into Disenchantment Bay and then Russell and Nunatak fjords. South of there (in the center of the map), the course of the Alsek River can be traced.
one of the new berths on deck. "Her hold is pretty rank," he wrote his sister prior to his departure, "and while I can stand considerable, I am looking out for No. 1, just the same, when it comes to comfort."

The passengers on the Blakely were extremely confident about the route they were planning to follow into the interior, believing, apparently, all the rumors and speculation they had heard about it. They envisioned their route, in the words of a Seattle Post-Intelligencer reporter, as proceeding "from the tidewater through steep glacial walls until they have found a country that is believed to possess but few obstacles to the prospector." The Minnesotans had even gone so far as to petition their senator to create a new mail route to follow in their footsteps.

In behalf of twenty men, nearly all head of families, we ask your consideration of the following statement and petition.

We are in a measure explorers of the interior of Alaska, sailing tomorrow on the brigantine Blakely to Yakutat bay. Thence we go to the Alsek river and northerly to the headwaters of the White and Tanana rivers.

About the same number have already gone into that country from this point and many more will follow as it is believed this will be a feasible route to the interior through and into American territory.

The problems of transportation of supplies and the hardships to be endured by these men in searching out available trails and opening up ways into this arctic region is a troublesome one and we feel entitled to the generous consideration of the post office department.

We respectfully petition that a mail carrier service be established from Yakutat to some point near the headwaters of the Tanana river.

On February 24, 1898, the newly refurbished Blakely cast off from her berth on the Seattle waterfront and was towed as far as Dungeness Spit. A reporter from the Seattle Daily Times was on hand to witness the preparations for the heavily laden vessel’s departure and gave the paper’s readers the following description:

Perhaps no vessel has ever left this port so loaded down with Humanity and freight as the brigantine Blakely, which will sail today for Yakutat Bay, with ninety-eight people packed like sardines....

Should these people get seasick there is not enough room around the rail of the vessel for them to pay their tributes to Neptune and it is difficult to understand how humanity’s eyes can be so blinded by the greed of gold as to venture to sea in such crowded quarters.

The voyage north on the Blakely was the beginning of what would be a very long nightmare for many of her passengers. A dramatic account of the voyage was penned by Dietz in 1914. After spending the night of February 24 at anchor off Dungeness Spit, the Blakely set sail for Yakutat before sunrise. Almost immediately seasickness began to spread among the passengers as the heavily laden vessel rolled in the swells. As the weather deteriorated, many more on board became violently ill, including the dogs whose “imploring cries rose above the creaking and clattering of the boat.... It produced

LEFT: The main terminus of the Nunatak Glacier empties into the icy waters of Nunatak Fjord. The bare slopes show that the fjord has only recently emerged from under the receding ice.

OPPOSITE PAGE: W. A. Thompson returned to the Alsek River for the winter of 1903-04. His caption for this photo reads, “One of my camping places in the interior. First off the ice. First dry ground in 72 days. Old camp '98.”
was most distressing.” As for the Blakely’s master, Dietz later recorded that he “had been on a glorious drunk, and had brought several bottles of whiskey with him, [and] kept to his cabin and did not appear until he had consumed all the booze.”

By March 3 sea conditions had worsened. Most of the passengers were incapacitated with seasickness, and many of the dogs perished. Captain McAfee, having apparently exhausted his supply of liquor, finally emerged from his cabin and assumed command of his ship; according to Dietz’s account, once sober, Captain McAfee proved to be an able seaman. The leaky little ship, her pumps working at maximum, was tossed about violently in one of the fierce storms for which the Gulf of Alaska is noted. For the next several days the Blakely was battered by fierce wind and waves. At the height of the storm one of the deck hands, Joe Creeg, was lost overboard. Finally, by March 9, the seas had calmed enough to permit the relighting of the galley stove, and those who were able had their first hot meal in five days. One of the passengers, who had succumbed to his seasickness, was buried at sea.

Finally, on March 24, 1898, the Blakely rounded Ocean Cape and entered the safety of the sheltered waters of Yakutat Bay. There she dropped anchor. Once ashore at the little Tlingit village of Yakutat, the passengers and crew of the Blakely were welcomed by the Reverend Albin Johnson of the Swedish Evangelical Covenant Mission. A roaring fire was built and meals prepared. Afterwards, Reverend Johnson conducted a prayer service. Considering the ordeal all had endured on the voyage north, none missed this opportunity to give thanks, even those who Dietz doubted “had ever prayed before.” A collection amounting to $300 was later taken up and reluctantly accepted by the Swedish missionary.

After a couple of days ashore recovering from their recent ordeal, the prospectors began to make their preparations for the trek across the mountains while the crew of the Blakely hauled the ship up onto the beach. There they began the arduous task of scraping off the accumulation of barnacles and other growth while the tons of water shipped during the voyage poured out through the vessel’s seams; these seams were then re-caulked with oakum. The deck house and berths that had been added in Seattle were broken down and the wood stored in the hold to serve as ballast on the return voyage. While the crew worked on the Blakely, the passengers began unloading their outfits from the hold.

Because the Blakely had taken on so much water, many of the stored provisions had been ruined. Even the tin cans purchased in Seattle had rusted so badly that they had to be scraped clean and coated with a mixture of seal blubber and fish oil to prevent further corrosion. On shore the equipment purchased in Seattle was tested, tents erected and stoves fired up. The surviving dogs, having been fattened up on the plentiful salmon, were hitched to the sleds and taken for practice runs. Some came to the conclusion that the store-bought equipment was not as well suited to the region as the native-made items at hand and numerous purchases, especially of snowshoes, were made.

Dietz and his party of New Yorkers took leave of the rest of the Blakely’s passengers when they opted to set out on their own by ascending a tributary of the giant Malaspina Glacier, the largest piedmont glacier in North America, instead of crossing the Nunatak Glacier. This would be a fateful decision on their part. Their dream of an easy passage was to prove instead a continuation of the nightmare that had begun on the voyage of the Blakely. Of the 18 men in this party who set out from Yakutat, 11 perished on the trail or in their winter quarters. The following season Dietz and the other six survivors struggled back across the mountains and the Malaspina Glacier to a desolate beach on the Gulf Coast. There they had given up all hope and just lay down on the beach in their sleeping bags. It was in this condition that they were spotted by the United States Revenue Cutter Wolcott; two had been rendered totally blind and three were dead in their sleeping bags.

The remainder of the Blakely’s passengers proceeded up into Disenchantment Bay and Russell Fjord to the Nunatak Glacier. Having been, until recently, scoured by the retreat
LEFT: William A. Thompson (1866-1928), was among the large party that crossed the Nunatak Glacier in 1898. He was a guide for a scientific party when this photograph was taken in 1906.

BELOW: When they reached Yakutat, the Argonauts' surviving dogs were hitched to sleds to make practice runs.

The rolling grasslands and few hills and passes described by the Alaskans were a far cry from the rugged wilderness that actually existed in the region of the Alsek River. George E. Farewell later wrote, "No one has ever located anything more substantial than a curse on its barren wilds." The difficult terrain, after the extreme hardships of crossing the through glacier, belied the gold seekers' belief in the "new and easy route" to fortune. Many of the prospectors, so buoyed with confidence when they had started out in Seattle, decided to abandon their venture. These men, including William Thompson, returned to Yakutat the way they had come, abandoning much of their gear along the way. When Professor Ralph S. Tarr first visited the region in 1905 to study the glaciers, he found the area near the land tongue of the Nunatak strewn with discarded sleds, stoves, crampons, and other gear. Thompson was not so disheartened, however, that he followed the others back to Seattle. He spent the next decade at Yakutat.

The "rolling grasslands" and few hills and passes described by the Alaskans were a far cry from the rugged wilderness that actually existed in the region of the Alsek River. George E. Farewell later wrote, "No one has ever located anything more substantial than a curse on its barren wilds." The difficult terrain, after the extreme hardships of crossing the through glacier, belied the gold seekers' belief in the "new and easy route" to fortune. Many of the prospectors, so buoyed with confidence when they had started out in Seattle, decided to abandon their venture. These men, including William Thompson, returned to Yakutat the way they had come, abandoning much of their gear along the way. When Professor Ralph S. Tarr first visited the region in 1905 to study the glaciers, he found the area near the land tongue of the Nunatak strewn with discarded sleds, stoves, crampons, and other gear. Thompson was not so disheartened, however, that he followed the others back to Seattle. He spent the next decade at Yakutat.

The remainder of the gold seekers split up at New Hamburg. Some continued to ascend the Alsek in the direction of the White and Tananna River region while another group decided to follow the Tatshenshini River. Of this latter group Alfred Brooks later wrote, "Probably not over a dozen of the original number reached Dalton House, on the Tatshenshini River. They had endured eighteen months of hard labor and privation, only to reach a point on the Dalton trail which can be easily reached from the coast in a few days travel."

The fate of all the others, with the exception of the Dietz party and William Thompson, remains unknown. Historian Pierre Berton writes that 41 of the Blakesly's contingent died on the trail, including the 18 men of the Dietz party. What was obvious, however, was that the Nunatak Glacier, once believed to be a "safe and easy" route, proved totally unsuitable as a route to the goldfields, and no large groups of prospectors would ever again make the attempt.

The Nunatak Glacier route was not, however, totally abandoned by all. It still remained the most viable route for anyone interested in reaching the region of the forks of the Alsek and Tatshenshini rivers. On a number of occasions over the next few years residents of the village of Yakutat, including William Thompson, again ventured across the ice to trap for furs and pan the occasional stream.

Bill Alley is an archivist and historian living in Vancouver. He has written numerous articles for publications in the Pacific Northwest, including Columbia.
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The PNW Historians Guild was founded in 1980 and held its first meeting on the University of Washington campus. In 1983, the first Guild Conference was held in Seattle.
The Hutton Settlement: A Home for One Man’s Family
Reviewed by Dale E. Soden.

In 1919, Levi Hutton, orphaned early in his life, fulfilled his dream by opening a home on the outskirts of Spokane to serve similarly disadvantaged children. For more than 80 years this home, known as the Hutton Settlement, has continued to provide shelter and support for needy children. Doris Pieroth, an accomplished historian, has written a well-researched and at times moving account of the Hutton Settlement and in doing so makes an important contribution to the social history of the Pacific Northwest. Pieroth sees the Hutton story in much larger terms than simply the history of an orphanage. This is the story of the dream of a remarkable individual, the tireless commitment of many women of Spokane’s middle class, and the evolving nature of the theory and practice of child care in the 20th century. Pieroth presents a balanced account of the successes and failures, and her interviews with former residents reveal much about the challenges of serving children in difficult circumstances.

Pieroth begins her narrative with the story of Levi Hutton who, along with his wife May, one of the most colorful figures in Spokane history, struck it rich in the silver mines of the Coeur d’Alene mining district in the early 20th century. But unlike many other mining moguls of the era, Hutton wanted to do something for the disadvantaged. Pieroth effectively places the story of the Hutton Settlement in the context of the problems inherent in caring for orphans throughout the United States in the 19th and 20th centuries.

For nine years, until his death in 1928, Levi Hutton provided a significant presence in the lives of children at the settlement. His intent was to create “a home for orphaned, luckless, and ill-fated children,” and according to Pieroth, he clearly succeeded. But Pieroth’s story also focuses on the remarkable commitment of the women who served as trustees of Hutton’s vision. Described by the author as “domestic feminists” these women “stood in the progressive tradition, identifying with reform efforts to improve their city’s increasingly urban and industrial society.” Organizing her narrative in generally a chronological fashion, Pieroth effectively relates the evolution of the Hutton Settlement to the context of larger political and social forces in the 20th century. From the economic struggles of the Depression that pushed Hutton to grow much of its own food to the social revolution of the 1960s, the Hutton history reveals the ways in which a social institution can provide a window into myriad issues.

From corporal punishment and dating regulations to recreation and education, Pieroth uses personal interviews to provide insight into the social history of the 20th century. Clearly, the Hutton Settlement children appreciated the care that was provided and the community that they shared, while at times they also exhibited frustration at some of the practices and rules that shaped their life together.

Readers may wish for more comparative analysis to better understand how unique Hutton was and is, but overall one will find this work informative and compelling. While the models for delivering social services to the needy continue to evolve, the history of the Hutton Settlement may provide a useful insight into the factors that might make for a successful community-wide effort toward extending help to the less fortunate.

Dale Soden is director of the Weyerhaeuser Center for Christian Faith and Learning and a professor of history at Whitworth College where he has taught since 1985. He is author of The Reverend Mark Matthews (2000).

How the Vote was Won
Woman Suffrage in the Western United States, 1868-1941.
Reviewed by G. Thomas Edwards.

Rebecca Mead correctly asserts that scholars have given too little attention to the western suffrage movement’s impact upon national suffrage history. Suffragist victories in the West “help explain,” she concludes, “the ultimate success of this radical reform.” The author analyzes this western movement, “introducing important western regional women activists, identifying dominant ideas, and tracing associations and contemporary social and political movements.” She asserts that Populism helped achieve suffrage in Colorado and Idaho, “but hostility to the People’s Party, as well as internal ambivalence, prevented further success in other states.”

Brief biographies relate the work of the first generation of western suffragists, including Laura DeForce Gordon of California, Abigail Scott Duniway of Oregon, and Caroline Nichols Churchill of Colorado. These early state leaders had conflicts with Susan B. Anthony and other national leaders. Mead is more critical of Duniway than other writers. “Duniway’s autocratic management style discouraged organizational expansion, alienated younger activists, and encouraged factionalism.”

Readers of this journal will be particularly interested in Mead’s telling of the fight for suffrage in the Pacific Northwest. But her accounts are uneven, and it is surprising that Mead’s listing of manuscript collections does not include important documents held in the Oregon Historical Society or the Duniway papers at the University of Oregon. She incorrectly identifies William S. U’Ren as a Washingtonian. Her
The Washington legislature's decision in 1871 prohibiting women from voting is more interesting and complex than Mead's account, though her discussion of the leadership of Emma Smith DeVoe, is comprehensive. Mead, like other recent scholars, stresses DeVoe's career prior to and during the 1910 Washington suffrage fight. DeVoe, who had learned from nationalist leader Carrie Chapman Catt and Oregon leader Duniway, "stressed good publicity, key endorsements, and systematic canvassing, but prioritized the 'personal intensive work.'" The author states that this unanticipated victory and the one in California the following year "established a new model for state campaigns and helped invigorate the national movement."

Mead's best state studies cover Colorado and California. During the crucial 1896 California referendum, the 76-year-old Anthony contributed to the suffrage struggle by traveling extensively and speaking frequently. Inspired by her energetic work, younger women, including many Women's Christian Temperance Union members, labored in the well-publicized struggle. The suffragists, who expressed satisfaction with the role played by the state's newspapers, needed considerable rural support to meet urban opposition—this was also true in Oregon's referendum struggle ten years later. Although suffragists lost their strenuous fight in California, they won that same year in Idaho.

Scholars interested in Mead's important subject would appreciate a more detailed account—173 pages of text are too few—and the inclusion of maps showing election returns. But this brief, well-written study is filled with keen perceptions. For example, "Equal suffrage in the West was both cause and effect of Progressivism and heavily influenced by one of his sisters, aided by Creffield's widow. The widow murdered in Seattle by George Mitchell, a brother of two women in the sect. Mitchell, acquitted of the killing, was then himself murdered by one of his sisters, aided by Creffield's widow. The widow then committed suicide in the King County jail while awaiting trial. All three deaths took place within six months, providing fodder for an extraordinary spate of Seattle yellow journalism."

Whew! No wonder the case has drawn such interest. These authors state they undertook their work to lend scholarship to the topic, place it in historical perspective, and to use the case study "as a window into many aspects of life and law in the Pacific Northwest." They also profess a desire to "tell a good story."

While this will probably never make any list of must-read beach books, and though the authors are a bit too fond of clichés ("Mitchell hit the jackpot...") and Hollywood matinee jargon ("When we last left the sect members..."), they largely succeed in telling a good story. But so did Stewart Holbrook.

What sets Murdering Holiness apart is its analysis of the trials of the two protagonists—Creffield for adultery and Mitchell for murder—along with the preparations for the trials (which never occurred) of Mitchell's murderer and her accomplice. Especially significant is the analysis of the insanity plea in all cases, which had an important impact on Washington law: "The debate over the defense of insanity... culminated in 1909, when Washington became the first common-law jurisdiction to abolish the defense. Insanity became... a factor that mitigated sentence, but it no longer went to culpability."

If you have not heard of the Creffield story, pick up this book for its titillating glimpse of a fringe religious movement and vigilantism, not to mention sex and murder. If you do know the tale, consider this book for its analysis of significant trials in the early 20th century. Either way, despite some stylistic inadequacies, Murdering Holiness is a solid contribution.

Keith Petersen is author of numerous books on the Pacific Northwest, including centennial histories of the University of Idaho and Lewis-Clark State College. He works in Lewiston, Idaho, as the coordinator for the Idaho Lewis and Clark Bicentennial.

For those, like me, unfamiliar with the case, here is a brief synopsis. Franz Creffield, a charismatic religious leader, formed a small (about 20) but loyal sect in Corvallis, Oregon, in 1903. Creffield's "Holy Rollers" aroused controversy and suspicion, and were driven from town—Creffield being tarred and feathered—just months after Creffield started his movement. Creffield was later convicted of adultery with one of his followers and went to prison. Upon his release, he again brought together most of his sect, but shortly thereafter was murdered in Seattle by George Mitchell, a brother of two women in the sect. Mitchell, acquitted of the killing, was then himself murdered by one of his sisters, aided by Creffield's widow. The widow then committed suicide in the King County jail while awaiting trial. All three deaths took place within six months, providing fodder for an extraordinary spate of Seattle yellow journalism.

Murdering Holiness: The Trials of Franz Creffield and George Mitchell


Reviewed by Keith Petersen.

It struck me as I read the introduction to this book and browsed the bibliography that I might be the only Pacific Northwesterner who had not heard of the Franz Creffield story. As the authors note, there have been "more than two dozen renderings of the story," most famously by Stewart Holbrook.
This fall brings to a close the History Museum's premier Lewis & Clark Bicentennial exhibition, Beyond Lewis & Clark: The Army Explores the West. The exhibition ends on October 31st, but Lewis & Clark enthusiasts need not despair. The Rivers of Lewis & Clark opens on November 26th. This exhibition focuses on the rivers the expedition traversed, considers contemporary policy questions, and offers narratives by people who live along the rivers. In addition to The Rivers of Lewis & Clark we have a diverse and powerful line-up of exhibits scheduled over the coming months:

In December the Model Train Festival returns. From December 26th through January 2nd the History Museum will be full of model trains. Bring in your family and friends to view some of the largest and most intricate model train layouts in the country. Model train aficionados will be stationed throughout the building to answer questions and provide insights into the displays.

In January we open two offerings from the Smithsonian Institute's traveling exhibit program—Close Up In Black: African American Movie Posters (opening January 22) and September 11: Bearing Witness to History (opening January 30). Close Up includes 90 movie posters from the golden age of "race movies" to the present and illuminates the impact of African Americans—performers, writers, designers, directors, and producers—on screen and behind the scenes.

Bearing Witness captures the moments of the attacks and the immediate aftermath, sharing the voices of survivors and rescue workers and displaying objects left at memorial sites. Visitors will be able to record their own stories for the Smithsonian's archives.

Check the next Explore It! that arrives in your mailbox for exhibit details and information on related programs. And don't miss the special Members Day shopping event at our Northwest Pendleton Museum Store! On Wednesday, December 1st only, members receive 10% off their Museum Store purchases—double the regular members' discount!

As always, I want to thank you for your membership in support of the Washington State History Society & Museum. We couldn't do what we do without you. When you receive your annual donation request in the mail this fall, please consider making an additional contribution to the History Fund. Your donation can be allocated to the project of your choice and allows us to take the work we do to a higher level.

—Brenda Hanen, Development Manager

On the verge of Mount St. Helens' historic eruption, three different women become linked in a desperate mission to save lives. And as each one faces destruction and tragedy, they build friendships that bring healing to their shattered lives.

Written by best-selling and award-winning author Lauraine Snelling, The Way of Women celebrates the resilience and strength of women like you in the face of extraordinary crisis.
Two hundred years have passed since the Corps of Discovery set out to explore uncharted territory. Many words that were familiar to Meriwether Lewis and William Clark and penned by expedition members in their journals are not commonly spoken, written, or understood today. Alan H. Hartley's new reference book takes modern readers on a fascinating voyage through the use and metamorphosis of those words, featuring over 1,100 entries and more than 2,000 illustrative quotations, as well as considerable background material on the pronunciation of English (and other languages) of the journey.

Illustrations
5 1/2" x 8 1/4" • 192 pages
Paperback • ISBN 0-87422-278-8 • $24.95
Spiral • ISBN 0-87422-279-6 • $27.95
Available in September 2004

To the White Clouds
Idaho's Conservation Saga, 1900-1970
J.M. Neil

In the 1960s, a mining corporation quietly applied to build a road to the base of Castle Peak, located in Idaho's magnificent and pristine White Clouds mountain range. That simple request resulted in a challenge to the Mining Act of 1872 and ignited a controversy that stirred a nation and quite possibly determined the results in Idaho's race for governor in 1970. Painstakingly researched, author J.M. Neil carefully sets the stage for the confrontation, describing how Idaho came to have millions of acres of federally protected wilderness. Neil also covers a surprising range of other topics integral to the state's conservation history.

Maps • references • index
6" x 9" • 256 pages
Paperback • ISBN 0-87422-276-1 • $21.95
Available in October 2004

Extending the Artist's Hand
Contemporary Sculpture from the Walla Walla Foundry
Mark Anderson, Chris Bruce, and Keith Wells, with an essay by Jim Dine

A quiet country town nestled at the foot of Washington's Blue Mountains is the unlikely home of a world-class art facility, the Walla Walla Foundry. Internationally renowned artists such as Terry Allen, Robert Arneson, Deborah Butterfield, Jim Dine, and Tom Otterness have utilized the firm's services to create, produce, and install finished art pieces worldwide.

With full color photography and informative text, Extending the Artist's Hand celebrates the collaboration between artist and technician, explores the fascinating journey of metal sculpture from initial concept to final installation, and documents the history and achievements of this extraordinary Eastern Washington enterprise.

Museum of Art, Washington State University
Illustrations • glossary
12" x 8 1/2" • 112 pages
Hardbound • ISBN 0-9755662-0-2 • $24.95
Available in August 2004

Spokane and the Inland Empire
An Interior Pacific Northwest Anthology
Revised Edition
David H. Stratton

Essential aspects about the prehistory, history, geography, and architecture of the Inland Pacific Northwest are presented here in one succinct volume. This landmark collection outlines the region's historical geographic systems, Palouse tribal history, characteristics of prehistoric Plateau Indian dwellings, a century of Columbia Plateau agriculture, the exceptional architecture of Spokane's Kirtland Cutter, and more. This new edition has been revised from the original volume published in 1991. Extensive illustrations supplement the text.

Illustrations • notes • references
6" x 9" • 224 pages
Paperback • ISBN 0-87422-277-X • $21.95
Available in November 2004

WSU Press books are available at bookstores or order direct:
Washington State University Press (CM)
PO Box 645910
Pullman, WA 99164-5910
Phone: 800-354-7360 • Fax: 509-335-8568
E-mail: wsupress@wsu.edu

Visit our Web site at wsupress.wsu.edu.
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“WITH LANDON JONES’S SUPERB BIOGRAPHY OF WILLIAM CLARK, WE HAVE AT LAST A FULL TREATMENT OF THIS DISTINGUISHED AMERICAN, WRITTEN WITH SPARKLE AND INSIGHT. THE WAIT IS OVER.”
—Gary E. Moulton, editor, The Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition

“A RIVETING PORTRAIT OF THE LAWLESSNESS AND CHAOS OF POSTREVOLUTIONARY LIFE ON THE AMERICAN FRONTIER AS WELL AS A FAST-PACED STORY OF CLARK’S DRAMATIC LIFE.”
—Publishers Weekly

“A RICHLY TEXTURED TALE OF A BRAVE AND COMPLICATED MAN. LANDON JONES HAS BROUGHT TO LIFE A VIOLENT, MORALLY COMPLEX TIME—WHEN THE FRONTIER WAS ST. LOUIS AND DIPLOMATS AND STATESMEN NEEDED TO BE WARRIORS AND EXPLORERS.”
—Evan Thomas, author of John Paul Jones: Sailor, Hero, Father of the American Navy
Discovering the
RIVERS OF LEWIS & CLARK

November 26, 2004, through January 17, 2005