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President's Message

Keepers of history, preserving our past

Virtually all members of the LCTHF share a keen appreciation of history. For a few it may border on the compulsive. No doubt we all have some friends who are "history nuts." For that matter, one of our former presidents uses "MLewisNut" as her e-mail address.

Accordingly, it came as a shock to me when someone insisted a few months ago, "The foundation is in danger of losing its history." At first I was incredulous. "How could that be," I thought, "when we are surrounded by all these delightful nuts?" Further, we have our archive of wpos and minutes of meetings going back almost to the flood, not to mention the Sherman Library itself.

If some small thread is still missing, I will just ring up Mr. X or Ms. Y to get the answer.

"That may be true," my associate explained, "but much of our history has never been written down. It cannot be found at a central location. Rather, think of your sources as dozens of humans. The history they can provide is mostly oral history, but they are aging, and many already have been lost to us." I began to catch on as she continued,

"There is no codified, written history of the founding of the foundation and its early years. For that matter, the real history of recent years and the Bicentennial has not been written. And exactly what are you going to do about it?"

"Consult with Ron Laycock," I should have replied, but instead I ducked in a different direction.

Meanwhile, Ron had agreed to chair a committee that he himself had proposed, a Past Presidents Council. None of us was very clear about exactly what this committee would take on, but we did realize that most past presidents were still interested in, and even devoted to, the foundation. Potentially they constituted a most valuable resource.

Last January 27, our board had the first of its three meetings for the year near the Denver airport, and the previous evening Ron, Karen Seaberg, Carol Bronson and I met to brainstorm about the Past Presidents Council. What would be its primary purpose? Just how could it best contribute to the foundation? For a good half hour the juices were not flowing, but then someone began to connect some dots, and the rest of us rapidly caught on.

Who could be better qualified to solve our "lost history" problem? The past presidents know a great deal of foundation history themselves, and collectively they have friendships with, and the trust of, nearly all the others who know our history best. They could do most of the oral interviews and direct the transcriptions. Several written chapters could result, each covering different topics and personalities. A handsome hardcover book with photographs ultimately might be produced.

Let us not get ahead of ourselves here. The past presidents may prefer to take on other projects, and certainly they have that right. It was agreed that I should write to all the past presidents we could reach, asking for their reactions and ideas and inviting them to meet with us during the annual meeting. All those who have responded to date have been positive and interested, though some will not be able to come to Charlottesville.
Already enough have replied to justify that meeting, which likely will be on August 7, with Ron Laycock presiding.

Meanwhile, we each have an opportunity to assist in writing the next chapter of foundation history by voting to elect our next directors to the board. As an ex officio member of Jane Weber’s Governance Committee, I know how very hard they worked to bring you this excellent slate. The one problem is that all eight are well qualified, and just like last year, we have to make some very difficult choices.

All current LCTHF members are urged to vote, including each adult member in a “family membership.” Last year nearly 1,000 ballots were sent in, which was a compelling sign of the good health of this organization. My sincere thanks to each of you who takes the trouble to vote, and a special “hats off” to the eight who have agreed to stand for office. Some of our best history has yet to be written.

—Jim Gramentine
President, LCTHF

Award nominations due May 10

LCTHF will present its annual awards in Charlottesville, Virginia, at the 39th annual meeting during lunch on Monday August 6.

Awards will be presented in the following categories: Foundation Chapter, Youth Achievement, Meritorious Achievement and Distinguished Service. Appreciation Award certificates also will be given.

Nominations should be sent to committee chairman Ken Jutzi at 1084 Sueno Court, Camarillo, California, 93010 no later than May 10, 2007. For more information, contact Ken at calcith@roadrunner.com.

The Foundation is particularly interested in receiving nominations for the youth award. There were no nominations in this category in 2006 and many deserving youth.

---
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Letters

Power plant opposition fights to preserve landmark

Lately the backers of a proposed coal-fired power plant in Great Falls, Montana, have sought to justify their poor site selection (with portions of the development in the Great Falls Portage National Historic Landmark) by recalling stories of camping with Stephen Ambrose at the campsites of Lewis and Clark and appreciating the historic value of those sites. Shame on them!!

While I do not presume to speak for my father, I nevertheless know that he was intelligent enough to recognize a rotten investment when he saw one, and he certainly would have been appalled at the idea of mitigating the plant’s damaging impact on the landmark. My father appreciated the unique history of the Great Falls area, especially as it pertains to Lewis and Clark. He spent much of his career as a writer and historian telling people all over the world that they should visit Great Falls and take in the clear air and magnificent vistas, and hike and paddle the area around the falls, including the wonderful downstream (and downwind) communities of Fort Benton and Loma.

If asked to quantify the value of these resources, I am certain he would have said “priceless.”

While the undemocratic methods of the coal plant’s proponents would have shocked my father, he likely would have been heartened to know that there is a rising tide of involved citizens and advocacy groups working to stop the plant’s construction at this site. Great Falls has a 1,500-member Citizens for Clean Energy organization that recently gathered on the steps of the local Civic Center to protest the plant. They carried signs reading “We Don’t Want It” and have collected more than 150 signatures from north central Montana health care providers opposed to the plant.

Landowners adjacent to and near the proposed site have filed a lawsuit based on the certainty that their land values will decline because of the plant’s operations. The Montana Preservation Association sent out a fact sheet concerning the threat to the landmark to all of its members asking that comment letters be sent to the Rural Utilities Services, the agency in charge of authorizing the federal loans required to build the plant. Finally, with the help of foundation staff, our organization is keeping a close eye on the portage route landmark and insisting that the site should not be compromised.

I encourage all members of the LCTHF to take an active role in the stewardship component of our mission statement. The trail is 3,700 miles long; we urgently need many sets of eyes and ears to make sure that 100 years from now, there will still be places Lewis and Clark might recognize. Our grandchildren deserve the right to be thrilled by walking in the captains’ footsteps. If you perceive a threat to that right, please alert the local chapter and Wendy Raney at foundation headquarters. A little information in the hands of the right people can move mountains, or in this case, hopefully, coal-fired power plants.

Some basic facts about the power plant and the public process thus far are included below.

STEPHENIE AMBROSE TURBS
Board member, LCTHF
Helena, Mont.

Highwood power plant proposal facts

Plans to build a coal-fired power facility on the edge of one of the nation’s most prominent Lewis and Clark sites—the Great Falls Portage Route of 1805—are moving ahead. Planned by Southern Montana Electric (SME) and the City of Great Falls, the 250-megawatt power plant would render Lewis and Clark’s Great Falls portage route unrecognizable, with a massive plant building, 400-foot smokestack, wind turbines, rail lines, transmission lines, roads, lights, steam, noise and mile-long coal trains.

To finance the Highwood Generating Station, SME has applied to the USDA Rural Utilities Services for a federal loan to subsidize roughly 75 percent of the $720 million construction costs of the plant. Thus, the American taxpayers themselves are, in effect, being asked to finance the destruction of one of the country’s historic treasures, less
Concern is Growing.

Not informed in a timely manner. Anticipated damage to the landmark is severe, and most of the impacts are not mitigatable.

Due to the severe threat to the landmark, many groups, including the foundation, asked SME and Rural Utilities Services to pursue alternative locations for this project.

Instead of siting the plant elsewhere, SME moved the footprint of the plant just off the boundary of the landmark and payments to offset the loss of this remarkable resource were offered to local Lewis and Clark organizations, a poor substitute.

Interested groups and individuals were not informed in a timely manner.

SME negotiated options to purchase property for the power plant in the Great Falls Portage in October 2004, yet interested parties were not fully informed of potential damage to the landmark until June 2006. Thus the opportunity to truly explore alternatives was missed, and interested parties were called to the table at a point where many considered the project a “done deal.”

Word is Out; Concern is Growing.

Proponets requested Cascade County approve a zone change from agricultural to heavy industrial to allow construction of this facility. They received a record 1,500 comments opposing the zone change, but despite this, the county changed the zoning designation to heavy industrial for property within and around the landmark.

Surrounding landowners have filed suit against the county on the grounds that this change to heavy industrial zoning is “spot zoning,” which is not allowed under law.

The LCTHF board of directors voted in October 2006 to oppose development of the coal-fired generation plant in or adjacent to the Great Falls Portage National Historic Landmark.

The arduous portage around the great falls was one of Lewis and Clark’s most remarkable physical triumphs. The corps set up camp here for nearly two weeks, constructed timber carriages and moved tons of equipment 17 miles over extremely rough terrain.

The area was awarded landmark status based on the integrity of the portage viewed.

The environmental impact statement issued for this project states that the Highwood power plant will have an “adverse and significant” impact on the landmark.

The foundation submitted comments on the draft and final environmental impact statements.

Model 1803 correction

A correction is due regarding my letter in the last issue of WPO on the Harpers Ferry short rifle. In the last sentence, I noted Richard Keller’s observation that the rifle bearing serial number 214 “has a straight upper ramrod pipe like other high-number Model 1803s but unlike the one with serial number 15.” I should have said, “... like other low-number Model 1803s, including number 15.” My thanks to Keller for pointing out the error.

Jim Merritt
Pennington, N.J.

WPO welcomes letters. We may edit them for length, accuracy, clarity and civility. Send them to us c/o Editor, WPO, P.O. Box 3434, Great Falls, MT 59403 (e-mail wpo@lewisandclark.org).

By Robert J. Miller

The “Corps of Volunteers for North Western Discovery” and President Thomas Jefferson used the Doctrine of Discovery to claim the Pacific Northwest for the United States.

Professor Miller’s fascinating new book establishes original theories about Jefferson’s and Lewis & Clark’s use of the Doctrine of Discovery and its rituals to claim American political, commercial, and property rights over the native peoples and nations of the Louisiana and Oregon Territories.

Miller also documents the new idea that the elements of Discovery led directly to the development of the American policy of Manifest Destiny.

To buy the hardcover book (230 pages) directly from the author for $35 + $4 shipping, visit http://law.lclarke.edu/faculty/rmiller

To order the book for $49.95, visit http://www.amazon.com or http://www.greenwood.com/catalog/C9011.aspx or call 1-800-225-5800.
Lewis and Clark: Remaking the American West, 1808-1838

The explorers paved the way for settlement of the West with Lewis as governor of the Louisiana Territory and Clark an Indian agent and general of the territorial militia.

By Robert J. Moore, Jr.

Most historians refer to the post-expedition lives and activities of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark as anti-climactic, even partially attributing the death of Lewis to his inability to function adequately in his post as territorial governor of Louisiana. In fact, after their return from the West both Lewis and Clark, who lived most of the remainder of their lives in St. Louis, were major participants in the process of remaking the West they “discovered” between 1804 and 1806. They did so by looking to the lands, culture and laws they had left behind in the United States, the Ohio River Valley and the State of Virginia. They were righteous; they believed in the superiority of their culture and the democratic form of government. They were racialists; not racists, but racialists, meaning that they felt that their culture was superior to all others, and that they had not only a right but a duty and an obligation to enlighten and improve those on a lower racial rung than themselves. Rather than working with the other cultural groups in upper Louisiana to share the best aspects of the lifeways of all, Lewis and Clark looked toward changing the laws and people they found in this region. They believed that by imposing the laws, Indian policies, economies and, especially, land policies favored by the United States, they would enlighten the inhabitants and better their lives by bringing democracy and order to the frontier.

In 1808, St. Louis was more a village than a city, with a population of about 2,000 people. It was part of a rapidly growing United States, composed of about 5.3 million people. Not included in this figure were American Indians and slaves, the latter of which were counted as only three-fifths of a person for the purpose of determining the number of representatives from each state in Congress. The United States was somewhat isolated from Europe, which was a six-week ocean voyage away. Still, European influences were strong. The United States tried to remain neutral in the almost continuous warfare between the most powerful European nations, France and England, while suspiciously eyeing Spain, their western neighbor, which seemed poised to block further growth. War with any or all of these nations was possible, and left the United States very vulnerable. The United States nearly went to war with France in 1798, with Spain in 1806, and after a long economic embargo actually declared war on England in 1812. These European rivals were seen not only as enemies of the nation, but of what the nation believed it represented—democracy and true freedom.

In 1808, President Thomas Jefferson was just ending his second term as chief executive. His proudest
achievement was the successful purchase of the Louisiana Territory from the French, assuring him of the eventual growth of American democracy to the west. Although Jefferson believed in states rights and distrusted a strong central government, he came to believe during his presidency that staving off the nation’s monarchical enemies would take a determined leadership, and that the survival of the nation depended upon the spread of democracy throughout the Americas. The first step was to push westward into the purchase lands, which provided space to grow for the young nation.3

The town of St. Louis would be the logical control center for the American takeover of the trans-Mississippi West. With the arrival of the Americans, the simpler days of the little French-speaking town were gone forever. St. Louis hung onto its French traditions for a time, but in the end overwhelming waves of non-French settlers from Europe and the eastern United States moved in. Soon the public square was built upon and became a market area, American-style brick dwellings took the place of the old post-en-terre vertical log structures and commercial buildings sprang up near the levee. The limestone bluff upon which the town was situated to protect it from floods was quarried away and the stone used in the building process. Courts were established, and St. Louis got its first lawyers and its first postmaster. Protestant denominations of the Christian faith arrived with the immigrants, and new churches sprang up to rival the Catholic chapel.4

The appointment of Meriwether Lewis as governor of the Louisiana Territory, and William Clark as Indian agent for the Far West and general of the territorial militia, was more than a mere reward. These two men knew the West better than any other American of their time. They were government employees, continuing to carry out the will of the policymakers, particularly Thomas Jefferson, in Washington, just as they had on their expedition. Now, after surveying the West, the two men could facilitate the absorption of the West into the American sphere of influence. On March 8, 1808, Meriwether Lewis returned to St. Louis, accompanied by his brother Reuben, to assume his new office. Being governor of the sprawling Upper Louisiana Territory proved challenging. In 1808, St. Louis was still a rowdy frontier town on the edge of a “wilderness.” Lewis often was opposed by factions in St. Louis, many of whom were interested in wresting land from the former French inhabitants. As governor, Lewis set out to accomplish three major goals: revise and codify the laws of Louisiana; facilitate the westward expansion and settlement of Anglo-Americans by obtaining land...
from and moving native people; and safeguard U.S. property and land laws in the region by building a strong militia, ensuring the proper placement of installations and troops and by securing alliances with powerful tribal groups like the Osage.

Lewis brought printer and editor Joseph Charless to St. Louis in 1808 to print the laws of the territory and to counteract propaganda put forth by his political opponents. Charless founded the Missouri Gazette, which became the official mouthpiece for Lewis, who wrote some editorials himself, at least once under the pseudonym “Clatsop.” On another level, the appearance of a newspaper in St. Louis boosted the “civilized” nature of the place, putting it on a level with other, larger cities around the United States and allowing first-hand reports from the American frontier to come to the attention of the entire nation. Newspapers were a powerful force in early America because they could be shipped at very low cost and in some instances for free through the mail. Extremely partisan, they carried specific, biased messages to the rest of the nation and the world. Interestingly, after the death of Lewis in 1809, Charless drifted into the political camp of his enemies, and later opposed William Clark as territorial governor and in Clark’s election campaign for governor of the new state of Missouri in 1820.

The new laws established by Lewis were heavily influenced by English common law as practiced in Virginia, Lewis’s home state, and reflected the overall goals and values of the United States. Under government orders, Lewis did not consult with the citizens of St. Louis in codifying these laws. The new laws constituted a radical departure from Spanish laws under which the territory had formerly been governed. The right of slaves to purchase their freedom, the right of married women to make contracts and the rights of citizens granted land charters by the King of Spain all were nullified. The biggest change in the territorial government from the Spanish regime was in the court system. Prior to 1804, all disputes and criminal charges were reviewed by the Spanish lieutenant governor, who had the power to act as prosecutor, judge and jury, but always in an atmosphere of fair arbitration rather than dictatorial sentencing. After 1804, American courts were set up with jury trials and the legal representation of both sides by lawyers. The new system of justice was based on the English common law and was very different from the Code Napoleon, which the Spanish had administered from New Orleans.

It was up to Lewis and Clark to organize areas to the west of St. Louis where, it was planned, Indian tribes would be moved. Thomas Jefferson saw American Indians as undeveloped people who slowly could be introduced to the “superior” western culture. He believed that assimilation was possible, but also came to believe that the process might take a long period of time. It would be better to move the tribes beyond the Mississippi River, Jefferson felt, where their assimilation process could take place gradually and friction with their Euro-American neighbors would be lessened. This was the essence of Jeffersonian Indian policy: to woo or threaten Indian tribes east of the Mississippi and “encourage” them to move west of the river, therefore giving them time to assimilate to the ways of the whites. Lewis and Clark would have to try to “pacify” the Indians who still lived in the region, including the Kickapoo, Shawnee, Delaware, Sac and Fox and Winnebago, negotiate with them to surrender their lands, and also facilitate the movement of eastern tribes like the Cherokee and Choctaw to the western side of the Mississippi. They employed a separate Indian policy for tribes west of the river. In contrast with eastern tribes already weakened and vulnerable, the western tribes showed themselves to be less compliant to U.S. desires. Tribal trading partners among the Osage, Omaha, Iowa, Ponca, Mandan, Hidatsa and other Missouri River tribes carefully were cultivated, while the government also held out hope of repairing relations with the Lakota Sioux and Arikara. These tribes must be made receptive to the idea of accepting transplanted eastern tribes in their midst, and also made allies of the United States rather than to England or Spain. The western tribes were wooed primarily with the carrot, but Lewis never relinquished

Ma-Has-Kah, Chief of the Ioways. Mahaska, known as White Cloud, (1784-1834) became a chief of the Iowa tribe after showing his prowess in battle against the Sioux. He was later imprisoned in St. Louis in 1808 for killing a French trader, but escaped.
the threat to use force against them as well. When the Osage defied U.S. authority, he halted trade with them, declared that they no longer enjoyed U.S. protection and invited their enemies to wage war on them.8

The complexity of Jeffersonian Indian policy was pointed up by the arrest of three Indians in 1808 for two separate murders of whites. During the course of their trials, more than a hundred Iowa, Sac and Fox Indians visited St. Louis, and a part of the courtroom was reserved for them. According to the Missouri Gazette, these Indians petitioned Lewis and Clark incessantly with pleas to pardon the accused men. On August 14, Lewis and Clark held a council with some of the chiefs of these tribes. In their speeches, Lewis and Clark, as usual, dwelt upon the power and greatness of the United States and upon the Indians' need of its friendship for their happiness. Meanwhile, Governor Lewis pushed the courts and public opinion to advocate the execution of all three Indians as an example to the tribes, but was overridden by orders from Washington, D.C. In the end, two of the prisoners escaped and were not pursued, and the third was pardoned as a goodwill gesture to the tribes.9

Major initiatives begun by Governor Lewis included negotiations with the Osage tribe. The Osage were at that time the most powerful tribe in the lower Midwest, reigning over the region of western Missouri, northern Arkansas and eastern Kansas due to their ties with French fur traders and Spanish government officials. At the beginning of the 1800s, dissident factions within the tribe were stealing horses, killing cattle, and harassing isolated settlers as an expression of their unhappiness with the steady encroachment upon their once sovereign domains. Governor Lewis was eager to cement relations with the Osage, but also wished to define tribal boundaries, confine the tribe to lands in the western part of Missouri, and to stop depredations upon other Indian tribes and white settlers. To do this, he wanted to negotiate a treaty with tribal leaders and move the government trading post, then called a “factory,” from Fort Bellefontaine (north of St. Louis) to the heart of the Osage country. Lewis turned to William Clark to accomplish these goals.

Clark negotiated what many Osage considered to be an adverse treaty on September 14, 1808, and a new one was negotiated by Pierre Chouteau later that year, and signed on November 10. Meriwether Lewis wrote the new treaty, which was quite similar to the one that was rejected, but provided for an annuity to the Great Osage of $1,000, and to the Little Osage of $500 in merchandise. The whole affair strained relations between the U.S. government and the Osage. It was something that had to be done in order to facilitate eventual westward expansion, but it was badly handled because the Americans knew so little about Osage tribal politics and culture.10

Governor Lewis supported the land policies and property rights of individuals under the Anglo-American and the Franco-Spanish regimes, but saw the status of Indian lands as one in which various degrees of arm-twisting and offers of annuities and presents could be used to gain clear title for his own people. Lewis supported the claims of locals who held Spanish land grants against a faction of his own people who wanted to nullify all of these claims, and as a result was greatly liked by the old French fur-trade elite in the town.11

In implementing various policies to achieve his goals and those of the government, Lewis made many enemies and had a stormy couple of years in office prior to his death. Not only did he fight factions led by land grabbers like John Smith T, but his own territorial secretary, Frederick Bates, was less than pleased with him. The reasons for their friction have been lost to history. Perhaps Bates was jealous of Lewis. Bates certainly saw himself as the better man. Although Lewis often could be aloof, abrasive, and build a small slight into a very long and lasting animosity, Bates's hatred for his superior was excessive. Bates took his enmity with Lewis to extremes,
writing letters behind the governor’s back to undermine his position in the territory. Lewis was governor subject to the reappointment of the president every three years, but Bates does not seem to have wanted his job. He seemed rather to want to make Lewis look bad enough that he would not be reappointed. The discord in the governor’s own office hamstrung his policies and slowed down the realization of his goals.12

The roof fell in on Lewis when he tried to raise the money and gather the resources to return the Mandan chief Sheheke-shote to his people. The alliance with the Mandan was considered to be of paramount importance to the U.S. government, yet little guidance emanated from the nation’s capital on how to return the chief. The Arikara people, who lived south of the Mandans along the Missouri, had been angered by the death of one of their chiefs while on a visit to Washington, D.C., and had closed the river to all traders, sealing the route home for Sheheke-shote. Lewis’s solution to the problem was to support a private fur-trading venture, which officially would be charged with the return of the chief by the government. This policy had been sanctioned at the time of the failed Nathaniel Pryor-led attempt to return Sheheke-shote in 1807. The St. Louis Missouri Fur Company was formed on March 7, 1809, by William Clark, Reuben Lewis, Pierre Chouteau, Manuel Lisa and other St. Louis fur trade entrepreneurs. It organized a force of 140 men to secure the chief’s safe return and afterward to engage in trade. In return for its services, Lewis promised to pay the company $7,000 and to bar any other trading parties from ascending the Missouri before May 20.

Lewis instructed the commander of the expedition, Pierre Chouteau, to demand the surrender of the Arikara men who killed the members of Ensign Pryor’s force in 1807; or, if the killers could not be identified, to take a token group of any Arikara men, and have them shot in the presence of the entire Arikara nation. If he could not make peace with the Arikara and had to bypass them, Chouteau was to get the Mandans to make war on them. These orders showed, once again, Lewis’s small regard for Indian people, and his authoritarian bent in treating them like children. Chouteau and his party returned the Mandan chief after holding a council with the Arikara chiefs and making no demands for the lives of any of the Arikaras.13

Lewis learned soon after the departure of the St. Louis Missouri Fur Company’s expedition that the new secretary of war, William Eustis, refused to honor several of his itemized costs for the chief’s return. A stinging letter of rebuke from Eustis arrived in St. Louis. By protesting Lewis’s bills, the government ruined his personal credit, and, as a consequence, creditors demanded payment of private debts amounting to $4,000. Their action forced him to turn over his lands as security, leaving him, as he said, “in poverty.” In an effort to explain his actions as territorial governor and settle the matter of the protested government bills, Lewis decided to make the long journey to Washington, D.C., to try to clear his name. We know that he met his death on this trip. It is hard to say if he had lived, what might have been different about the story of westward expansion. As a government employee, he was carrying out a larger policy established by President Thomas Jefferson. He was subject to changes in administration, as evidenced with the election of James Madison in 1808, and to possible removal and discipline if he displeased his superiors in Washington. Upon his death, another functionary would take his place. More likely than not, Lewis’s co-commander, William Clark, might have risen to that task whether Lewis had lived or died. But what often is lost in discussions of Meriwether Lewis’s life, because of the controversy surrounding his death, is his accomplishments while in office. Lewis achieved many of the goals set out for him, and laid the groundwork for U.S. hegemony in the trans-Mississippi region. His methods may have, at times, been unorthodox and imperfectly realized, but he was nevertheless successful, unlike his predecessor James Wilkinson, in winning over the French inhabitants, in formalizing a treaty with the Osage, in returning Sheheke-shote to his people, in codifying the laws of the territory and in solidifying the U.S. presence in the region.14

Lewis’s death put even more pressure on William Clark as the government’s “man in St. Louis.” Although he initially shrugged off the duties of territorial governor by declining the post, he had his hands full in his handling of Indian affairs. Not only was he charged with maintaining intertribal peace and implementing Jeffersonian relocation policies, he also was responsible for keeping peaceful relations between the United States and Indian tribes who disliked American settlement and often were influenced heavily by the intrigues of Spain and Great Britain. Tribal leaders watched as American settlers rapidly moved into Indian country, displacing entire tribes and taking their land, sometimes by treaty, often by force. Most American farmers were not good neighbors to Indians, distrusting them and sometimes
killing them. And the Americans were horning in on the fur trade, not just by displacing British and Spanish traders, but also by taking over the traditional Indian role of trapper and hunter, forcing the Indians out of the economic picture entirely.

As the man in charge of the government’s Indian relations in St. Louis, Clark participated in treaty negotiations, settled intertribal disputes, drove squatters off Indian lands, and prevented Indians from returning to lands they had ceded by treaty. Clark persuaded the Sioux and other tribes, potentially hostile to U.S. interests, to side against Britain or remain neutral during the War of 1812. His personal influence probably saved the upper Mississippi Valley for the United States during those hostilities.15

Most of this work was carried on in one very special building, Clark’s Indian Museum and Council Chamber. Located near where the Gateway Arch stands today on the St. Louis riverfront, it was perhaps the most important single physical space in America in the early process of remaking the West in the image of the United States. It was an intersection between East and West because it was a frequent meeting place of the U.S. government, represented by William Clark, and the representatives of Indian nations. Major treaties were negotiated in the Council Chamber with tribes from the Rock River Sioux, Winnebago and Ottawa in 1816; the Menominee, Oto and Ponca in 1817; the Pawnee, Quapaw, Shawnee, Delaware, Cherokee and Osage in 1818; the Great and Little Osage in 1825; the Osage and Delaware in 1826; and the Iowa, Sac and Fox in 1836.16

The council chamber was an intersection because travelers returning from the West—fur traders, trappers, entrepreneurs, explorers—came there to mark additions or corrections onto Clark’s master map of the American West, the most accurate single representation of the trans-Mississippi West of its day. Within the chamber, the operations of the various groups in the West were marked and charted as in a war room, while the boundaries of Indian nations and their relative strengths and weaknesses were discussed and compared. Routes by which to penetrate the West, new mountain passes, rivers and lakes were noted with great enthusiasm.

The council chamber was also a threshold between East and West, because the items within it, cultural and natural exhibits symbolic of the western lands, gave travelers from the east a view of these regions and cultures without actually going there; for the adventurous few who prepared to travel west, it served as a preview of the world they were about to enter. All traders and explorers expecting to travel upriver had to obtain a pass from Clark to proceed beyond St. Louis. For native people from the West, the museum may have been a disquieting place, with cultural items of various tribes hung and displayed like trophies around the room, or, perhaps, they saw the items as evidence of William Clark’s power, since they were gifts from individuals in the many tribes he had encountered.

Famous visitors to the museum included the Marquis de Lafayette, Henry Rowe Schoolcraft, Prince Paul of Wurttemberg, George Catlin, William Drummond Stewart, Prince Maximilian of Weid-Neuweid, Karl Bodmer and the Sac and Fox chief Keokuk. There were two incarnations of the museum, the first at First and Pine streets from 1811 to 1818 and the second at First and Vine from 1818 to 1838. Built of brick, the second council chamber was 100 feet long and 30 feet wide.

The building was important as a museum as well. At a time when the United States had perhaps a total of ten or twelve museums, St. Louis had a free museum open to the public, which previewed the West. William Clark made a list of the items in the museum, cataloging 201 artifacts, including 18 pairs of moccasins, 11 men’s suits (shirts and leggings), 2 women’s dresses, and assorted necklaces,
Jean Baptiste, whom William painted with a “History of a battle between the Sioux & Pawnees & the Socks Fox.” No one knows what became of all these artifacts. Clark family tradition holds that a scoundrel named Albert Koch, who ran another St. Louis scab bar & the Socks Fox. An entire Sioux tipi also was listed, which was from the government for schoolbooks, pens, paper, ink, for his education. This experience highli ghted Clark’s belief in his early years, were brought to St. Louis as Clark’s official wards and put under his stern control. In 1809, Toussaint Charbonneau & Sacagawea brought their son Jean Baptiste, whom William Clark called “Pomp,” to St. Louis for his education. This experiment highlighted Clark’s belief that not only did “savages” need to be educated to be elevated above their natural state (as he found them during the expedition), but also revealed that he, like Jefferson, believed that they were capable of being educated with the values and culture of the whites. Pomp learned French and English, classical literature, history, mathematics and science during his St. Louis school years, where he attended a Baptist school as well as the Catholic forerunner of St. Louis University. Pomp lived in a boarding house across the street from the Clark home during the final years of his education. Clark paid the boy’s expenses and then sought reimbursement from the government for schoolbooks, pens, paper, ink, and food, board and clothing.17

Clark also can be seen as a stern father figure to his slave York. After the return of the expedition, Clark famously refused to manumit York. York pleaded with Clark to return to the Louisville area where York’s wife was living, but only was allowed to go for short periods. Perhaps Clark simply was unwilling to do without his services, or perhaps York was a symbol. United States law concern-
in power for so long because he was popular with the wealthy business interests of the town and retained favor with federal officials in the national capital. Clark could be characterized as what would later be called a political "boss" in the region, a man who pulled the strings from behind the scenes while his very vocal and very aggressive lieutenants, Thomas Hart Benton and Benjamin O'Fallon, ensured that his policies were implemented.

Despite his successful management of the fractious and culturally diverse frontier territory, Clark's political foes attacked him on many fronts, including his work as a trustee on the St. Louis school board, his handling of the issuance of a charter for the Bank of Missouri (on whose board he later served), his involvement with a political machine openly led by Thomas Hart Benton, his perceived predisposition to be "soft" on Indians, and his lengthy absences from the territory on personal as well as government business. The Missouri Gazette played up Clark's absenteeism to sway public opinion against him.

Clark ran for the post of governor of the new state of Missouri in 1820, but lost. He was not able to campaign because his wife Julia was ill with breast cancer. Tragically she died at her parents' home in Fincastle, Virginia, at the age of 28. Clark was en route from St. Louis to comfort her when he learned of her death. Clark's loss in this crucial election was partly due to class differences. The old French elite with which he was allied was outnumbered by the influx of new immigrants into the territory. According to the final election returns, Clark's opponent Alexander McNair, received 6,576 votes to Clark's 2,656. During the contest, Clark was called "the Indian's friend," an appellation that would make any man in a frontier community extremely unpopular. With his defeat for the governorship of the new state, William Clark's political career, for all intents and purposes, came to an end, although he continued on as U.S. agent for Indian affairs in the western territories until his death in 1838.

Thomas Jefferson had set the tone for the treatment of Indians in the West up to the time that Andrew Jackson became president in 1829. Jackson believed that Indians should not continue to live in tribal groups as autonomous nations, and that they should be subject to the authority of the state governments in which they resided. Many felt that Indian people were not assimilating fast enough, but Jackson felt that they were incapable of assimilation. This is why he championed a bill in Congress that called for the forcible removal of all Indians still living east of the Mississippi. The Relocation Bill passed Congress and was signed into law on May 28, 1830, which led, among other things, to the "Trail of Tears."

William Clark may have remained a Jeffersonian in his Indian policy beliefs, but was perhaps not persuaded by Jacksonian tactics. We cannot be sure of this thesis because Clark wrote nothing that has survived expressing opposition to Jackson's policies. As an official agent of the government, Clark continued to be bound by his duty to follow edicts from Washington. There can be no doubt that he lamented the consequences of the removal policies, to which he believed there was no alternative. As superintendent of Indian affairs in St. Louis, he witnessed at first hand the ravages wrought upon Indian people by removal, and was one of the few during that era who expressed grave concern about the horrible plight of the relocated tribes.

Despite the terrible things printed about Clark during his lifetime and the hatred of political enemies, when the old man passed away on September 1, 1838, there was general regret. Clark's passing also meant the passing of an era. William Clark died before the peopling of the West by Anglo-Americans began in earnest. But he and Meriwether Lewis had laid the groundwork for all that came later: the massive migration, the entrepreneurship, and the transportation revolution by water-borne and rail-borne steam engines. By the removal of Indian people to the West, by setting a course and a precedent for American laws and customs to be carried into the new West, by leading the effort to make the interests of the United States the paramount ones in the region, Lewis and Clark paved the way for the eventual settlement of the West. They moved American boundaries, interests...
and culture ever further west, and gave the United States a basis for its later claims to the Pacific Northwest and Rocky Mountain region.

Like good soldiers, Lewis and Clark implemented government policy without asking too many hard questions. In their attempts to remake the “untamed frontier” into a mirror image of the United States back east, there is no doubt they believed in the superiority of their own culture and the blessings of American democracy. They gave little thought to the effects their policies had on the French-speaking and native people until, as in the case of Clark, it was too late to reverse the process.

In looking back at these events more than 200 years later, we can learn useful lessons from their mistakes, and also see more clearly that their involvement in the westward expansion of the United States included not just their voyage of discovery, but also the remainder of their post-expedition lives.

Robert J. Moore, Jr., has been the historian for the National Park Service at Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis since 1991. He has written articles for national magazines on Lewis and Clark, westward expansion and Dred Scott. He is the author of eight books.
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The September 23, 1806, arrival of the Lewis and Clark Expedition in St. Louis marked the end of their journey, but the men were far from home and the completion of their duties.

By Thomas C. Danisi and John C. Jackson

On September 23, 1806, members of the Lewis and Clark Expedition stepped out of their boats on the St. Louis riverbank. Their long voyage of discovery was over.

The date of their arrival is confirmed by a letter that the wealthy St. Louis resident John Mullanphy wrote that day. Mullanphy's short, excited note was rushed across the Mississippi River in time to catch a rider headed east:

Concerning the safe arrival of Messrs. Lewis and Clark, who went 2 years and 4 months ago to explore the Missouri, to be anxiously wished for by every one, I have the pleasure to mention, that they arrived here about one hour ago, in good health, with the loss of one man, who died. They visited the Pacific Ocean, which they left on the 27th of March last. They would have been here about the 1st of August, but for the detention they met with from the snow and frost in crossing mountains on which are eternal snows. Their journal will no doubt be not only importantly interesting to us all, but a fortune for the worthy and laudable adventurers. When they arrived, 3 cheers were fired. They really have the appearance of Robinson Crusoes, dressed entirely in buckskins. We shall know all very soon, I have had no particulars yet.¹

Mullanphy's bold stroke was effective as his letter was published in The Palladium, a Frankfort, Kentucky, newspaper, on October 4.

The small, muddy St. Louis village the Corps of Discovery passed 28 months earlier had been an empty stage. Much had changed in the now-bustling fur trade center, but the explorers spent little time there before heading east to take care of business. Lewis and Clark departed St. Louis, a town excited by what the explorers had reported, on about October 21, 1806.

Congress anticipated major changes in trading and hired factors, agents and interpreters to operate new government trading establishments. At the Cantonment Belle Fontaine factory located 18 miles north of St. Louis, the assistant factor George Sibley wrote an enthusiastic letter regarding his expectations. "[W]e shall see floating down the Missouri, valuable cargoes of East-India Merchandise; I need say no more, this bare hint will be sufficient for you to build on for weeks & months. I cannot predict what effect these things will have on my Fortunes tho' certain it is they will have a very material one."²

Lewis and Clark proceeded east with York, Sergeant John Ordway, interpreter Francois Labiche, Osage Indian Agent Pierre Chouteau, and the Mandan
and Osage delegations. Prominent among them was Sheheke-Shote (or Big White) and his family who had come from the Mandan villages. Chouteau thought the trip to Washington, D.C., should take about 40 days, based on his previous delivery of an Indian delegation to the capital.1

The group parted ways at Frankfort, Kentucky, on November 13. Chouteau went directly to Washington with his party including the Osage Indians and interpreters. Clark and York headed to Fincastle, Virginia, to visit the Hancock family. Lewis and the Mandan Indians went to Charlottesville, Virginia, where Lewis visited his family before going on to Washington, D.C. Lewis arrived at his family home in Albemarle County on December 13 and stayed through Christmas Day. He reached Washington late in the evening on December 28 and found a warm welcome at the presidential mansion. Chouteau and his delegation had reached the capital a week earlier.2

On December 30, Lewis met with an old friend, New York Congressman Samuel Mitchell, who had invited Lewis to dine with him at his Washington lodgings. The physician, lawyer, scientist and professor of chemistry admired the astronomical and other scientific attainments of Lewis, who perhaps still was recovering his table manners after two and a half years in the wilderness. It was not meant as flattery when Mitchell noted that a scientist could only look upon Lewis "as a man returned from another planet."3

The celebration continued on New Year's Day when the citizens came to the President's House to pay their respects to the president and glimpse the colorfully dressed Indian entourage. Mitchell paid his compliments to Jefferson at his house on the "Palatine Hills":4

While I was looking round and meditating what to do with myself, the Miss Johnsons ... expressed a desire to be escorted to the side of the room where the newly arrived Indians were. I at once became their pioneer and showed them the King and Queen of the Mandanes, who with a child of theirs, have come from a journey of about 1600 miles down the Missouri to see their great Father the President. His majesties were gaily dressed in a regimental coat, &c, but his Consort was wrapped in a blanket, and had not the smallest ornament about her. She resembled exceedingly one of our Long Island squaws. There was also another Mandane woman there, who was wife to a Canadian White man, that acted as interpreter. She had two children with her. We also looked at the five Osages and the one Delaware warriors.5

A testimonial banquet in Washington, D.C., had been delayed in hope that Clark would arrive. It finally was held in his absence January 14, 1807, and attended by citizens of Washington, several officers of government, members of Congress, and strangers of distinction including Pierre Chouteau, French translator Pierre Provenchere, Mandan chief Sheheke-shote and his personal interpreter René Jusseaume.6

The Washington, D.C., newspaper, The Sun, reported:

Capt. Lewis was received with the liveliest demonstrations of regard. Every one present seemed to be deeply impressed with a sentiment of gratitude, mingled with an elevation of mind, on setting down, at the festive board, with this favorite of fortune, who has thus successfully surmounted the numerous and imminent perils of a tour of nearly four years, through regions previously unexplored by civilized man.7

After an evening at a well-spread table with toasts interspersed between songs and instrumental music, Lewis rose the next morning to address Congress regarding the compensation due members of the expedition. At the opening of Congress, Jefferson briefly detailed the journey of the Corps of Discovery. He recommended additional compensation to show "that Messrs. Lewis and Clarke, and their brave companions, have, by this arduous service, deserved well of their country."8

Lewis promptly delivered a roster of the expedition, which included their rank and his remarks on their respective merits and services. Secretary of War Henry Dearborn transmitted the list of officers, non-commissioned officers and privates who formed the party. He believed that the expedition met "with a degree of boldness, perseverance, and judgment, and success, that has rarely, if ever, occurred, in this or any other country." Dearborn recommended that all the men receive double pay and be granted 320 acres, which they could locate on any surveyed land then for sale in the United States. Lewis would receive 1,500 acres under his recommendation and Clark, 1,000 acres. That didn't satisfy Lewis who proposed to Dearborn "that no distinction of rank so noticed as to make a difference in the quantity of land granted to each," and he preferred "an equal division" of the quantity granted.9

Weeks passed as Congress deliberated on various types of compensation. Gratitude was fleeting. Delay and discussion within Congress were indications that some representatives of the people were not impressed by the results of the expensive adventure. Some failed to see how the exploration had benefited the nation.

Rep. Matthew Lyon believed that double pay amounted to more than $60,000, and coupled with the land grant, could exceed that sum by three or four times. He believed that the companions of Lewis and Clark "might go over all the Western country and locate their warrants on the best land, in 160 acres lots."10
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On February 28, the House deliberated late into the evening before passing legislation bestowing double pay on members of the expedition and a grant of 320 acres in the Territory of Louisiana at the rate of two dollars an acre. Lewis and Clark received 1,600 acres each. The Senate confirmed the bill on March 3.12

In addition to a compensation package for the band of followers, the Jefferson administration had been grappling with the myriad complexities of a new territory and finding a suitable and trustworthy candidate to head it. The president had been trying to establish a territorial government and formulate some basic laws for three years.13

Jefferson and his cabinet saw a potential solution to their dilemma in the appointment of Lewis as governor of the Louisiana Territory. They believed Lewis’s return to St. Louis as governor would erase grievances and restore confidence.

Secretary of the Treasury Albert Gallatin recognized that Lewis would be tied up for several months settling expedition accounts and submitting his final report in Washington, and traveling to Philadelphia to arrange for publication of the journals. He urged Jefferson to appoint a secretary of the Louisiana Territory who would govern in the interim. Jefferson appointed Frederick Bates who already was familiar with territorial politics, land claims, post roads and business affairs.14

On February 28, 1807, President Jefferson issued an order that Lewis was to be governor of the Louisiana Territory. The U.S. Senate confirmed his order two days later.15

However, Lewis remained in Washington completing his obligations. He had to commit all of his expedition expenditures to paper, and the treasury accountant at the War Department, William Simmons, had a reputation for being manic in the pursuit of details. The expenditures were complex and it took time to locate and tabulate the innumerable ledger items. The total cost had risen to $38,000, a ten-fold increase from his original estimate of $2,500 in early 1803.16 A final accounting could not be made because receipts still had not arrived, some vouchers had not come in for payment and others had not been credited. That time-consuming paperwork intruded upon the other matters Lewis was trying to complete.

When Lewis finally left for Philadelphia, he went under an already impossible deadline, and was burdened by the responsibilities of his troubled official post as governor. Lewis intended to distribute the specimens he collected throughout the expedition to those who would help him properly describe and evaluate them and arrange for their expert assistance in compiling a narrative dealing with natural history of the expedition.

Congressional records indicate Sergeant John Ordway was paid $112 to cover travel expenses from St. Louis to Washington, D.C.

In addition to that challenge, he had just a few months to compose a narrative of the great adventure. Meantime, he was disappointed to learn that his audience might be lost. While still in St. Louis, he had given Private Robert Frazer permission to publish his private journal. Now Sergeant Patrick Gass also was planning to publish his notes.

Lewis intended to do more than merely publish the raw field journals. He intended to produce a synthesis of the journals coupled with precise descriptions of the natural history specimens that he had collected, a comprehensive description rather than a mere adventure book as the Gass and Frazer books promised to be.17

He had outlined his intentions with printer John Conrad. From what must have been a rudimentary description, Conrad worked out an estimate of the cost. By the beginning of April 1807, Conrad estimated a total cost of $4,500 and developed a revised proof of the prospectus. The prospectus described a narrative of the voyage in the first volume and a second volume devoted to geography, Indians and the fur trade embellished with a number of plates. A third volume would be confined exclusively to scientific research, principally in natural history under the head of “Botany, Mineralogy, and Zoology ... including a comparative view of twenty-three vocabularies of distinct Indian languages,” and of course, the great map of North America.18

Lewis was pleased when the prospectus was published in the Philadelphia Aurora on June 16, 1807. The following morning, he and his friend Mahlon Dickerson accompanied a party to Peale’s museum to see a stuffed monkey and other exhibits.

During the time Lewis spent in Philadelphia, Dickerson’s record paid close attention to the ladies they visited. During a hot June and July, Dickerson and Lewis visited a number of homes that may have sheltered eligible daughters. The young women might have been impressed by Lewis’s southern manners, but parents observed that his future lay in a frontier French town of uncertain respectability. Additionally, a governor’s lady would be meeting rustic strangers, dirty-linen Frenchmen, Spanish scoundrels and even Indians.

Lewis returned to his family home in Albemarle County on November 3, 1807, and wrote Dickerson to arrange for the education of his half-brother John Marks. Lewis then talked of romance and noted that “his little affair” with Anne Randolph was short, perhaps due to the fact that she was “previously engaged.” The references that Lewis made about his disappointed overtures did not entirely mask shyness. Meantime, Lewis may have met 16-year-
old Letitia Breckenridge or her younger sister Elizabeth, but in the November letter to Dickerson, Lewis revealed that his heart remained in Philadelphia. 19

At the end of November 1807, as he returned to St. Louis to assume his duties, Governor Lewis’s entourage included his brother Reuben and John Pernier, the free mulatto valet whom Jefferson sent along to look after him. 20 There were wagoners and horse handlers to deal with hauling the governor’s papers, the wardrobes of the two young gentlemen and household furnishings necessary to make life bearable in St. Louis. Lewis carried with him the documents of his exploration, which still had to be converted into a narrative of adventure and natural history.

The slow-moving wagon gave the brothers time to wander afield and to look over the lands that belonged to their mother and John Marks, which appeared to be secure. But Lewis’s holding on Brush Creek in the Ohio Military Reserve, descended from his father’s service, was in doubt and Lewis was resigned to losing the greater part of it. When they reached Lexington, Kentucky, on January 14, 1808, the citizens gave Lewis a party “in testimony of their regard and respect for him.” 21 By mid-February, he arrived in Louisville to find that William Clark had been there as late as the third of the month. They had failed to intercept him on the road as he traveled east to his wedding.

Lewis found an opportunity to write their mother that Reuben already had set out in a flat-bottomed boat with the baggage and carriage, accompanied by Major Hughes, Mr. Cox and Pernier. After descending the Ohio for 320 miles, they disembarked on the west side of the Mississippi River and covered the next 165 miles by land. Lewis expected to leave the next day, traveling overland by way of Vincennes (Indiana), and Cahokia (Illinois). He arrived in St. Louis to begin his tenure as governor on March 8, a travel record for that time of year. 22

Foundation member Thomas C. Danisi and John C. Jackson are dedicated researchers and published authors with a broad background in western development. They recently completed a fully documented biography of Meriwether Lewis.
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As with all evolutionary phases of the learning process, the nineteenth century natural history movement had a purposeful development during recorded history, but it lacked the technical quality and exactness of other well-established sciences. Many of the early naturalists regarded an organism as part of nature that only needed to be discovered, recorded and described. For the most part, natural history was largely descriptive, deficient in quantitative data and lacked the solid conceptual fabric found in physics, chemistry and mathematics. Naturalists made little or no attempt to understand the interrelationships of organisms with each other and their environment.

It was common practice for early naturalists to record their descriptions with a dead bird in hand as it was believed that a bird in hand was worth two in the bush. Field binoculars, adequate field guides and color film cameras would not appear until the twentieth century. Bird study and reliable bird records depended primarily on the gun. On August 25, 1804, Captain Meriwether Lewis wrote a brief description of a heron-like bird: “we could not kill it therefore I can not describe it more particularly.”

Natural history, once a well-embraced discipline by nature viewers, eventually lost its position among the established sciences. There was a prejudice against what we now call ecology, based on the belief that if you can’t measure anything quantitatively, then it’s probably not of any scientific value.2

Despite the limitations of many early naturalists, who confined their studies to descriptive biology, natural history’s basic foundation remains with us, but it has evolved into the science of ecology, or natural history quantified. Probably the most comprehensive definition is the simple one most often given—a study of animals and plants in their relation to each other and to their environment. The practitioners of the new natural history carefully gathered a mass of accurate information that required careful analysis by a different brand of expert, who would suggest a new approach to studying nature, something less passive than the idea that everything in nature is an illustration of divine wisdom.3

Before German biologist Ernst Haeckel first proposed the word “ecology” in 1869, many of the great naturalists of the biological renaissance of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries had contributed to the subject. In this group of early naturalists who probed the secrets of living systems and their environment, we include Meriwether Lewis, who possessed an objective, systematic and philosophical approach to better understanding the natural world. It would take time for the scientific community to comprehend the significance of his achievements and ecological insights.

Lewis’s natural history documentations have long
Expedition members filled a prairie dog hole full of water to force the animal out. They killed one and captured another, which they sent to President Jefferson. The prairie dog survived its four-month journey and Jefferson was able to see firsthand the "barking squirrel" of the plains.

been recognized as classics in the nation's biological archives. His literary flair as a gifted biological reporter and his unquenchable curiosity projected natural history information to the reader with a sense of preciseness, greatness and grandeur allowing for a better understanding of the natural setting in the unexplored lands west of the Mississippi River. We gain the distinct impression that Lewis's aesthetic sensitivity to natural systems harbors the vibrant stirrings of an ecological awareness.

The word "discovery" has various meanings among different groups in our society. In the academic arena, the word implies diligent and careful research, statistical evaluation and journal publication for acceptance by the scientific community. Discovery for Lewis and Clark was different in the sense that each day they traveled through uncharted lands provided opportunities for observation and documentation of previously unrecorded information, and allowed the men's inherent faculties to recognize its importance and to accurately record it. This, in itself, and no more, gives us a better understanding of the basic meaning of the word discovery for Lewis and Clark as they traveled through unexplored regions.

Consider for example, Lewis's discovery and documentation of the common poor-will, *Phalaenoptilus nuttalii*, on October 16, 1804, in the vicinity of present-day Emmonsburg, North Dakota: "This day took a small bird alive of the order of the [blank] or goatsuckers. it appeared to be passing into the dormant state. on the morning of the 18th the mercury was at 30 degrees. the bird could scarcely move. I run my penknife into it's body under the wing and completely destroyed its lungs and heart— yet it lived upwards of two hours this fanominon I could not account for unless it proceeded from the want of circulation of the blo[old]."

The key words are "it appeared to be passing into the dormant state." In 1949, 145 years after Lewis's observation, ornithologist E.C. Jaeger substantiated Lewis's theory about the poor-will's hibernation when he found a hibernating poor-will lodged in a rock crevice in the Chuckwalla Mountains of California.

A discussion on the subject of discoveries also has to include the serendipitous or accidental, unanticipated discovery that is revealed in mysterious, unexplainable ways. Lewis and Clark made such a discovery on September 7, 1804, in present-day Boyd County, Nebraska. At the base of a conspicuous 300-foot rock formation they encountered a colony of prairie dogs, *Cynomys ludovicianus*, a species entirely new to them and the scientific world. They collected specimens, preserved skeletons and skins and recorded descriptions. After the discovery, Clark wrote in his journal: "... after diging 6 feet, found by running a pole down that we were not half way down to his Lodges, we found 2 frogs in the hole, and killed a Dark rattle Snake near with a Ground rat in
him ... it is said that a kind of lizard also a snake reside with those animals." The persistent myth that rattlesnakes live in a harmonious relationship with other burrowing inhabitants was discredited when they found a prairie dog in the digestive tract of the rattlesnake.

Lewis made another serendipitous discovery on April 9, 1805, two days after the expedition’s departure from Fort Mandan. Lewis observed Sacagawea probing the ground with a sharp stick, which eventually revealed a large cache of finger-sized roots that had been buried by rodents. Lewis thought they were similar to the edible roots of the Jerusalem artichoke, Helianthus tuberosus, whose geographic range extends into present-day McLean County, North Dakota. Indians apparently did not gather artichokes in the way Lewis described, but rather used this digging method to gather the hog peanut, Amphicarpa bracteata, which, like the artichoke, Indians of the Missouri River used for food. Roots of both species most likely are collected and cached by the meadow mole, Microtus pennsylvanicus.

UNSELFISH DEDICATION

The depth and complexity of President Thomas Jefferson’s detailed set of instructions to Lewis clearly reflected his scientific thinking and organizational skills for collecting exploratory information. Those instructions stipulated that the captains’ observations were to be entered distinctly and intelligibly in a journal. Lewis and Clark regarded these presidential orders as a mandate and responded with energetic brilliance and dedication in fulfilling their assignments. One cannot emphasize enough their dedication in gathering new information, and in some situations under extraordinary circumstances. As a prime example, Lewis was wounded while hunting elk with expedition member Pierre Cruzatte on August 11, 1806. Cruzatte reportedly had mistaken Lewis for an elk and shot Lewis in the fleshy upper part of his left thigh, missing the bone. As the ball exited, it cut a gash in his right buttock. Despite his pain and feverish condition, on August 12, Lewis found the strength to write a detailed, 265-word botanical description of the pin cherry, Prunus pensylvanicus. That was his last biological entry in his journal and one that rightly could be classified as a contribution of the highest order to the botanical archives.

Another dedicated Lewis documentation occurred on the morning of June 15, 1805, at the Great Falls of the Missouri, a day after being chased by a grizzly, charged by three buffalo and encountering a “tyger cat,” which may have been a wolverine. On waking, he observed a prairie rattlesnake, Crotalus viridis, coiled up about 10 feet away in the leaning trunk of a tree he had been sleeping under. After killing the snake, the systematic naturalist took the time to count 176 scales on the abdomen and 17 half-formed rattle segments.

STRUCTURAL ADAPTATIONS

An inherent attribute that proved extremely helpful in Lewis’s numerous discoveries was his astute perception in noticing an animal’s specialized structural adaptations molded through years of natural selection to cope with its physical and biotic environment. Consider, for example, Lewis’s observant eye in noting the specialized adaptation of sharp-tailed grouse, Pedioecetes phasianellus, for moving about on deep snow: “the toes are also curiously bordered on their lower edges with narrow hard scales which are placed very close to each other and extend horizontally about 1/8 of an inch on each side of the toes thus adding to the width of the tread which nature seems bountifully to have furnished them at this season for passing over the snow with more ease. in the summer season those scales fall off.” Lewis was correct. Members of the grouse family solve the problem of locomotion on snow by growing fingerlike scales along the sides of each toe. During the spring, these “snowshoe” fringes molt.

Lewis also noted the specialized adaptations of his Lewis’s woodpecker, Melanerpes lewis, while camped by the Clearwater River in present-day Idaho.

- “the tongue is barbed, pointed ...” In typical woodpeckers, the tongue is barbed at the tip to facilitate extracting larval grubs from bark crevices and excavations in trees.
- “the pointed tail Seems to assist it in sitting with more ease or retaining it in, it’s resting position against the perpendicular Side of a tree.” Woodpecker tail feathers have extra sturdy shafts that help support birds while moving up or down vertical tree trunks.
- “it has four toes on each foot, of which two are in rear and two in front.” Woodpeckers typically have their two outer toes directed backward and the two inner toes forward, providing stability for clinging to and climbing vertical surfaces. Ornithologists at a later date would label this as a zygodactyl toe arrangement.

We also learn from Lewis that an animal’s structural adaptations in obtaining food appear most apparent in the structure of a bird’s beak. While there is wide diversity in the sizes and shapes of beaks, their adaptations seem to
tend toward a generalized bill suitable for eating a variety of foods or toward a highly specialized bill suitable for eating foods of a restricted type.

On May 1, 1805, about 75 miles above the mouth of the Yellowstone River, Lewis wrote a very detailed description of the American avocet, *Recurvirostra Americana*: "... the beak is black and flat, largest where it joins the head, and from thence becoming thinner and tapering to a very sharp point, the upper chap being 1/8 of an inch the longest and turns down at the point and forms a little hook ... the beak is much curved, the curvature being upwards instead of downwards as is common with most birds; the substance of the beak precisely resembles whalebone at a little distance, and is quite as flexible as that substance ... this bird which I shall henceforth stile the Missouri plover, generally feeds about the shallow bars of the river; to collect its food which consists of [blank], it immerses its beak in the water and throws its head and beak from side to side at every step it takes." 8

Lewis clearly explained how the avocet, which he also called the partly coloured plover, used its recurved bill in obtaining food. Avocets often feed in groups, marching shoulder to shoulder through shallow waters, sweeping upturned bills from side to side, like farmers scything hay, and picking up minute crustaceans, aquatic insects and occasionally seeds. Birds with a straight or a downward decurved bill could not feed this way.

Lewis also noted of the gizzard anatomy of the sage grouse, *Centrocercus urophasianus*: "the gizzard of it is large and much less compressed and muscular than in most fowls; in short it resembles a maw quite as much as a gizzard." 9 The sage grouse possesses the typical fowl-like digestive tract with the exception that the stomach is a thin-walled membranous structure as compared with the heavy-walled organ found in most other upland game birds and domestic fowl. Since the sage grouse feeds primarily on the herbaceous leaves of the sage plant and requires little grit in its diet, there is no need for a highly developed gizzard.

**Habitat Documentations**

The word "habitat," where an organism lives and its surroundings, both living and nonliving, did not come into general scientific use until wildlife ecologist Aldo Leopold led a nation to a new perception of nature and to a new vision of its relationship with the natural environment.

Today, we recognize that the habitat of any given animal may be considered from three different positions: Where is it? What is it? Why does this particular animal live there? The first question, which focuses on location, is a special question of spatial geography such as the sagebrush-grasslands bordering the Missouri River in eastern Montana. The second question deals with structural components, which is more complex as it involves geology, topography, vegetation, climate, and a combination of other biological and physical factors. The third question of why this particular species of animal lives in a certain place is more difficult to answer as it attempts to determine why one species rather than another is found there. Our first baseline historical information in answering question number one comes from Lewis and Clark who documented numerous discoveries and provided substantial data on the geographic location of animals observed. Lewis and Clark also introduced new approaches to exploration by recording data on weather, topography and vegetative landscapes, which established the proper basement fabric for future researchers who would investigate question number two and pave the way, step by step, for an accumulation of new knowledge and stirring discoveries that would unfold in later years addressing question number three.

The ecological meaning of the word habitat certainly must have been present in Lewis's thinking. Consider, for example, his May 24, 1805, journal entry while traveling through Montana's Upper Missouri River country: "... the beaver appears to keep pace with the timber as it declines in quantity they also become more scarce." 10 Plant distribution normally determines animal distribution. Animals, of course, are important components of any habitat, but plants are considered the key to a habitat type because they do not move. They generally are the dominant form of life, and they are the
food source on which animals depend for energy, growth and maintenance.

Lewis noted descriptive habitat selections for mule and white-tailed deer (or common deer) in his May 10, 1805, journal entry while traveling through eastern Montana: “we have rarely found the mule deer in any except a rough country; they prefer the open grounds and are seldom found in the woodlands near the river; when they are met with in the woodlands or river bottoms and are pursued, they invariably run to the hills or open country as the Elk do. the contrary happens with the common deer.” Surprisingly, in his detailed description of the mule deer, Lewis makes no mention of the deer’s unique four-legged bounding, pogo-stick style of running in steep, boulder strewn terrain, unlike the whitetail that has a smooth-flowing loping elegance when running. He does mention, however, that the bounding gait of the Columbian-black tail deer was similar to that of the mule deer in “...bounding with all four feet off the ground at the same time when running at full speed and not loping as the common deer or antelope do.”

Although the evolutionary significance of the mule deer’s bounding gait still remains a matter of uncertainty, it probably serves as a movement adaptation designed for a steep, rough and obstacle-filled terrain.

When time, circumstances and interest permitted, Lewis did an exemplary job of providing not only a detailed description of a species, but also comments on other points of significance that might have been missed by another observer. For example, Lewis’s “cock of the plains” (sage grouse, Centrocercus urophasianus) discovery in the vicinity of the Marias River, which he further described in his Fort Clatsop journal entry for March 2, 1806, provides an excellent physical description of food habits, gizzard anatomy, taste palatability, flight patterns, and a habitat description in which he mentions that he could not recall ever seeing sage grouse except in the neighborhood of pulpy-leaved thorn, or greasewood, Sarcobatus vermiculatus. (Lewis actually meant “wild hyssop,” which is recognized as big sagebrush, Artemesia tridentata.) Use of sagebrush by this upland game bird for various daily and seasonal activities demonstrates the inseparable relation of sage grouse and sagebrush.

While the Lewis and Clark journals do not provide a complete picture of plant communities in the various physiographic regions they passed through, they do underscore that whether we are talking about historical or present times, dynamic and competitive forces in the environment are constantly at work. Lewis’s comments on plants represent a single frame from a motion picture film, an arrested moment in the long and complex history of living things. For example, on numerous occasions historians have written with descriptive rhetoric of the “tall limber grasses” that would bend “under a passing horse’s belly.” Thus a reader is left with the impression that the Upper Missouri Great Plains once consisted of an endless sea of tall grasses rippling under capricious winds. Lewis was the first to document that such interpretations were not necessarily correct. Reflecting on a vegetative landscape near the Great Falls of the Missouri, he wrote: “immense quantities of small grasshoppers of a brown colour in the plains, they no doubt contribute much to keep the grass as low as we find it which is not generally more than three inches ...”

During their painstaking portage around the Great Falls of the Missouri, Lewis noted that the spiny beds of prickly pear added another dimension to their growing list of trials. Their Great Falls portage cut across many
buffalo migration routes they encountered during their journey through the plains country. The abundance of prickly pear cactus in such areas served as mute testimony that overgrazing was but one of the factors operating in plant successional stages. Contrary to what is commonly believed today, overgrazing in certain areas of Montana and other plains areas occurred long before the first Texas trail herds arrived.

**Observational Competency**

Lewis and Clark were confused by the different color phases of the grizzly bear, *Ursus arctos horribilis*, described by the explorers as white, gray, red, yellow, black or grizzly (meaning hairs having lighter, whitish tips). Lewis wondered if the bear’s different color phases represented as many as twenty different species. After careful consideration over the complexity of the problem, Lewis correctly concluded that they were a single species, an ecological insight that came to him on May 14, 1806, while waiting in a Nez Perce camp for snow to melt in the Bitterroot Mountains. He wrote: "perhaps it would not be inappropriate to designate them the variagated bear." 16

The trait of observational competency is readily noted in Lewis’s observation of the prairie dog and his curiosity as to how survival was possible for this animal without an available source of free-standing water: “there is a large assemblage of the burrows of the Burrowing Squirrel they generally seelct a south or south Easterly exposure for their residence, and never visit the brooks or river for water; I am astonished how this anamal exists as it dose without water, particularly in a country like this where there is scarcely any rain during ¾ of the year ... yet we have sometimes found their villages at the distance of five or six miles from any water ...” 17

Answers to his curiosity would not surface until decades later when researchers discovered that other arid-land rodent species, in addition to the prairie dog, including the kangaroo rat, *Dipodomys ordii*, and the pocket mouse, *Perognathus spp.*, can live their entire lives without drinking water. Instead, they use the metabolic water produced through the breakdown of the oils and fats in the seeds they eat. Water is conserved further by their excretion of highly concentrated urine.

Lewis’s observational prowess is noted when he briefly touches on the subject of light refraction for his September 17, 1804, description of the black-billed magpie, *Pica pica*, and its iridescent colors: “the upper side of the wing, as well as the short side of the plumage of the partly coloured feathers is of a dark blackis or bluish green sometimes presenting as light orange yellow or bluish tint as it happens to be presented to different exposures of ligt ... the underside of the feathers is a pale black, the upper side is a dark blueish green which like the outer part of the wings is changable as it reflects different portions of light. towards the extremity of these feathers they become of an orange green, then shaded pass to a redish indigo blue, and again at the extremity assume the predominant colour of changeable green—the tints of these feathers are very similar and equally as beautifal and rich as the tints of blue and green of the peacock—” 19

The color found in birds is produced in two ways, by pigments (lipochromes and melanins) or by the physical structure of the feathers. Bird color pigments were unknown to scientists during this early timeframe, but Lewis’s note, “reflects different portions of light,” refers to the fact that he was aware that the physical structure of the feathers produces the iridescent shimmering play of colors: the iridescent and interchanging colors so commonly observed on hummingbirds, grackles and the necks of pigeons are due to the interference or unequal dispersion of light from special feather structure.

**Collecting Technical Data—Counting and Measuring**

In 1883, physicist Lord Kelvin wrote: “When you can measure what you are speaking about and express it in numbers you know something about it. When you cannot measure it, when you cannot express it in numbers, your knowledge is of a meager and unsatisfactory kind; it may be the beginning of knowledge, but you have scarcely, in your thoughts, advanced to the stage of science, whatever the matter may be.” 20
The common egret has a large platform nest, usually high in a tree, in or by water, and sometimes in thickets or marsh vegetation. Lewis noted the bird inhabited ponds and marshes, and fed upon tadpoles, frogs and small fish.

Lewis conscientiously counted, weighed and measured at every opportunity. When describing a zoological specimen, he undoubtedly felt that by accurately recording measurements, he could add further credibility to his discovery. When his measurements for various species are compared with those in current field guides, they are amazingly accurate. His August 2, 1804, recording of the common egret, *Casmerodius albus*, serves as a prime example of his meticulous attention to detail.

- **Body weight**—two pounds
- **Body length** (tip of beak to tip of toe)—4 feet, 7¼ inches
- **Eye length**—seven-tenths of half an inch
- **Wing length**—4 feet, 11 inches
- **Beak length**—5 inches
- **First wing joint length**—6 inches; 7 feathers; feather length—3 inches
- **Second wing joint length**—8¾ inches; 18 feathers; feather length—6 inches
- **Third wing joint length**—3½ inches; 6 feathers; feather length—10 to 12 inches
- **Fourth wing joint length**—1 inch; 5 feathers; feather length—12 inches
- **Toe (including nail) length for four toes starting with outside front toe—**4¼, 4¾, 3¼ inches. Hind toe—3 inches
- **Tail; 12 feathers—**6 inches

**Collecting phenological data**

As instructed by President Jefferson, Lewis paid close attention to the dates at which particular plants flowered. Although Lewis was unaware of it, he was dabbling in a later-developed branch of science known as phenology that deals with the correlation between climate and seasonal biological phenomena such as the flowering and fruiting of plants and migration of birds. The secrets of how an organism responds to external climatic stimuli have yet to be discovered.²²

The following entries are a modest sampling of Lewis’s attentiveness to this subject:

- **June 3, 1805**, in the vicinity of the Marias River—“saw the yellow and red courants, not yet ripe; also the goosberry which begins to ripen; the wild rose ... is now in full bloom.”²³
- **June 25, 1805**, Great Falls area—“there is a species of wild rye which is now heading ...”²⁴
- **July 15, 1805**, in the vicinity of the Smith River—“the prickly pear is now in full bloom and forms one of the beauties as well as the greatest pests of the plains. the sunflower is also in bloom and is abundant.”²⁵
- **April 11, 1805**, near the mouth of the Little Missouri River—“The lark woodpecker, with yellow wings, and a black spot on the breast common to the U’ States has appeared ... many plants begin to appear above the ground ... the Eagle is now laying their eggs, and the gees have mated.”²⁶
- **April 21, 1805**, Little Muddy River—“the Elk are begin to shed their horns.”²⁷
- **June 14, 1805**, Great Falls area—“the young geese are now completely feathered except the wings which both in the young and old are yet deficient.”²⁸
- **June 30, 1806**, near Travelers’ Rest—“I also met with the plant in bloom which is sometimes called the lady’s slipper or mockerson flower.”²⁹

**Historic truth**

Historic truth is a fundamental fabric to natural historians reviewing historical documents. With reliable and accurate information, it is possible to reconstruct early ecological observations and trends over the years for specific geographic localities. Although such early natural history documentations are by no means a definitive work and should be considered only as a starting point with which to begin a serious investigation into a pre-settlement environment, they can pave the way for the development of more comprehensive fabrics that can be woven from the criss-crossing threads of an almost limitless variety of possibilities.

The picture we visualize, thanks to Lewis’s observant eye and active pen, is one highly colored with enlightening biological information. From a diverse and
enlightening biological information. From a diverse and complex array of assignments, emerged an incredible accumulation of scientific information, which left a lasting imprint on the scientific community. Today, no symposium on the natural history of the West can ignore his significant contributions to the biological archives and the scientific community.

Foundation member Kenneth Walcheck, a retired wildlife biologist, lives in Bozeman, Montana. He is a longtime contributor to WPO. His last article, "We eat an eminence of meat," appeared in the August 2006 issue.

Notes
1 Gary E. Moulton, ed., The Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, 13 volumes (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983-2001), Vol. 3, p. 12. All quotations or references to journal entries in the ensuing text are from Moulton, by date. This was the accepted way of how things were done and one reason why many journal entries on bird observations are incomplete, making it difficult or impossible to determine which species was observed.

2 For some early naturalists, the first immediate response was to record the new discovery and then breathe a sigh of relief, lest by chance the species disappeared before receiving its baptism of a Latin scientific name. They assumed that those unknown forces that caused its creation also could cause its disappearance at any time.

3 The word ecology stems from the Greek oikos meaning "household" or "home." Thus, ecology deals with the organism and where it lives. Ecology, a multidisciplinary science, springing from the roots of plant geography and natural history, began with the descriptive studies of organisms by early naturalists. The natural history of birds and mammals as discussed by John James Audubon, Alexander Wilson and William Brewster essentially is ecology.


5 Ibid., p. 53. Corps members killed one prairie dog and caught a live one by pouring "a great quantity of water in his hole."

6 Ibid., Vol. 6, p. 366. March 1, 1806.


8 Ibid., Vol. 4, p. 97.

9 Ibid., Vol. 6, p. 570. The maw is the receptacle into which food is taken by swallowing, such as the throat, crop or stomach.

10 Ibid., Vol. 4 pp. 189-190.

11 Ibid., pp. 136-137.

12 Ibid., Vol. 6, p. 328.

13 Bounding (stotting) of mule deer possibly can serve as a complex system of predator avoidance. In personal communication with the author, wildlife behaviorist Valerius Geist suggests that the bounding adaptation permits the deer to foil a predator's attack by its sudden movement latterly during its bounding jump in an unpredicted direction, thereby escaping the predator's lunge and placing terrain obstacles (boulders, brush, etc.) between itself and the predator.

14 The original range distribution of sage grouse mirrored that of the distribution of big sagebrush and related species.


16 The species has been defined as a group of actually or potentially interbreeding populations that are isolated reproductively from other such groups. Such a definition of a species is applicable only to bisexual organisms. Species—the kind of animal—usually is the smallest unit recognized in zoological field work, but specialists working closely with many individuals of the same species from different parts of the species' range often can sort them into geographic groups—eastern, western, southern, desert and coastal—and designate them as geographic races. These races may differ only in superficial characteristics such as size or intensity of color, but still are capable of interbreeding with each other.

17 Moulton, Vol. 7, p. 256. Despite Lewis's common-sense decision that there was only one species of grizzly, color variations observed in the red fox (cross fox, May 31, 1805; and silver fox, Feb. 21, 1806); and black bear (cinnamon bear, May 31, 1806) led him to believe they were different species. Like many later-day naturalists, the explorers were not familiar with the fact that the red fox and black bear produce color variations in the same litter.

18 Ibid., Vol. 4, pp. 183-184.

19 Ibid., Vol. 3, p. 84.


21 Moulton, Vol. 2, pp. 436-437. The reader may wonder why all of the trail documentations did not receive such careful measurements. Many factors including, but not limited to, exhaustion, travel difficulties, adverse weather, illness and higher priorities often prevented Lewis from recording detailed measurements. The greatest number of faunal trail discoveries occurred when the expedition halted for an extended period of time. Extended stays at Fort Mandan, the Marias River, the Great Falls of the Missouri and Fort Clatsop allowed additional time for observations, exploration, species collection and sufficient time to record their discoveries. Additional biological information also was obtained from Indians at Fort Mandan and Fort Clatsop.

22 The calendar-like regularity of the spring and fall plant and animal occurrences of many species is without doubt the consequence of the accumulated effects of millennia of climatic cycles impressed on the sensitive living cells of plants and animals.


24 Ibid., p. 331.

25 Ibid., p. 383.

26 Ibid., pp. 93-94. Lewis was referring to the Northern flicker, Colaptes auratus, in his reference to the lark woodpecker.

27 Ibid., p. 57.


29 Ibid., Vol. 8, p. 66.
FOLLOWING THE PERIPATETIC CAPTAINS

Walking in the footsteps of Lewis and Clark can help modern-day explorers better understand the journey.

NOS IUNGAT AMBULARE

BY ROBERT R. HUNT

Lewis and Clark were the writingest explorers of their time,” according to Donald Jackson, a quintessential source for understanding the Lewis and Clark Expedition. He might well have added that they also were the walkingest explorers.

Some of the “writingest” parts of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark’s journals are about walking. The author has counted 247 journal entries by the captains in which they mention walking, 157 by Clark and 90 by Lewis. Those references calculate to at least 1,600 miles of walking by the captains throughout the expedition, 900 miles for Clark and 700 for Lewis. The disparity reflects the many months in which there are no journal entries from Lewis.

It is not just the statistics of hours and miles logged by these explorers that compel attention. Picture Lewis and Clark outside the context of their historic mission. Imagine them in the broad frame of Euro-American life of the time, as people moved about increasingly by horse, boat and wheel carriage. Samuel Johnson, a great literary figure of the eighteenth century, quoting a French author, noted “very few men know how to take a walk.” It was only at the end of the century that literary figures including William Wordsworth and Samuel Taylor Coleridge expounded the virtues of walking.

Their publication in 1797 of Lyrical Ballads signaled a literary movement “due in great part, if not mainly to the renewed practice of walking.” A growing body of literature led to a sentimental “Walkers Hall of Fame,” enshrining Wordsworth and his sister Dorothy, along with Coleridge, Mary Wollstonecraft, John Keats, Alfred Tennyson, Thomas DeQuincy, Matthew Arnold and other famous literary ramblers. Charles Dickens also belongs in this company. His essay, “Night Walks,” prompted a prescription: “If you can’t sleep, try walking.”

In America, the heritage includes the likes of John James Audubon, Henry David Thoreau, Ralph Waldo Emerson and Walt Whitman—a lengthening chain even today.

Meriwether Lewis and William Clark are uniquely part of this heritage; they should be known as not solely westering explorers, but also as exemplary walkers. They can be viewed today as emblems of the spirit of walking in America.

It must be noted that Lewis and Clark had to walk. They were on a military mission under orders from President Thomas Jefferson, whose instructions implied a land-based, walking effort involving mapping, collecting natural history specimens and observing native cultures. Additionally, the captains had to assure food, shelter, clothing and forward progression for the Corps of Discovery.

Walking offered Clark, always a mapmaker, the opportunity to sight, measure and take notes. It brings to mind the old walking dictum that “nothing educates an eye for features of a landscape so well as the practice of measuring it with your own legs.”

Lewis walked on shore to engage important local contacts, from government officials to traders and tribal
As the rest of his companions looked on, expedition Private Hugh McNeal put one moccasined foot on each side of a small rivulet of water high in the Rocky Mountains just beneath the Continental Divide, thrust his musket skyward, lifted his head "... and thanked his God that he had lived to bestride the mighty and heretofore deemed endless Missouri." (Journal entry of Captain Lewis, August 12, 1805.)

Leaders. He also walked many miles as he collected plant and animals specimens and recorded information on landscapes. Both captains traversed land to scout their route and hunt.

Two characteristics identify the imperative locations where the captains were forced to walk: 1) decision points for the course of the journey, such as the junction of the Marias and Missouri rivers; and 2) hazardous places including river rapids and falls such as the descents down the Columbia River.

Other important checkpoints compelled the captains to walk on shore. Many such places, two hundred years later, have been memorialized. They are conspicuous places, which attract modern-day tourists looking to walk in the footsteps of Lewis and Clark. Examples include the heights above the confluence of the Kansas and Missouri rivers, Floyd's Bluff, the river landing at the site of the expedition's confrontation with the Teton Sioux, Lemhi and Lolo mountain passes and the Pacific shore.

Assuredly, not all walking was for business purposes. Some of the rambling, tramping, traipsing and sauntering was for amusement.

It is clear that the captains enjoyed opportunities to view the scenic wonders of their journey as they walked. One exults with Lewis, reading of his walk on Aug. 12, 1805, when he reached Lemhi Pass "... the road took us to the most distant fountain of the waters of the mighty Missouri in surch of which we have spent so many toilsome days and wrisless nights. thus far I had accomplished one of those great objects on which my mind has been unalterably fixed for many years, judge then the pleasure I felt in allaying my thirst with this pure and ice cold water which issues from the base of a low mountain ..." 10

Clark, too, rejoiced in the refreshments of nature. Ashore on July 4, 1804, he noted "one of the most butifull Plains, I ever Saw ... the variety of flours Delicately and highly flavored raised above the Grass, which Strikes & profumes the Sensation, and amuses the mind throws it into Conjecterig the cause of So magnificent a Senserey ... far removed from the Sivilised world to be enjoyed by nothing but the Buffalo Elk Deer & Bear ..." 11

These images of the captains striding across the West reflect ingrained walking habits Lewis must have assumed as a youthful family neighbor of his mentor, Thomas Jefferson, near Monticello. He would have been familiar with Jefferson's thoughts regarding the benefits of walking. In a letter to his young nephew Peter Carr on August 19, 1785, Jefferson wrote, "Walking is the best possible exercise. Habituate yourself to walk very far ... Let your gun ... be the constant companion of your walks." 12

An important decision for any traveler on foot is what to carry. On June 3, 1805, at the Marias-Missouri river junction, Lewis noted, "I had now my sack and blanket happenst in readiness to swing on my back, which is the first time in my life that I had ever prepared a burthen of this kind, and I am fully convinced that it will not be the last." 13 What had he carried during his previous excursions when confronting challenging situations?
From the journals, we know that on routine shore walks, Lewis and Clark carried their guns, and sometimes their espiroons. There are few clues to reveal what the captains carried in their backpacks on longer walks. With meager references and more guesswork, the author offers a checklist of the contents of a backpack carried for jaunts longer than a day:

- Extra clothing and moccasins (July 30, 1805)
- Spy glass (July 17, 1806)
- Watch, in a pocket or on the pack (June 29, 1805)
- Shot pouch, horn, tomahawk and wiping rod (June 29, 1805)
- Umbrella and compass (June 19, 1805)
- Food snacks, i.e., "... bisquit ... jirk of Elk ..." (September 17, 1804)
- Medical items such as a pen knife for bleeding, Rush's pills and opium
- Light trade items such as fish hooks, beads and flint
- Canteen
- Technical instruments and equipment for astronomical and mapping observations such as an octant, sextant and chronometer.

There often were as many miseries and dangers as there were pleasures for the captains while walking. They suffered, among many other annoyances and dangers, frozen feet, mosquitoes, grizzly bear threats, obstructive winds, prickly pear, boils and blisters.

Lewis and Clark frequently were accompanied on their walks by members of the party, particularly during scouting and hunting ventures. The captains were cautious about walking together. They had determined October 26, 1804, that for security reasons they should not leave the boat at the same time, "... until we knew the Desposition of the Nativs." This was not an inviolable rule, however, and there were some exceptions.

Not to be ignored among his "companionable walks" is one recorded April 22, 1805, by Lewis following a walk with his dog, Seaman, during which they acquired an additional companion. "... I met with a buffaloe calf which attached itself to me and continued to follow close at my heels ... it appeared alarmed at my dog which was probably the cause of it's so readily attaching itself to me." This companion stuck with Lewis for a distance of six or seven miles.

All of these images of the peripatetic captains have become imprinted on the national consciousness. Lewis and Clark represent the spirit of walking in America, and belong in any walkers' hall of fame. The walks in their journals are distinct among the "accounts of men who walked out upon America with a clear and eager eye and put down their actual experiences with honesty and without artifice." Two hundred years later, the records of their walks (alongside the writings of Audubon, John Muir, Emerson, Thoreau and other famous walkers) inspire those who set foot on our national trails, offering images "to brood over from here to yonder craggy point ... and from thence onward to the far distant horizon."
Make your own discoveries and stay fit on the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail

Following in the footsteps of Captains Meriwether Lewis and William Clark is a favorite pastime of many Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation members. Advantages include seeing the trail from the explorers’ viewpoint, gaining a more thorough understanding of a significant element of America’s heritage and staying fit. From Monticello to Astoria, there are hundreds of hikes, walks and places to stretch your legs. Undoubtedly, each member has his or her favorites. The following are suggestions from foundation members for places to enjoy the beauty of the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail, learn new information about the Corps of Discovery and maintain a healthy lifestyle. This list is by no means all inclusive; it’s simply a sampling. All are encouraged to explore and find special places for themselves.

Tillamook Head: The farthest point reached by the Lewis and Clark Expedition was not at the mouth of the Columbia River, but rather 20 miles south at Tillamook Head. Today a section of the Oregon Coast Trail in Ecola State Park follows the explorers’ route to the dramatic, thousand-foot cliff of Tillamook Head. This is a moderate, 3.6-mile loop, which gains 900 feet of elevation. It is open all year and a $3 day-use parking fee is collected at the park’s entrance. Drive west from Portland on Highway 26 to the Oregon Coast. Turn left on Highway 101 for 3 miles, take the north exit for Cannon Beach and follow Ecola State Park signs, keeping right for 2 miles to the park’s entrance booth. Turn right at the booth for 1.5 miles to the Indian Beach picnic area parking lot.

Fort to Sea Trail: The Fort-to-Sea Trail replicates the route the Corps of Discovery may have taken from the original site of Fort Clatsop to the Pacific Ocean. Hikers stroll through a varied landscape of wetlands, coastal woods, along the edge of a coastal lake and through shore-pine covered dunes. The moderate trail starts at Fort Clatsop near Warrenton, Oregon, and continues for 6.5 miles to Sunset Beach. The section from Sunset Beach trailhead to the viewing platform overlooking the Pacific Ocean is ADA accessible. This part of the trail is graveled and has wide footbridges. There are shorter segments along the trail that can be explored.

Howard Creek: In 1805 and 1806, Lewis and Clark followed part of the Nii Mii Poo Trail along the south facing slopes above Lolo Creek. This is a moderate, two-mile hike that gains 600 feet in elevation. A few steep sections of the trail can be a bit strenuous. From Missoula, Montana, go south on Highway 93 to Lolo; turn west on Highway 12 and go 18.5 miles to the Howard Creek turnout. There is a parking area, picnic area and toilet about half a mile off the highway. Folks looking for a longer hike can continue on to Lolo Hot Springs from Howard Creek, roughly six miles.

Lewis and Clark Pass: On July 7, 1806, Lewis’s homebound party climbed to the top of what is now Lewis and Clark Pass and saw the landscape stretch endlessly in every direction. They spotted a prominent landmark, Square Butte, to the north and knew they were on their way home. The 1.5-mile (3 miles total) trail is well groomed and very clear. There is no shade for a significant portion of the hike and the incline of this moderate hike is steep at times. The trailhead is nine miles east of Lincoln, Montana, on Highway 200, then up a gravel road 11 miles. Parking, picnic facilities and restrooms are available.

Spirit Mound: Lewis and Clark reported that the people of the Omaha, Oto and Yankton tribes believed the mound was occupied by little people who shot any human who came near. Visitors can reach the top of Spirit Mound by way of a ¼-mile trail with moderate hills. The area recently was restored to natural prairie grasses similar to what Lewis and Clark would have seen. The trail is five miles north of Vermillion, South Dakota, on Highway 19. Parking, picnic facilities and restrooms are available.

Katy Trail: The Katy Trail is a 225-mile bike path stretching across most of the state of Missouri. About 150 miles of it follows Lewis and Clark’s path up the Missouri River beneath towering river bluffs from St. Charles to Boonville. The trail is a Missouri State Park and a rails-to-trails project. It is all easy, level walking on gravel with opportunities for short walks or long hikes as well as bicycling.

Falls of the Ohio: Any riverfront along the Ohio that allows walking or bicycling parallels the 1803 route of the explorers. There are parks, historical sites, and other areas of access from Pittsburgh to the confluence of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers. A particularly good place to enjoy following the Ohio River Trail of Lewis and Clark is the Falls of the Ohio area. The Louisville metropolitan area has miles of developed walking and bicycling routes along the river as well as Lewis and Clark related sites slightly inland that allow people not only to follow the trail, but also visit historic sites. Across the river in Clarksville, Indiana, a series of riverfront parks and paths also allows wonderful access to the riverfront.

—Wendy Raney
Explorers and missionaries shared biases toward Indians, had different impacts

Bringing Indians to the Book
Albert Furtwangler
University of Washington Press
226 pages/$22.50 paper

Albert Furtwangler's *Bringing Indians to the Book* is an engaging and original study of early missionaries in the Pacific Northwest and the difficulties they faced. It is also a critique of the Lewis and Clark Expedition's relationship with Indians of the Columbia Basin—one that examines both the differences and underlying similarities between the explorers' and missionaries' mostly negative attitudes toward tribal cultures.

Lewis and Clark had been gone from the Oregon country for a generation when the first missionaries appeared on the scene, but the latter group's presence owed much to William Clark in his capacity as the U.S. superintendent of Indian affairs. In 1831, a delegation of Nez Perce Indians arrived in St. Louis, sent by their tribe to ask Clark about the Bible and Christianity. The Indians, according to a contemporary account, had learned that their own religion was "radically wrong" and that whites were "in possession of the true mode of worshipping the great Spirit." Clark (who was at best nominally devout) obliged by explaining the tenets of Christian faith and encouraging them in their spiritual quest.

When evangelical organizations back East learned of this extraordinary encounter, they responded by dispatching the first missionaries—Jason and Daniel Lee, Marcus and Narcissa Whitman, Henry and Eliza Spalding—into the country first penetrated by the Corps of Discovery. The missionaries' lot was generally one of loneliness, frustration, depression and despair. Initially at least, few Indians showed any interest in their preachings. The missionaries worked in isolated posts, quarreled over doctrine and methods, and lost wives and children to disease. Some abandoned their missions after a few years. One committed suicide, and the Whitmans were murdered by the very Indians they had come to help.

By comparison, Lewis and Clark had it easy. They spent just five months in their winter quarters at Fort Clatsop, where they collected a wealth of ethnographic information about the Chinooks and other tribes of the region before heading home.

The explorers and missionaries came to the Pacific Northwest for vastly different purposes, but Furtwangler shows how these "bookish invaders" shared similar biases. His theme is the clash of literate and oral cultures and the inability of the former to fully comprehend or respect the latter: "When the explorers and missionaries came west bearing books, they carried them not only in their baggage but in their most commonplace thoughts and habits."

*Bringing Indians to the Book* is a densely erudite work that is difficult to summarize. It is not a conventional narrative history so much as an extended essay. Furtwangler, a professor of English affiliated with Willamette University and the author of *Acts of Discovery: Visions of America in the Lewis and Clark Journals* (University of Illinois Press, 1999), looks at his subject through multiple lenses of history, anthropology, literature and linguistics. He is deeply analytical, but his writing is fluid and mostly easy to follow, even when it occasionally addresses topics of greater interest to academics than general readers.

Devotees of the Corps of Discovery will be drawn to the chapter titled "Columbia Rediviva," after the Boston-based merchant ship credited with discovering the Columbia River. That was in 1792, 13 years before Lewis and Clark reached the Pacific. The first missionaries, Jason and Daniel Lee, followed Lewis and Clark 19 years later. They were greeted by Dr. John McLoughlin, the chief factor at Fort Vancouver, the Hudson's Bay Company post on the north shore of the lower estuary. McLoughlin helped them settle in the Willamette Valley. By 1840, writes Furtwangler, "a chain of mission compounds stretched along the route Lewis and Clark had traced three decades earlier."

The author compares the explorers' experiences in the region with those of the missionaries, beginning with organization. "Lewis and Clark," he writes, "led a select military expedition to the Pacific, with all the advantages that implies," including tight discipline and a hardy esprit de corps. Jason Lee, by contrast, "had no such authority and no such morale. Once he was established in Oregon, his followers came to him in irregular groups and often were chosen by mission boards that ignored his stipulations." While "Lewis and Clark had very clear
and full instructions" from Thomas Jefferson, the missionaries “lacked such clear directions.” Lewis and Clark assumed they were in control of their fate and acted accordingly, while the missionaries tended to put their faith in God and hope for the best, often with tragic results.

As students of the expedition know, the captains held relatively low opinions of the lower Columbia Indians, and their view of them steadily darkened during the gloomy winter at Fort Clatsop. Furtwangler assesses the notorious “battery of Venus” passage in Lewis’s journal about Clatsop women, which dwells at length on their alleged deformities, lack of hygiene and the brazen immodesty of their cedar-bark skirts. The very sight of what Lewis called these “dirty naked wenches” repelled him.

As an antidote to Lewis’s starkly negative view, Furtwangler introduces Celieast Smith, the Clatsop wife of a settler who helped the Methodist missionary John Frost when he entered the country in 1840. Celieast was at least partially Christianized and served as a translator. “Long after the mission had faded away,” notes Furtwangler, “the Smiths were still prospering on the land,” their “long and apparently stable marriage” belying Lewis’s judgment that “Clatsop women could only be repugnant to any sensible white man.” (Coincidentally, Celieast was the daughter of Coboway, the Clatsop headman who befriended Lewis and Clark, whom she remembered from her childhood.)

John Frost, adds Furtwangler, “seems to have looked past” the Smiths’ virtues, and he condemned the natives in the same harsh tones as Lewis: “To his mind, the Indians of the region moved in a spiritual, moral darkness that the missions were ill-prepared to combat. If Lewis saw Indians as physically ugly, Frost saw them as almost hopelessly depraved.”

Furtwangler argues that the “bookishness” uniting the explorers and missionaries represented an unbridgeable gulf between them and the alien, preliterate natives. Ultimately, of course, white hegemony overwhelmed the ancient ways. Indians abandoned ancestral beliefs and converted. They learned to speak English and to read and write.

Ironically, much of today’s knowledge of the old oral cultures comes from the written records, however biased and incomplete, left by explorers, missionaries and early anthropologists. The author describes current efforts by the Confederate Tribes of Grande Ronde to teach their children Chinook Jargon, the coastal trade language in use when Lewis and Clark descended the Columbia. It is still spoken by a few elders, but the tribal languages on which it is based are effectively dead. “The youngsters learn orally,” Furtwangler observes, “but words are also spelled out phonetically in a modified Roman alphabet,” and teaching aids include children’s books with characters like Olivia the Pig. “The strain between oral and literate cultures goes on, with popular bookishness called in to preserve remaining whispers from the past.”

—J.L. Merritt

---

NOW AVAILABLE

Lewis and Clark’s Journey across Missouri
Brett Dauter and other contributors

This beautifully photographed and illustrated book explores Lewis and Clark’s time in Missouri through journal excerpts, one-of-a-kind maps made by nationally known geographer James Harlan that locate the Corps of Discovery’s campsites, and an along-the-river guide for travelers who wish to explore the historic towns, state parks, and other points of interest. Individual chapters also probe the river then and now, the Native Americans then in the state, the fur trade at the time, the last European settlement on the river, and contemporary flora and fauna of Missouri.

114 pages, 124 color illustrations, $24.95 paper

Seaman’s Journey
with Lewis and Clark
Linda Couchman, Linda Hailey, Melinda Hailey, and Linda Warner

Designed by teachers, this colorfully illustrated book for ages 9 and up includes thoughtful, creative opportunities to learn about the Corps of Discovery. The book features double-page spreads for each of the states along the journey, along with relevant social studies content, including state capitals and state mottos. Activities include mazes, games, and word searches. 148 pages, 280 color illustrations, $24.95 paper

These books are distributed by University of Missouri Press for Missouri Life

Available at local bookstores or
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Keepers of the Story - Stewards of the Trail
Annual meeting speakers announced, Jenkins leaves L&C National Historic Park

The foundation’s 39th annual meeting, “Reporting Back to Jefferson,” August 5-7 in Charlottesville, Virginia, will offer a broad array of speakers covering the time period beginning with Meriwether Lewis’s return trip to Charlottesville with Mandan chief Sheheke-shote and ending with the final disposition of materials to President Thomas Jefferson in Washington, D.C., and the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia.

Speakers for the event include: Dr. Peter Kastor, associate professor of history at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri; Dr. Castle McLaughlin from the Peabody Museum in Cambridge, Massachusetts; Dr. Carolyn Gilman from the Missouri Historical Society in St. Louis; Dr. Elizabeth Chew from the Thomas Jefferson Foundation in Charlottesville, Virginia; and Robert S. Cox, a past curator for the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and current head of special collections and university archives at the W.E.B. DuBois Library at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst.

Authors Larry Morris and Tracy Potter will speak about what ultimately became of Corps of Discovery members and the Indians who traveled to Washington, D.C., in particular Sheheke-shote.

Interesting information will be offered by Trent Strickland, a member of the Carolinas Chapter, who will speak on Richard Warfington, the only expedition member from North Carolina; Jane Henley, a past foundation president and a collateral descendant of Lewis, who will speak about Lewis’s return trip through the Cumberland Gap to Charlottesville; Peter Hatch, director of the Thomas Jefferson Center for Historic Plants, who will share his PowerPoint presentation on the plants of the expedition; and Dr. Douglas Seefeldt, who will share his experiences with the University of Virginia’s digital project on Lewis and Clark. Bob Anderson, a descendant of Private George Shannon, and Julia Teuschler will talk about the experiences of the reenactors who traveled the trail from 2003-2006.

Most of these presenters will be sharing information with foundation members for the first time and will offer new insights to the “wrap up” period of the Lewis and Clark Expedition.

Station Camp addition completes park
Chip Jenkins, superintendent of Lewis and Clark National Historical Park, has accepted the top job at North Cascades National Park in northern Washington, which he took over April 15.

“This is a tremendous professional opportunity and a good place for my family,” Jenkins said. “I have been blessed to be here at a time of great opportunity. At times I’ve had a chance to lead, at times to be part of a team, at times to follow the lead of others. Always there has been a group of talented, smart, energetic and just plain fun people at work trying to take advantage of the opportunities.”

Jenkins came to what was then Fort Clatsop National Memorial in December 2002 as the park prepared for the upcoming Lewis and Clark Bicentennial and pursued an ambitious expansion plan.

During his tenure, the park helped host “Destination: The Pacific,” in November 2005. The Bicentennial commemoration was one of 15 national Signature Events. The park leveraged the national attention it received to gain funding for a 10-fold increase from its original size with the acquisition of hundreds of acres of neighboring land and the construction of new trails and visitor amenities, including the Fort to Sea Trail and the Netul Landing shuttle stop.

Jenkins is credited with getting nearby communities to consider creating a National Heritage Area encompassing the lower Columbia River region. The park and the group that organized the signature event recently sponsored a workshop for 80 community leaders focused on “gateway communities” and national heritage areas.

“Recently, folks came together to learn about and discuss the future of the region,” Jenkins said. “Now is the perfect time to celebrate our accomplishments and look to the future.”

In October 2005, an accidental fire destroyed the original Fort Clatsop replica less than a month before Bicentennial activities were scheduled to begin. Under Jenkins’ leadership, local residents and Lewis and Clark enthusiasts from across the country supported the effort to rebuild the fort, which was completed last year and dedicated in December.

With the Bicentennial over and the park’s expansion complete, and the park now focused on an effort to create a National Heritage Area in the lower Columbia River region, Jenkins felt the time was right to move on.

“This area is indelibly etched into my heart and I will carry with me the experiences we have shared, lessons I have learned and the wonderful people I have met,” Jenkins said.

North Cascades National Park, headquartered in Sedro Woolley, Washington, is part of three units, including the Ross Lake and Lake Chelan National Recreation Areas, that together cover more than 600,000 acres of mostly rugged wilderness near the Canadian border.
Trail activities focus on assessment, preservation and planning for the future

Activity along the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail hasn’t slowed since the close of the Bicentennial commemoration, however priorities generally have shifted to include an assessment of changes, enhancements and developments to the trail over the past decade, development of preservation priorities and planning for the future.

Parties along the trail are conducting inventories of expedition-related materials to secure a better record of all that was developed during the Bicentennial. The inventories are driven by organizations and agencies within each state, and therefore the information collected meets the needs of those doing the work. Some states are inventorying only place-based assets, such as interpretive signs, campsites and gravesites, which are affixed to a geographic location and not intended to move. Other states have taken the inventory one step further to include ephemeral objects such as brochures, music and traveling education trunks. As states conclude their inventories, they are providing the National Park Service with their results, and ultimately, the foundation will have a complete copy of the inventory database.

**Trail extension**

The foundation has redoubled its efforts to extend the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail east to Monticello to include the preparatory routes of Lewis and Clark prior to the expedition and their return to Washington, D.C., to report to President Thomas Jefferson.

Foundation representatives have met with National Park Service officials to discuss trail extension and concerns the agency might have regarding their administration of a sea-to-sea trail. Following the meeting, the foundation has taken steps to draft federal legislation that calls for a Special Resources Study of the proposed expansion. The Park Service is providing information and assistance with this process. A study would make three primary determinations: the national significance of the proposed extension; its suitability and whether it meets the parameters of the National Trail Systems Act; and the feasibility of the proposed extension. U.S. Senator Jim Bunning of Kentucky tentatively has agreed to sponsor extension legislation.

If Congress passes a bill calling for a Special Resources Study and includes funding for the study, the National Park Service would complete the study in one to two years. If the extended trail meets the study criteria, Congress would again be called upon to pass legislation, this time to officially extend the trail. The process of achieving this significant foundation goal could take several years, and members are encouraged to follow its progress and actively participate in ensuring its success.

**Congress approves $2.5 million for completion of National Historical Park**

The 2007 budget for the National Parks Service includes $2.5 million to purchase a land easement on 320 acres of property near Station Camp on the Washington side of the Columbia River. This approval marks the final piece of funding for land acquisition for the Lewis and Clark National Historical Park.

The easement will prevent development in the wooded hillsides above the historic site, the spot where in 1805 the Lewis and Clark Expedition declared their westward journey complete.

The Conservation Fund, a national preservation group that has been involved in other land deals for the park, currently is negotiating with the land’s owners.

Station Camp, near the town of McGowan in southwest Washington, was home for the Corps of Discovery for 10 days in November 1805. Station Camp served not only as a departure point for a closer look at the Pacific coastline, but also as a primary survey station for Clark’s detailed mapping of the area. The explorers voted at Station Camp on where to hunker down for winter, and the result took them across the Columbia River into Oregon.

Station Camp becomes the 12th park in a network of historical sites that follow the explorers over 40 miles from Long Beach, Washington, to Cannon Beach, Oregon. The National Park Service manages all of the parks.

**Federal legislation update**

U.S. Rep. Bennie Thompson of Mississippi has submitted a resolution to recognize and honor York for his role in the Lewis and Clark Expedition (H. Res. 151). His resolution honors York for his contributions to the expedition; recognizes York as the first African American to explore the lands acquired in the Louisiana Purchase; and urges students of American history to study the regretfully often-overlooked role of York in the expedition.

Sen. Byron Dorgan of North Dakota has introduced the Native American $1 Coin Act (S. 585), which proposes a new reverse design on not less than 20 percent of the total Sacagawea dollar coins minted every year during the presidential dollar coin program. The legislation stipulates that one-third of the total dollar coins minted every year will be the Sacagawea design. It also proposes changing the current Sacagawea spelling in previous legislation to Sakakawea.

For more information on these bills and other federal legislation, visit www.thomas.loc.gov.

—Wendy Raney
Director of Field Operations
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