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This majestic painting by Frederick Remington depicts the French explorers Pierre-Esprit Radisson (1636-1710) and his brother-in-law Médard des Grosseilliers (1618-1696) plying wilderness waters in a *canot du maître* ("master’s canoe"), the workhorse of the Canadian fur trade. In 1793, more than a century after Radisson and Grosseilliers and 10 years before Lewis and Clark, the Scottish explorer and fur trader Alexander Mackenzie made use of a *canot du maître* in his crossing of the continent. Lewis’s design of his iron-framed boat may well have been influenced by Mackenzie’s description of a *canot du maître* in the intrepid Scotsman’s account of his crossing, *Voyages from Montreal*, a book read by both Meriwether Lewis and Thomas Jefferson read.  

For more on Mackenzie’s influence on the Lewis and Clark Expedition, see H. Carl Camp’s article beginning on page 6. Remington’s *Radisson and Grosseilliers* is reprinted courtesy the Buffalo Bill Historical Center / Whitney Gallery of Art, Cody, Wyoming; gift of Mrs. Karl Frank.
Gass grandson's grave found

Readers of WPO may be interested in the following about a descendant of Sergeant Patrick Gass, the longest surviving member of the Lewis and Clark Expedition.

In a lonely, forgotten gravesite in the unendowed section of Greenwood Cemetery in Spokane, Washington, lie the remains of Gass’s grandson Benjamin Patrick Brierley. I learned this several years ago from my friends David and Judy Peegren. They discovered Brierley’s grave by accident. The flat gravestone was covered with brush and vegetation, and when they cleared the debris they were surprised to read this inscription:

*Benjamin Patrick Brierley 1877-1935 Grandson of Serg’t Gass of L.C. Expedition*

After doing some research, I found more about Brierley:

His gravesite is located at Lawn 26, lot 18, Space 17. He died on January 4, 1935, just shy of his 58th birthday, and was buried on January 11. Records found in the Smith Funeral Home say he died of acute alcoholism, although information I discovered later call this into question.

The death certificate, found at the Spokane County Courthouse, confirms that he died at the Pennington Hotel, where he’d lived since the previous December 22. T. E. Barnhart, the county coroner, stated that Benjamin died at 11 p.m. His death certificate also states that Benjamin was born on February 3, 1877, in Wellsburg, West Virginia, and that his age at the time of death was 57 years, 11 months, and 1 day. His father, George Brierley, was born in Wilmington, Delaware, and his mother, Rachel Gass, was born in Wellsburg, West Virginia. Benjamin was “male, white and single,” according to coroner’s witness W. B. Thurtell, who lived at the American Hotel.

Pursuing the story further, I got in touch with genealogist Donna Potter, who uncovered more information. From Donna I learned that Benjamin Brierley was the second child and first son of George Joshua Brierley and his wife, born Rachel Maria Gass. George’s father was Benjamin Brierley, born in England in 1825, and his mother was Mary Dowling.

Rachel Maria Gass, born March 30, 1848, in Pierce’s Run, West Virginia, was the youngest child of Sergeant Patrick McLain Gass, born June 12, 1771. Gass died in 1870, in his 99th year. A bachelor most of his life, at 58 he married the much younger Maria Hamilton. They had three sons and three daughters.

Patrick and Maria’s younger daughter, Rachel Maria, married George Joshua Brierley on August 4, 1873, in Washington County, Pennsylvania. They had four children: Sarah Ann (“Sally”), Benjamin Patrick, Rachel, and Robert Hamilton (“Burt” or perhaps “Bert”), all born in Brooke County.

The 1880 U.S. census listed George Brierley, age 32, as a farmer in Cross Creek, Brooke County, West Virginia. His son Benjamin, the subject of my investigation, married Margaret Green on August 7, 1905, in Galesburg, Illinois. At some point he moved to Des Moines, Iowa. He registered for the draft on September 12, 1918, at age 41. (The U.S. had entered World War I the previous year.) On the draft form he listed his occupation as “traveling salesman for the Chicago Copy Company.” He was 5’4”, 150 pounds, had blue eyes, and was “gray bald.” He listed his mother,
first of the year and head for Chicago, the company headquarters. As Painter recalled, "Then they would travel all over the United States selling photograph restoration, copies of photographs, and framing. In the early days they traveled by train, and then by car, and in 1932 acquired a Model A Ford Convertible... which I remembered riding in." He said that every year Benjamin and Robert would come home to Independence to spend the holidays with their mother, Rachel Maria, and the rest of the family. When their mother became too frail (she died in 1926) they would stay with the family of their sister Rachel Brierley Painter, Eugene Gass Painter's mother, and her husband, Asa Painter.

Eugene Gass Painter added that his aunt Sally (Sarah Brierley) married John Buxton and that they had a son, Owen Buxton. Also, he recalled that his uncle Benjamin had been married, although he and his wife "weren't together very long" and no one in the family remembered much about her.

He said that in early January 1935 the family learned that Benjamin had been killed by a hit-and-run driver in Spokane. Owen Buxton lived in Spokane, and he handled the funeral arrangements.

The story of Benjamin Brierley's death is somewhat confusing. Collating the above information suggests a scenario in which he was hit by a car and then taken to his hotel, where he died. It's possible he'd been drinking, which may have contributed to the accident and to the statement found in the funeral home that he was alcoholic.

It's not clear if his brother, Robert, was with him at the time. Probably he wasn't, since his nephew Owen took care of the funeral. Whoever made the final arrangements, apparently there wasn't enough money to locate the grave in the tended part of the cemetery or to erect a granite headstone. But the modest marker on his hitherto neglected grave rightfully notes his connection to Lewis and Clark.
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President's Message

A busy winter and a promising spring

Happy spring from Lewis and Clark country! It's been a productive winter for your board of directors, with several promising developments on the horizon.

To begin with, we held a meeting in Denver where we adopted the new mission statement and set the strategic goals for the next three-to-five years. Our new mission statement, "We preserve, promote, and teach the diverse heritage of Lewis and Clark for the benefit of all," emerged after long discussions on what it is that our foundation actually does. In addition we formulated a new vision statement: "The Foundation will be the nation's premier nonprofit organization for the preservation of the Lewis and Clark Trail and the sharing of its stories." The board identified six strategic goals focused on strengthening our organization through board development, better communication with chapters, extending the trail, ensuring sustainability of the Foundation, and building partnerships with Lewis and Clark Interpretative and Educational centers across America.

In addition to those positive developments, several of us participated in the Hike to the Hill event in Washington, D.C. Unlike previous years, the weather cooperated and the Partnership for National Historic Trails (PNT) enjoyed trekking from the Lincoln Memorial to our nation's Capitol. We held several days of productive meetings and had appointments with various congressional delegations involved in national trails. Our group had the advantage of telling representatives that we were not after funds, but needed their support in favor of completing the national Lewis and Clark Trail by officially including the eastern states. Everyone we met with seemed to get the message that we need the trail to reach "from sea to shining sea!"

The director of the National Park Service, Jon Jarvis, graciously allowed us some time to discuss the challenges we, and the NPS, face in getting youth involved in learning about the outdoors. It's clear that among trail organizations we have earned a lot of respect. Mainly that is due to you and your chapters for keeping the Lewis and Clark fire burning since the bicentennial. Our foundation can only move forward if we build on the successes of the commemoration and not go back to the status quo. To accomplish this we need chapters now more than ever. We depend on chapters to reach out to the general public and to offer programs, speakers, field trips, and site monitoring. Our involvement in taking care of the Lewis and Clark Trail is crucial in these times of federal budgetary constraints. Thank you for your ongoing passion for L&C history.

Internet technology is a tool we can use to communicate with our chapters, each other, and like-minded organizations. We are in the process of updating our Web site, and I invite you to join our group on Facebook and to alert Ken Jutzi, Lorna Hainesworth, Jay Buckley, or myself if you have any news you would like to share with the rest of the world. Make no mistake—a lot is happening along the trail, and if we're to effectively preserve, promote, and teach the diverse heritage of Lewis and Clark we need to keep up with the medium!

Nearly every day we witness another example of the power of instant communication, whether it's in times of national emergency or political crisis; we need to use that tool, just as Thomas Jefferson loved to use new inventions, to help people learn and appreciate the lessons of Lewis and Clark. Again I thank you for your continued support of the Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation.

—Stephanie Ambrose Tubbs
President, LCTHF
One thing I most enjoy about the Lewis and Clark Trail is the complexity associated with the trail and its history. This is not one story, or even one trail, but a quilt of richly descriptive accounts of steadfast people and tales that twist and change as much as do the waters of the Missouri. I never worry that I will be bored with these stories or that I could ever know everything about the expedition and the trail. I think this is why there continues to be such broad interest in Lewis and Clark.

Even after all these years, it is fascinating that some questions about the Corps of Discovery remain unanswered. The hope that academic research or science will shed new light on old questions keeps us captivated with the trail and its stories. Some of my own questions tend to be simple. Yet, when I ask these questions, I am often surprised by the answers I get.

Case in point: I recently asked what I thought was a simple question: How long is the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail? I have seen many numbers given for the length of the trail from Wood River to the Pacific Ocean. The answer we typically give is, “The trail is approximately 3,700 miles long.” We give this answer because this is the number cited in the trail’s enabling legislation in 1978. But what is the real answer?

My curiosity led me to pose the question to Ryan Cooper, the trail’s cultural geographer. Ryan is a smart guy, so I hoped for a quick, definitive answer I could trust. What I received was a multi-page lesson in geography and map-making, complete with diagrams. I was thrilled — here was yet another basic trail question with no simple answer! Ryan’s answer was far more complex and interesting than what I’d been seeking, and I share with you this abridged version:

“One would think that in today’s high-tech world with fancy Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and Global Positioning Systems (GPS) the answer would be straightforward. The answer is actually complicated, and depends on which projection, coordinate system, and spheroid we use. Distance estimates will vary wildly — by hundreds of miles.

“There’s the Missouri River, which has moved all over the place, so we don’t have a definitive answer as to where Lewis and Clark really went. But we’re getting there. Keep in mind if you go through the journals and add up the distance totals the explorers calculated for how far they traveled each day from Wood River to Fort Clatsop, even assuming the distances are correct you will end up with a trail distance much greater than 3,700 miles. Because the expedition was traveling by river, they were zigzagging over a wide river valley rather than following the straightest route. That makes it a real challenge to figure out how to really measure the trail length. Also, the trail does not only include the route that the keelboat took. What about those pirogues and what about all those miles walked along the river by Lewis, Drouillard, and other members of the expedition?

“Even if we had the world’s longest tape measure and could walk the actual surface of the earth and avoid all the distortions/inaccuracies inherent in the GIS, where would we go? Given the fact that this is actually impossible, which line on the map do I use to measure the distance? Believe it or not, depending on the choice, the distance may vary by hundreds of miles. Results I have seen have been anywhere from 3,400 to 4,200 miles. If you need a hard and fast number, we can pick one of these lines and I can provide a number. Sadly, however, it will still be just an approximation.”

I view Ryan’s answer to my question as good news. I believe it serves to strengthen our resolve to keep researching campsites, routes, and encounters, while continuing to help our partners preserve the trail. That helps to keep us all intrigued and investigative about the truths behind the enduring history we love.

—Mark Weekley
Superintendent, L&C Historic Trail

Omaha meeting

The LCTHF will hold its 43rd annual meeting, July 31–August 3, in Omaha and Council Bluffs. Hosted by the Mouth of the Platte Chapter, it will feature distinguished L&C scholars such as Gary Moulton, James Ronda, and Clay Jenkinson; tours of historic sites, including the Floyd Monument; and reenactments and historical interpreters in the roles of Lewis and Clark, Pierre Cruzatte, and George Drouillard. For details, go to www.lewisandclark.org.
Voyages from Montreal

Alexander Mackenzie reached the Pacific 10 years before the Corps of Discovery — an achievement that spurred Jefferson to action and influenced the planning of Lewis’s “darling project”

By H. Carl Camp

Without question, the “Corps of Volunteers for North West Discovery” (Corps of Discovery for short) was the brainchild of Thomas Jefferson. The influences that led to its creation are a study in the evolution of one man’s ambitious vision and his perseverance in pursuit of its realization.

No sooner had the United States gained its independence from Great Britain than Jefferson began to dream of a larger republic. He envisioned the eventual development of an “empire of liberty” stretching from ocean to ocean. Between 1783 and 1793 he promoted no fewer than three initiatives to send an exploratory expedition beyond the nation’s western boundary into the trans-Mississippi region to gather strategic information and search for the ever-elusive Northwest Passage. For one reason or another, each failed to achieve the desired outcome.

In summary, the initiatives were: (a) Jefferson’s unsuccessful 1783 overture to the Revolutionary War hero General George Rogers Clark (William’s older brother) to lead a western expedition to the Pacific coast; (b) the ill-fated Russian trek by John Ledyard, an American adventurer who had accompanied Captain James Cook on his third voyage of discovery into the northwest Pacific; and, (c) the “Michaux Expedition” of 1793, sponsored by the American Philosophical Society (of which Jefferson was an influential member), which foundered short of gaining the western boundary of the U.S. The failure of this last effort was followed by a ten-year hiatus in Jefferson’s overt attempts to send a group of American explorers into the largely unknown western wilderness.

Jolted into Action

Shortly after Jefferson was elected President, his interest in western exploration was re-kindled by the publication, in 1801, of Alexander Mackenzie’s journal recounting his 1793 journey across Canada from Montreal to the Pacific Ocean and back. Learning of the publishing event, the President obtained a copy of Voyages From Montreal. He read it, as did his personal secretary, Meriwether Lewis, while on his usual summer retreat at Monticello in 1802. As well he might, Jefferson took alarm at the threat to his vision of an ocean-to-ocean “empire of liberty” implicit in Mackenzie’s vigorous advocacy that Great Britain move quickly to lay claim to the vast western regions of the
North American continent and the untold riches to be had from the fur trade. (Of course, the President did not then
know that Mackenzie’s brethren in the British Colonial
Office largely ignored his entreaty and a succession of
others in subsequent years.)

When Jefferson and his secretary returned to the
nation’s capital that fall, they began to plan in earnest yet
another initiative to field a western expedition. Lewis
put together an estimate of the personnel, supplies, and
equipment needed to support the endeavor and drafted
a preliminary budget. The President prepared a secret
message to Congress in which he requested authorization
of the venture and an appropriation to meet its costs. In
short order, Congress granted his request, including $2,500
to fund the initial expenses.3

MACKENZIE’S INFLUENCE ON THE EXPEDITION

Mackenzie’s journal unquestionably succeeded in re-
kindling Jefferson’s long-standing desire to send an
American expedition across the western reaches of the
continent to the Pacific. But the intrepid explorer’s
influence did not stop there. Numerous aspects of
the Lewis and Clark Expedition reveal a close kinship
with Mackenzie’s account of his challenges and
accomplishments. It would not be an exaggeration to say
the record of his experiences provided the Americans a
useful field guide on what worked and what didn’t. After
all, he had already “been there, done that.”

The stimulative effect Mackenzie’s journal had on
Jefferson, goading him into action, has occasioned
recognition and comment over the years since the Lewis
and Clark Expedition. Less well-documented was its
continuing influence on the co-commanders of that
expedition, especially Meriwether Lewis. The records of
the expedition, principally the journals, frequently echo
the hovering presence of Alexander Mackenzie. Early
recognition of the broader-ranging impact and influence
of Mackenzie’s publication on those who would, figuratively,
follow in his footsteps can be found in the following
caucustic broadside that David McKeehan, editor of a
paraphrased version of Sergeant Patrick Gass’s journal,
directed at Lewis in 1807 in defense of his client’s right to
publish, before Lewis, an early account of his experiences
as a member of the Corps of Discovery:

May 2011 We Proceeded On
With respect to the hazardous nature of the enterprise and the courage necessary for undertaking it, candour impels me to say, that public opinion has placed them on too high ground. Mr. McKeehan with a party consisting of about one fourth part of the number under your command, with means which will not bear a comparison with those furnished you, and without the authority, the flags, or medals of his government, crossed the Rocky mountains several degrees north of your rout, and for the first time penetrated to the Pacific Ocean. You had the advantage of the information contained in his journal, and could in some degree estimate and guard against the dangers and difficulties you were to meet.

It seems obvious that McKeehan was able to level this pointed barb at Lewis only because he had access to the pertinent information from Gass, who as a responsible member of the Corps of Discovery had ample opportunities to observe what considerations went into the captains' decision-making during the expedition. However, there is no direct documentation to establish whether they had a copy of Voyages From Montreal with them on the trip.

The distinguished historian Bernard DeVoto alleged they did, but without offering specific evidence. The eminent Lewis and Clark scholar Donald Jackson thought it likely, due to the content of certain passages scattered through the journals. Close reading and comparison of the journals, along with related documents, yield some strong parallels in content and suggest a derivative kinship. The circumstantial evidence reported here, and that marshaled by David L. Nicandri in an article in the Pacific Northwest Quarterly, “Lewis and Clark: Exploring under the Influence of Alexander Mackenzie,” is strong enough to support the inference that Lewis and Clark did, indeed, carry a copy of Mackenzie's book with them on their expedition. Nicandri asserts that Mackenzie's “account, on close inspection, was a methodological and literary model for Lewis and Clark.” Still later in his article he goes on to say, “In many respects it appears that Voyages served as a veritable trail guide. The Americans used a number of Mackenzie's tactics, as may have been expected, but in addition they emulated, and even plagiarized, many textual passages. Making inscriptions on trees was merely the most obvious example of Mackenzie's influence.”

As broad-ranging as Nicandri's article is, it leaves untouched other connections explored below.

**STAFFING THE L&C EXPEDITION**

As a point of departure, the Mackenzie Expedition was comprised entirely of a civilian team of 10 men, including two Indian guides. All were involved in the fur trade in one capacity or another and had accumulated years of experience crisscrossing the wilds of the Canadian interior east of the Rocky Mountains. Two of the men had accompanied Mackenzie on his 1789 expedition, which reached the Arctic Ocean.

By way of comparison, Jefferson in his confidential message to Congress proposed the following:

An intelligent officer and ten or twelve men, fit for the enterprise and willing to undertake it, taken from our posts, where they may be spared without inconvenience, might explore the whole line [of the Missouri River], even to the Western ocean . . .

Notice the composition of the group he recommended: all military men. The rationale, as stated, is fourfold: they were to be selected, or “chosen”; they were to be willing and able participants; they could be spared from their posts without compromising normal operations; and, they would already be on the public payroll, thereby avoiding the additional expense a civilian operation would entail.

In addition to the above, in my judgment there was another consideration—unstated but controlling—at work here. The military composition of the group of American explorers arguably was a deliberate choice meant to avoid some of the distressing personnel problems Mackenzie confronted. In his journal Mackenzie makes it abundantly clear that his civilian comrades were a fractious group who openly challenged many of his field decisions, were often surly and uncooperative, and sometimes threatened to abandon the enterprise altogether. On the other hand, the uniformed members of the American expedition would be subject to the strict command structure and disciplines of the Articles of War governing the U.S.
military since the Revolutionary War. The commanding officers would have ample disciplinary powers to curb any expedition member who stepped out of line and put the mission in jeopardy. This staffing decision is reflective of a practical "lesson" drawn from a recurrent theme found in the Mackenzie narrative.

It was thought at the time the size of the group authorized by Congress would enable it to defend itself if attacked but would not be so large as to alarm Indian tribes encountered en route and incite unwanted hostility. As preparations progressed, however, it became clear that more manpower would be needed to carry out the expedition's ambitious mission. Consequently, the size of the Corps of Discovery was increased accordingly. At least in the first phase of the journey, the party consisted of four times the original authorization. Beyond Fort Mandan, the "permanent party," which numbered 29, was only about three times the original figure.

![Newfoundland, ca. 1800, when the breed was markedly different from today's darker, heavier version. Lewis's Seaman was a Newfoundland.](image)

**LEWIS'S CANINE COMPANION**

Turning to another point of comparison, Nicandri makes only cursory mention of the fact that both Mackenzie and Lewis took along a canine companion on their expedition. The name and breed of Mackenzie's dog is not revealed in his journal. Lewis paid $20 of his own money to acquire a Newfoundland waterdog (probably in Pittsburgh) and named him Seaman. The journals of Mackenzie and Lewis make clear that both animals became valued companions, versatile hunters, and useful watchdogs. Members of each expedition looked upon their leader's dog as "our dog" before the journey was over. The Canadians lamented the disappearance of their dog just before they reached the Pacific coast, but rejoiced when he was found and recovered on the homeward journey. Lewis authorized a "posse" from the Corps of Discovery to "shoot to kill" if the Indians who kidnapped Seaman at one point in the homeward journey refused to release the dog unharmed. As their pursuers closed in, the kidnappers released Seaman, who returned unscathed to his master.

**LEWIS'S "IRON BOAT"**

Every knowledgeable Lewis and Clark enthusiast is aware of Meriwether Lewis's lightweight, collapsible iron-framed boat—"The Experiment"—and the drama played out in mid-summer 1805 at the Great Falls of the Missouri. What may not be so well known is how, and why, Lewis and his mentor, Jefferson, came up with their design for the boat that summer of 1802 at Monticello. Consider the following as a plausible scenario.

The Mackenzie expedition's main means of conveyance was a slender voyageur's canoe (a *canot du maître*), whose dimensions he described in his journal as "twenty-five feet long within, exclusive of the stem and stern, twenty-six inches hold, and four feet nine inches beam." He went on to describe it as a very lightweight craft that could be carried by two men for three or four miles on a good road without having to rest. It would accommodate 3,000 pounds of supplies and equipment, plus the baggage of ten crew members. Its light weight in relation to cargo capacity became a key consideration when it came time to portage across the Continental Divide from the eastern watershed to that of the west.

The same considerations apparently were at the forefront of Jefferson's and Lewis's thinking as they began planning their own expedition. Together they designed a relatively lightweight, collapsible iron-framed boat that would be covered with bark and animal skins and could be portaged a short distance by a few men when that became necessary at the Continental Divide. Fabricated and tested under Lewis's supervision over a four-week period at the national armory at Harpers Ferry in the spring of 1803, it became his famed "Iron Boat." The real eye-opener, however, is this: the dimensions of the ill-fated craft were almost a carbon copy of Mackenzie's birch-bark canoe. (See table next page for a side-by-side comparison.)

The materials in the two canoes were distinctly different. The Canadian canoe consisted of a sturdy but lightweight wooden frame to which were lashed flexible slabs of birch bark, the seams of which were caulked with resin collected from the plentiful spruce and fir trees along the route. Frequently in his narrative, Mackenzie told of the expedition having to stop and repair damage to the hull of the canoe due to collisions with boulders and other river hazards and to re-caulk the seams that separated and
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leaked. The men ranged into the surrounding forests to collect the additional bark and resin to make the repairs. It was a more or less routine occurrence—every couple of days—as recounted by Mackenzie. Eventually, the canoe was damaged so extensively and patched up so often that it was no longer serviceable. At that point, before they could resume the journey, the explorers had to pause long enough to construct a replacement from scratch.13

Evidently, Lewis drew practical, cautionary lessons from these episodes in Mackenzie’s narrative. He knew there would come a time when the Corps of Discovery would have to portage across the Divide in order to enter the Columbia River watershed. Hopefully it would involve a distance no greater than that encountered by Mackenzie and his men—a mere 817 paces (“about a quarter of a mile”).14 Apparently, to his way of thinking, the iron frame of “The Experiment” would be both more rigid and more durable than the light wooden frame of the Canadians’ vessel. In a letter to Jefferson on June 19, 1803, after his four-week sojourn at Harpers Ferry supervising the design, fabrication, and testing of two prototype sections of this unique craft, Lewis proudly touted the virtues of his “favorite boat.” In his own words:

The bark and wood, when it becomes necessary to transport the vessel to any considerable distance, may be discarded; as those articles are readily obtained for the purposes of this canoe, at all seasons of the year, and in every quarter of the country, which is tolerably furnished with forest trees.15

This astonishing assertion seems composed in equal parts of Lewis’s naïve expectation that the forest resources with which he was so familiar back east would continue to be available in the western extremity of the continent and the assurance he felt that he too would be able to make necessary adjustments and repairs to his boat as readily as Mackenzie had done. Thus reassured in his own mind, Lewis apparently saw no need to lay in a supply of naval resin before his departure from the east coast, where it was abundantly available.

In retrospect, Lewis relied too implicitly on the “lessons” he drew from Mackenzie’s journal. The Great Falls area where “The Experiment” was assembled and prepared for service offered few sturdy trees and none that could supply the resin needed to caulk the seams where the vessel’s elk-hide covering was stitched together. The improvised compound of charcoal, tallow, and beeswax that was tried as a last resort failed. The boat leaked so badly it was not serviceable. Professing his mortification over the failure, Lewis abandoned then and there the unique vessel in which he had invested so much energy and hope. It was replaced by two hurriedly made dugout canoes. This lesson—too well learned from Mackenzie—proved a bitter disappointment.16

LEWIS’S “DARLING PROJECT”

When the Corps of Discovery resumed its journey westward from Fort Mandan on April 7, 1805, Meriwether Lewis was upbeat and in a philosophical mood, as reflected in this frequently quoted passage from his journal:

the picture which now presented itself to me was a most pleasing one. [E]ntertaining as I do, the most confident hope of succeeding in a voyage which had formed a dazzling project of mine for the last ten years... could but esteem this moment of my... departure as among the most happy of my life.17

This is no exaggeration. In 1789, when Lewis was 18, going on 19, and a mere ensign in the military, he learned of the American Philosophical Society’s plan to send a small exploring party up the Missouri River and across the continent to the Pacific Ocean. He volunteered to lead it! Instead, the society chose the eminent French botanist André Michaux, who was then visiting the United States, to lead what proved to be an abortive undertaking. It seems Lewis was not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MACKENZIE’S BIRCH BARK CANOE</th>
<th>LEWIS’S IRON-FRAMED BOAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LENGTH:</strong> 25’, excluding curved stem and stern</td>
<td><strong>LENGTH:</strong> 24'10&quot; (36’ assembled, including curved stem and stern, less 5’7” stem and 5’7” stern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIDTH (beam):</strong> 4’9”</td>
<td><strong>WIDTH (beam):</strong> 4’10” at Harpers Ferry; 4’6” at Great Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPTH (hold):</strong> 2’2”</td>
<td><strong>DEPTH (hold):</strong> 2’2”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

lacking in self-confidence at that stage of his life.

Perhaps as revealing was his distinctive turn of phrase: “a darling project of mine.” Without question, Lewis had a way with words—a certain literary flair. In this instance, however, the words were not his, even though they obviously fit his mood at the time. Consider the following passage from Alexander Mackenzie’s journal entry for June 25, 1793. On this date, Mackenzie faced a crisis. A tribe he encountered had turned hostile, and out of fear his Indian guides deserted the expedition. He bitterly lamented his loss of the guides, “without whose assistance it would be impossible for me to proceed, when my darling project would end in disappointment.”

The situations the two men described were diametrically opposed: Mackenzie was distraught, while Lewis was aglow with optimism. Both were clearly solicitous of the outcome of their respective projects.

**Childbirth Along the Trail**

The Corps of Discovery finally reached the headwaters of the Missouri River in mid-August, 1805, and made contact with the Shoshones (also known as the Snakes) just as they were preparing to descend to the plains for their annual buffalo hunt. Despite the desperate hunger stalking the tribe at the time, Lewis eventually succeeded in persuading Chief Cameahwait, Sacagawea’s brother, and his lesser chiefs to furnish horses and manpower to get the expedition across the Continental Divide and onto the Columbia River watershed. After several days’ travel from Camp Fortunate, the entourage crossed the divide on August 26 and “halted to dine and graze our horses.” Lewis described in some detail a singular event which unfolded during that pause along the trail:

One of the women who had been assisting in the transportation of the baggage halted at a little run [stream] about a mile behind us, and sent the two pack horses which she had been conducting by one of her female friends. I enquired of Cameahwait the cause of her detention, and was informed by him in an unconcerned manner that she had halted to bring fourth a child and would soon overtake us; in about an hour the woman arrived with her newborn babe and passed us on her way up to the camp apparently as well as she ever was. It appears to me that the facility and ease with which the women of the aborigines of North America bring fourth their children is rather a gift of nature than depending as some have supposed on the habit of carrying heavy burdens on their backs while in the state of pregnancy. If a pure and dry air, an elevated and cold country is unfavorable to childbirth, we might expect every difficult incident to that operation of nature in this part of the continent; again as [S]nake Indians possess an abundance of horses, their women are seldom compelled like those in other parts of the continent to carry their burdens on their backs, yet
they have their children with equal convenience, and it is a rare occurrence for any of them to experience difficulty in childbirth.²⁰

Let's take a closer look at this passage. It is composed of two distinct parts: the first takes notice of the astonishingly swift, and apparently uncomplicated, childbirth that had just taken place back on the trail; the second makes a global generalization that it is rare for childbirth among aboriginal women of North America to be attended by difficulty or complications. That is quite a leap from a single event to such a broad generalization. As far as we know, the only other birth of an Indian child Lewis had observed firsthand was that of Sacagawea's son, Jean Baptiste, on February 11 of that year. And that birth was far from simple and easy. Gripped in the throes of a prolonged and fruitless labor, Sacagawea delivered her firstborn only after she drank a potion consisting of a ground-up button from a rattlesnake's rattle mixed with a measure of water.²¹

At best, Lewis's evidence was contradictory. Where do you suppose he came up with his observations? Consider this passage from Alexander Mackenzie's journal entry on January 12, 1793:

> The Indians, indeed, consider the state of a woman in labour as among the most trifling occurrences of corporal pain to which human nature is subject, and they may be, in some measure, justified in this apparent insensitivity for the circumstances of that situation among themselves. It is by no means uncommon in the hasty removal of their camps from one position to another, for a woman to be taken in labour, to deliver herself in her way, without any assistance or notice from her associates in the journey, and to overtake them before they complete the arrangements of their evening station, with her new-born babe on her back.²²

This passage bears an instructive kinship to Lewis's later generalization on the same subject. Neither identifies his “authority” on the matter, relying instead on “those who know about these things.”

LEAVING THEIR MARKS ON THE PACIFIC COAST

The Mackenzie Expedition reached the western extremity of the continent on July 21, 1793. Upon the explorers’ arrival in the tidewater area of what was to become known as the Dean Channel, they were followed and harassed by several boatloads of troublesome Indians from the surrounding area. The beleaguered men spent an uneasy and uncomfortable night on guard atop an easily defended rock outcropping overlooking the bay. They were still some distance from the ocean itself; however, given the circumstances and the mounting level of anxiety among members of the company, Mackenzie consoled himself with the thought that they were close enough to claim success for their endeavor. The next morning he made multiple celestial observations with his instruments to document their location. Before leaving their cramped situation, Mackenzie recorded this famous inscription on the rock that had been their refuge overnight:

> I now mixed up some vermilion in grease, and inscribed in large characters, on the South-East face of the rock on which we had slept last night, this brief memorial — “Alexander Mackenzie, from Canada, by land, the twenty-second of July, one-thousand seven hundred and ninety three.”²²

That task completed, the Mackenzie Expedition with some haste began its homeward trek by retracing its outward route. The explorers had spent only one night on (actually near) the Pacific.

Almost twelve and one-half years later, the Lewis and Clark Expedition, three times the size of Mackenzie’s small band of explorers, arrived at the mouth of the Columbia River—within sight of the Pacific Ocean. It was on November 7, 1805, that William Clark recorded his exuberant cry: “O, the joy! Ocean in view!”²³ Not satisfied, however, to stay in the storm-tossed tidal estuary, on November 14 Meriwether Lewis and four men left the water-logged encampment for the purpose of reconnoitering Cape Disappointment and the nearby Pacific coast. After Lewis’s return on the 17th, William Clark took a 10-man contingent the next day to the same coastal area. Here is his description of the event:

> I set out at day light with 10 men & my Sevenr, Shabano, Sergt. Pryer odderway Jos. & R. Fields Shannon Colter, wiser, Lebiech & york proceeded on Down the Shore from the 1st point ... here Capt. Lewis myself & Severl. of the men marked our names day of the month & by Land &c. &c.²⁴

In this fashion, Lewis and Clark and at least several of their men made a point of emulating Mackenzie’s earlier inscription almost exactly, although carved into convenient tree trunks along the seashore rather than painted on a large rock outcropping. In fact, the Americans had been regularly inscribing their names, initials, and dates at various locations as they crossed the continent. They left an unmistakable trail of graffiti all the way to the Pacific. Strangely enough, none of those inscriptions appear to have survived to the present day except for the one Clark carved into the rock called Pompeys Pillar in today’s south-central Montana:
“Wm. Clark July 25 1806.” But that was placed there on the return journey during the Clark-led Yellowstone reconnaissance.\textsuperscript{25}

In contrast, as noted by Mackenzie’s 20th-century editor W. Kaye Lamb, the Canadian government in 1926 “erected a monument and tablet to mark the terminus of Mackenzie’s journey and [his] famous inscription was carved in the rock and filled with red cement.”\textsuperscript{26}

To return to our question about Lewis and Clark: Did they or didn’t they take along Mackenzie’s book? Donald Jackson believed it highly likely, due to the kinship he discerned between certain passages in the expeditions’ journals. David L. Nicandri has concluded the captains carried Mackenzie’s book and more or less used it as a field guide during their transcontinental journey.

On the basis of my own research, I agree with each of these gentlemen. Although the available evidence is largely circumstantial, it is persuasive. Either Lewis and Clark had a copy of Voyages From Montreal with them or they were blessed with total recall (a.k.a., photographic memory). I know of no source that attributes the latter trait to either man.

Considerations of national pride and bragging rights aside, being the second white men across the continent might not have been such a bad thing. Being second—like Avis—maybe you just have to try harder. For example: you plan for a larger expedition and a longer stay in the field; recruit a band of military volunteers instead of civilians; have the full faith and credit of your government backing the effort; build an improved model of a canoe for the portages that lie ahead; vividly write volumes and volumes describing people, places, and things you have visited; collect many artifacts and specimens of flora and fauna encountered throughout the journey; attempt to foster long-term peaceful relationships with the native populations; and in the end bask in the gratitude and favor of your government and fellow citizens.

Although he was knighted, Alexander Mackenzie never fully recovered the capital he expended on his private venture. Nor did he reap the satisfaction that would have come had the British government embraced his vision of an enlarged continental trading empire extending all the way to the Pacific. An attenuated version materialized later, but that was long after Mackenzie had passed from the scene.
JOURNAL COPYING

at TRAVELERS’ REST

Marked by many similarities and occasional differences, the journals of Gass, Ordway, and Whitehouse add details to the record left by Lewis and Clark and offer insight into the expedition’s group dynamics

By Albert Furtwangler

A few months after the Corps of Discovery returned to St. Louis, Meriwether Lewis tried to warn off would-be publishers and assert an exclusive claim to almost all the expedition records. On March 14, 1807, he published a notice in the Washington National Intelligencer stating that his forthcoming journals would be a “genuine work,” unlike any “unauthorized and probably ... spurious publications” that might appear. On April 7 the bookseller David McKeehan replied in the Pittsburgh Gazette with a long essay about his plans to publish the journal of Sergeant Patrick Gass. He addressed Lewis directly and attacked his claims from several angles. In an extended passage he made some acute points about collaborative journal keeping, and the resulting accuracy of Gass’s records:

The object of multiplying journals of the tour was that, in case of defeat or other misfortune affecting the safety of those taken by the commanding officers, the chances of preserving information with respect to the country through which the expedition was to pass might also be multiplied. Connected with this part of the investigation is another point (and a material one) on which I must ask a question or two, and say a few words: this respects the credit due to these journals and their claim to correctness. Was it not a part of your duty to see that these journals were regularly kept, and, if necessary, to supply from your journal, any defects or omissions? Were not all the journals belonging to the corps brought together at certain resting places, examined, compared and corrected? If Mr. Gass (from whom I purchased) is “unacquainted with celestial observation” (which I will grant) was it not your duty, and did you not supply him with the result of those made by yourself? How else did Mr. Gass find out the latitude of certain places where your observations were taken to the exactness of minutes, seconds and tenths of seconds? Without information from Captain Clarke or yourself, how did he ascertain the distances of places, the breadth of rivers and bays, height of falls and length of portages? But it is unnecessary to multiply questions: you know that these journals will furnish the necessary information relative to the tour; and that the publication of them will “depreciate the worth of the work you are preparing for publication.” This is what alarms your insatiable avarice.

This passage is a fair sample of McKeehan’s combative
and sometimes sarcastic tone. It also contains four crucial points about how the various journals were kept—points that seem to derive from the first-hand experience of Patrick Gass.

According to McKeehan, the journals were kept by several men besides Captains Lewis and Clark as a precaution against loss of information due to "defeat or other misfortune." This point is confirmed by the explicit instruction President Jefferson gave to Lewis in 1803: "Several copies of [your observations] as well as of your other notes should be made at leisure times, & put into the care of the most trust-worthy of your attendants, to guard, by multiplying them, against the accidental losses to which they will be exposed."

As a result, the captains had to share their information about exact latitudes and other measurements. McKeehan had obviously noted such information in the Gass journal he was editing, and knew it could not have come from Gass himself. Such details also appear in other enlisted men's journals and tally with the captains' records, as McKeehan puts it, "to the exactness of minutes, seconds, and tenths of seconds."

If the captains insisted on such exact replication of details, McKeehan argues that they had a "duty" to oversee the journals kept by others—to make sure that copied details were full and accurate and to "supply any defects or omissions." This seems a reasonable, even inescapable, inference.

A modern reader can see at a glance that the captains' pages were not simply transcribed by subordinate copyists. But if the captains contributed essential details and expected accurate copying then it seems likely they read the other men's records. And as McKeehan suggests, their practice could well have extended to making pointed suggestions about any "defects or omissions."

These four points bring us to McKeehan's acute central question: "Were not all the journals belonging to the corps brought together at certain resting places, examined, compared, and corrected?" A lot hangs on this point. If Lewis could only answer yes, then his claim to hold the only authoritative records was certainly false. (In fact, Lewis never published an answer to McKeehan's attack. Perhaps he never saw it, for it was not reprinted outside
We proceeded toward Pittsburgh.) An affirmative answer also meant everything to McKeehan. His prospectus for the Gass journal insisted on its authenticity in precisely these terms. “To recommend the correctness of this work, the publisher begs leave to state, that at the different resting places of the expedition, the several journals were brought together, compared, corrected, and the blanks, which had been unavoidably left, filled up.”

Finally, this claim has important consequences for later readers. For it would mean that no single journal, no matter who claimed to have penned it, could be the work of that writer alone. Instead, a group of writers compared freely and exchanged the information they recorded. If McKeehan is right, they examined and revised their work together, very deliberately, from stage to stage of their joint exploration.

One important resting place provides a convenient framework for testing McKeehan’s point. In September 1805 the explorers paused for two nights after they left the Bitterroot River and moved westward along a creek the captains named Travelers’ Rest. Here the captains made celestial observations, Lewis pondered the course they were about to pursue, hunters were sent out to bring in provisions for the rough route ahead, and men in camp busied themselves making moccasins. At this point the enlisted men’s journals show evident signs of close copying. But they also show significant differences, enough to reveal how the five known journal keepers—Lewis, Clark, Gass, Sergeant John Ordway, and Private Joseph Whitehouse—recorded events in their own ways from day to day. Convergences and variations in their journals also show how the writers learned by other means than copying—by what must have been open, ongoing conversations among all these officers and men.

The closest parallels in this period are in the journals kept by Ordway and Whitehouse. Their brief entries for September 11 match word for word in many lines and are distinct from entries by Gass, Clark, and Lewis.

Ordway:

Wednesday 11th Sept. 1805. a beautiful pleasant morning, we went out to hunt up our horses, but they were so scattered that we could not find them until 12 o’clock. So we dined here. the latitude at this place is 46° 48′ 28″ 8/10 North. the snow on the mountain about 1 mile to the S. W. of us does not melt but very little. Some of the men who were hunting the horses detained us until 4 o’clock at which time we set out and proceeded on up this creek course nearly west. the narrow bottom along this creek is mostly covered with pine timber. passed a tree on which was a number of shapes drawn on it with paint by the natives. a white bear Skin hung on the same tree. we supposed this to be a place of worship among them. came about 7 miles this evening and camped on a smooth plain near the creek, where had lately been a large encampment of Indians. saw one house made of earth. the pine trees peeled as far up as a man could reach. we supposed that the natives done it to git the inside bark to mix with their dried fruit to eat. the choke cherries are plenty on &c.

Whitehouse:

Wednesday 11th Sept. 1805. a beautiful pleasant morning, we went out to hunt up our horses, but they were so scattered that we could not find them until 12 o’clock. So we dined here. the latitude at this place is 46° 48′ 28″ 8/10 North. the snow on the mountain about 1 mile to the S. W. of us does not melt but very little. Some of the men who were hunting the horses detained us until 4 o’clock at which time we set out and proceeded on up this creek course nearly west. the narrow bottom along this creek is mostly covered with pine timber. passed a tree on which was a number of shapes drawn on it with paint by the natives. a white bear Skin hung on the same tree. we supposed this to be a place of worship among them. came about 7 miles this evening and camped on a smooth plain near the creek, where had lately been a large encampment of Indians. saw one house made of earth. the pine trees peeled as far up as a man could reach. we supposed that the natives done it to git the inside bark to mix with their dried fruit to eat. the choke cherries are plenty on &c.

When read in this order, it may seem that the second passage here is a copy and embellishment of the first. Yet the opposite could be just as likely. Copying is tedious work, and it could be that Ordway was the copyist and that he chose to set down less material—just the essentials after a long day on the trail. In either case, the copying is close in phrasing and even spelling; note the eccentric words latitude, until, covered, peeled, and inside and the latitude reading (which matches Gass: “Capt. Lewis had a meridian altitude that gave 46° 48′ 28.8 North latitude”). Yet these passages are not word-for-word copies, and the phrasing begins to diverge in the opening lines.

Whitehouse has the more detailed and interesting variations, but one has to wonder if he had an exceptional eye or just a more energetic pen. He notes that snow on a nearby mountain does not seem to melt. But Clark has something similar in his entry for this day: “the mountains on the left high & Covered with Snow. The day Verry worm.” The observation could well have been a common topic that day on the trail or in camp, a clue about the cold passage the party was about to face in the Bitterroot Mountains.

A few lines later Whitehouse makes unique points about a tree with native designs, and pine trees that have been peeled. But his phrasing indicates that he is reporting what others, too, have seen and concluded: “we suppose this to be a place of worship” and “we suppose that the
43rd Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation
Annual Meeting Events 2011

OPTIONAL PRE-MEETING TOUR “A”: Omaha/Council Bluffs: Thursday/Friday, 28 & 29 July

OPTIONAL PRE-MEETING TOUR “B”: Nebraska City, Lewis & Clark Interpretive Center, Saturday, 30 July

Sunday, 31 July: Afternoon at Joslyn Museum and Witherspoon Hall
* Dr. Clay Jenkinson: In the Footsteps of Lewis & Clark: Prince Maximilian and Karl Bodmer
* Tour of Joslyn galleries and book signing
* Opening reception at Embassy Suites

Monday, 1 August:
* Foundation Business Meeting
* Awards Luncheon
* Afternoon presentations:
  * Stephanie Ambrose-Tubbs: Miscreants in Lewis & Clark History
  * Kira Gale: When Council Bluffs was on the Upper Missouri
  * Neal Ratliff: Observing Nature with the Corps of Discovery
* Dinner Keynote Address: Tim Cowman: Missouri River Corridor Before and After Lewis & Clark

Tuesday, 2 August: Bus Tour to Sioux City and Onawa, IA
* Re-enactment of Sgt. Floyd burial
* Box lunch at Chris Larson Park
* Tour Sgt. Floyd River Museum and Welcome Center and Sioux City Lewis & Clark Interpretive Center
* Daniel Slosberg interprets Pierre Cruzatte with John Mangan and the Omaha Nation School Band
* Lewis & Clark State Park and keelboat display
* Dinner on your own

Wednesday, 3 August: Bus Tour to Fort Atkinson State Historical Park
* Jan Donelson, Bud Clark and Otoe-Missouria delegation re-enact the “First Council”
* Morning Presentations:
  * Jeff Barnes: Forts of Omaha and Council Bluffs
  * Mike Berger: Lewis & Clark Psychology: Moses Reed
* Tour of Fort Atkinson and lunch
* National Parks Building: performance by Camp Pomp attendees: “First Encounters”
* Western Historic Trails Center: Darrel Draper as George Drouillard: hunter, interpreter and sign talker
* Closing Banquet Keynote Address by Dr. James Ronda: First Encounters, Second Looks
* Invitation to 44th Annual Meeting in Clarksville, Indiana

OPTIONAL POST-MEETING TOUR “C”: Northern Tour, Thursday, Friday & Saturday, 4, 5 & 6 August

- See next page for optional tour details -

ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES
Fontenelle Forest Bird Walk; Living History Encampment; Riverfront Bicycle Ride; Camp Pomp; Teachers Workshop; New Members, Chapter Presidents and Past Presidents Meetings; Vendors, Exhibitors and Book Sales.
43rd Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation
Annual Meeting
Omaha, NE/Council Bluffs, IA 30 July - 3 August 2011

OPTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Pre-Meeting Tour “A”: Omaha/Council Bluffs
Thurs. & Fri., 28 & 29 Jul.
Cost: $350 (Bus & Meals Included)
Minimum 10; Maximum 20 participants

Day 1, Thurs. 28 Jul.
- Confluence of the Missouri and Platte Rivers
- Lewis and Clark Monument, Council Bluffs, IA
- The Bertrand Exhibit, De Soto Bend, IA
- Union Pacific Railroad Museum

Day 2, Fri. 29 Jul.
- Strategic Air and Space Museum
- Fr. Flanagan’s Boys Town
- Omaha Pioneer Park Sculptures
- Ft. Omaha
- Heartland of America Park

Pre-Meeting Tour “B”: Nebraska City
Sat., 30 Jul.
Cost $55 (Bus, Lunch and reception included)

- Lunch at the Lied Conference Center
- Tour of Arbor Lodge and Arbor Day Farm
- Tour of Missouri River Basin Lewis & Clark Interpretive Trail & Visitor Center
- Earth Lodge
- Welcoming reception for members of the Otoe-Missouria Tribe; light hors d'oeuvres

TEACHERS’ WORKSHOP
Mon., 1 Aug.
Cost $50 (Includes lunch)
Minimum 10; Maximum 25 participants

A 1-day Teachers’ Workshop is planned which will include hands-on activities and educational opportunities offered on the subject of Lewis & Clark. Presentations include “First Encounters of the Lewis and Clark Expedition on the Middle Missouri” and “Using Technology in the Classroom to Teach Lewis and Clark Subject Matter.”

Post-Meeting Tour “C”: Northern Tour
Thurs., Fri. & Sat., 4, 5 & 6 Aug.
Cost $650 (Bus, Meals & Lodging included)
Minimum 10; Maximum 20 participants

Day 1, Thurs., 4 Aug.
- The Bertrand Exhibit, DeSoto Bend, IA
- Lewis & Clark Murals, Sioux City, IA
- Sgt. Gass Memorial State Park, Elk Point, SD
- Spirit Mound, SD
- Missouri River Overlook, Vermillion, SD
- Pierre Dorian Burial Site, Yankton, SD
- Argo Hotel, Crofton, NE

Day 2, Fri. 5 Aug.
- Kreycik Riverview Elk/Bison Ranch, Niobrara, NE
- Old Baldy, Lynch, NE
- Ashfall Fossil Beds, Royal, NE
- Sites along the Shannon Trail
- Ponca State Park

Day 3, Sat. 6 Aug.
- Chief Blackbird Burial Site, Decatur, NE
- Pelican Island, Tekamah, NE
- Tour and Afternoon Tea, Ft. Omaha, NE

CAMP POMP: Ages 6-18 yrs
Cost $200
Includes bus trips, lunches/evening meals
Minimum 10; Maximum 25 participants

Children will learn about the adventures of the Lewis & Clark Expedition along the Middle Missouri. Activities include drama and crafts. Children will present a play focusing on the “First Encounters on the Middle Missouri” to be presented for the attendees on 3 Aug. On Tues. and Wed., Aug. 2 & 3, children will travel on the bus with their parents to the re-enactments in Sioux City, IA and Ft. Atkinson, NE.
Registration Instructions
(REGISTRATIONS LIMITED TO THE FIRST 400)

Registration Fees: Postmarked before 15 June 2011, $345; after 15 June 2011, $400. Fees may only be paid by check or money order. Registration form and fees should be mailed to Mouth of the Platte, Inc., P.O. Box 3344, Omaha, NE 68103. Questions may be addressed to: mouthoftheplatte@cox.net or call Della Bauer at 402-697-8544.

Cancellations/Refunds: Cancellation requests postmarked prior to 15 June 2011, will receive full refund minus a $50 handling charge. Refunds postmarked from 15 June to 15 July 2011, will receive a 50% refund. Requests for refunds after 15 July 2011 will be considered only for emergency or extenuating circumstances.

Confirmation Notices: All attendees will receive confirmation of registration. Confirmation notices will include a receipt of payment and a complete schedule of events as well as any other pertinent information. Confirmation notices will indicate whether a registration is complete or requires additional information. Please read your confirmation notice carefully. To report a correction or discrepancy call the number indicated on the notice. If you have not received a confirmation within three weeks of submitting your registration form, write or email Mouth of the Platte, Inc., PO Box 3344, Omaha, NE 68103 or mouthoftheplatte@cox.net.

Silent Auction: If you have Lewis & Clark items you would like to donate to the Silent Auction, please send a description of the item and the starting bid to Mouth of the Platte, Inc., via U. S. mail or email.

Lodging Information

Conference Hotel: The Embassy Suites, 555 South Tenth Street, Omaha, NE 68102. Phone: 402-346-9000 for reservations. Room rate for Lewis & Clark Annual Meeting attendees is $119.00 plus tax. Rate includes a full breakfast daily and is effective three days before and after the conference. Please identify yourself as an Annual Meeting Registrant. The hotel is located in the downtown area near the "Old Market", approximately five miles from the airport. Hotel shuttles are available from the airport on request.

More hotels and motels are available in the Omaha/Council Bluffs area. Google search "Motels Omaha" for a list.

Camping is available at NP Dodge Park, 402-444-4673, 11005 John J. Pershing Dr., Omaha, NE 68122, located approximately ten miles from downtown Omaha, or at Lake Manawa State Park, 712-366-0220, 1100 South Shore Dr, Council Bluffs, IA. Recreational Vehicle camping is available at Lake Manawa State Park and Bluffs Run RV Park, 712-308-5005, www.horseshoe councilsbluffs.com.
# Annual Meeting Registration Form for the 43rd Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation

**Omaha, NE/Council Bluffs, IA 30 July - 3 August 2011**

**Additional registration forms are available at [www.lewisandclark.org](http://www.lewisandclark.org) or [www.mouthoftheplatte.org](http://www.mouthoftheplatte.org)**

## REGISTRATION FORM (PLEASE PRINT)

**FULL NAME OF REGISTRANT #1**
**NAME AS YOU WOULD LIKE IT ON BADGE**

- Cost: $345 (before 6/15)
- Cost: $400 (after 6/15)

**FULL NAME OF REGISTRANT #2**
**NAME AS YOU WOULD LIKE IT ON BADGE**

- Cost: $345 (before 6/15)
- Cost: $400 (after 6/15)

**Mailing Address:**

**Phone Numbers:**

- Home
- Cell

**Email Address:**

**Emergency Contact:**

- Name:
- Phone:

**Chapter Name:**

**Special Needs:**

- Diet/Other (please describe):

**Camp Pomp Attendee:**

- Name:
- Age:

- Cost: $200

(Use additional sheet for more than two participants)

**Registrants Attending Teachers' Workshop:**

- Cost: $50 x ____ =

**Pre-Meeting Tour “A”: Omaha/Council Bluffs, Thurs. & Fri., 28 & 29 Jul.**

- Cost: $350 x ____ =

**Pre-Meeting Tour “B”: Nebraska City, Sat., 30 Jul.**

- Cost: $55 x ____ =

**Post-Meeting Tour “C”: Northern Tour, Thurs., Fri., & Sat.; 4.5, & 6 Aug.**

- Cost: $650 x ____ =

## Meals for Non-Registered Guests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Meal</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sun.</td>
<td>Recep</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon.</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon.</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>Banq</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Single Day Registration:**

- Sun. 31 Jul., Joslyn Museum/Evening Reception: Cost: $75
- Mon. 1 Aug., Lectures: Lunch and Dinner: Cost: $100
- Tues. 2 Aug., Bus Trip to Sioux City/Onawa, lunch only: Cost: $125
- Wed. 3 Aug., Ft. Atkinson, NPS, WHTC bus trip/Lunch and closing banquet: Cost: $125

**TOTAL COSTS SUBMITTED:**

FEES MUST BE PAID BY CHECK/MONEY ORDER TO: Mouth of the Platte, Inc., P.O. Box 3344, Omaha, NE 68103

---

If interested in the Bicycle Ride on Sun., 31 Jul., 7:00-11:00 a.m., please contact bpawloski@cox.net
natives done it to git the enside beark."

Whitehouse's entry for September 13, two days later, also provides notable details beyond what other journals report. On that date the party had two chief events. They came upon a beautiful hot spring (now called Lolo Hot Springs) and then missed their trail and made an awkward passage over rough terrain. Gass, Ordway, Whitehouse, and Clark all cover these matters, sometimes repeating exact phrases from each others' journals.

Gass has the briefest passage, a mere outline with one striking image. (A modern reader should be aware that this is Gass's journal as edited by McKeehan, and so purged of obvious peculiarities of spelling and grammar; the original Gass journal is lost.)

*Friday 13th*. A cloudy morning. Capt. Lewis's horse could not be found; but some of the men were left to hunt for him and we proceeded on. When we had gone 2 miles, we came to a most beautiful warm spring, the water of which is considerably above blood heat; and I could not bear my hand in it without uneasiness. There are so many paths leading to and from this spring, that our guide took a wrong one for a mile or two, and we had bad travelling across till we got into the road again at noon we halted. 9

Ordway's entry is a few lines longer and phrased somewhat differently, but it covers the same materials (cloudy day, lost horse, short distance, warm spring, lost trail) in the same order.

Friday 13th Sept. 1805. cloudy. we got all our horses up except one which Capt. Lewis rode and a colt also. we then loaded our horses and proceeded on a Short distance and came to a warm Spring which run from a ledge of rocks and nearly boiled and issued out in several places[,] it had been frequented by the Savages. a little dam was fixed and had been used for a bathing place. we drank a little of the water and washed our faces in it. a handsome green on the creek near this Spring. we had Some difficulty here in finding the direct trail. we went round a bad way came on the trail again and halted to dine at or near the head of Sd Creek at a beaver dam. 10

The Whitehouse journal starts out with phrasing that closely matches Ordway's, then diverges with several embellishments on the same outline. But after a few lines a startling phrase leaps from the page: "considerable above blood heat," the same words in the same order as in Gass.

*Friday 13th Sept. 1805*. cloudy. we got our horses up all but the one Capt. Lewis rode and a colt which our young Indian rode. we hunted Some time for them but could not find them. then all but 2 or three loaded the horses and proceeded on a Short distance passed a warm Spring, which nearly boiled where it issued out of the rocks[,] a Short distance below the natives has dammed it up to bathe themselves in, and the water in that place is considerable above blood heat. it runs out in Sundry places and Some places cooler than others. Several of us drank of the water, it has a little sulphur taste and verry clear. these Springs are very beautiful to See, and we think them to be as good to bathe in &c. as any other ever yet found in the United States. a handsome grove or Small meadow on the creek near Sd. Springs. a little above we could not git along the Indian trail for the timber which had been blown down in a thicket of pine &c. So we went around a hill and came on the trail again and proceeded on until about 11 oClock and halted to dine and let our horses feed. 11

For this date then we have three overlapping accounts, with Whitehouse providing many additional touches: a missing colt "which our young Indian rode"; water running cooler in some places and tasting of sulfur; downed timber as the reason for the "bad travelling" the others mention. Whitehouse also records another general opinion when he writes that "we think" these springs "to
be as good to bathe in &c. as any other ever yet found in the United States.” That’s a sweeping pronouncement for a mere private to make unless he has more experienced observers to back up that “we” in “we think”!

Clark’s journal for this date does not have any matching phrases, but when it is read next to these others it clearly follows the same pattern and supplies some of the same odd details:

a cloudy morning[.] Capt Lewis and one of our guides lost their horses, Capt Lewis & 4 men detained to hunt the horses, I proceeded on with the party up the Creek at 2 miles passed Several Springs which I observed the Deer Elk &c. had made roads to, and below one of the Indians had made a whole to bathe, I tasted this water and found it hot & not bad tasted The last [blank] in further examination I found this water nearly boiling hot at the places it Spouted from the rocks (which a hard Corse Grt, and of great size the rocks on the Side of the Mountain of the Same texture[.]) I put my finger in the water, at first could not bare it in a Second—as Several roads led from these Springs in different directions, my Guide took a wrong road and took us out of our rout 3 miles through intolerable rout, after falling into the right road I proceeded on thro tolerabrl rout for abt. 4 or 5 miles and halted to let our horses graze as well as waite for Capt. Lewis who has not yet Come up, The pine Country falling timber &c. &c. Continue.12

Like Whitehouse, Clark mentions the water’s taste and notes the fallen timbers; like Gass, he notes the two-mile distance from camp to the springs, and the shock of the hot water. Moreover there is a close similarity of language in Clark’s brief field notes for this date: “Those springs come out in maney places in the rocks and nearly boiling hot.”13 In Ordway, the line is “nearly boiled and issued out in several places.” In Whitehouse, “nearly boiled where it Issued out of the rocks.”

These entries thus show a loose copying of highlights, with notable lapses and variations. No one, that is, seems to have dictated a master outline and then scrutinized the various copies to make sure they all tallied. In fact, they show conspicuous differences. Clark and Gass say they halted at noon; Whitehouse has them halting at about eleven. Whitehouse notes a sulfur taste in the water; Clark finds no bad taste. My best conjecture is that late in the day the writers gathered for a brief conference and agreed on a series of main points. Then they opened their journals to write separately, though Ordway and Whitehouse probably sat side by side, with Gass nearby as the conversation continued.

Captain Clark surely contributed to such pre-writing preparations, if only to provide distances, latitudes, and other exact measurements. But what about Lewis? Did he leave such surface events to others while he held himself aloof with his own deeper thoughts? His journal entries in this period consist of only two long passages for September 9 and 10, and both those entries weigh much larger matters.

Lewis reviews what past and present native informants have told him about the mountains and rivers he now sees, and tries to make out what these bits of evidence imply about the routes he has covered and now faces.

It might well seem that Lewis is thus looking out at a different world from the mere stuff of lost horses and hot springs and fallen timbers. Yet there is a striking passage in the Whitehouse journal that could only have derived from Lewis’s abstract thinking at this point.

In the words of John Logan Allen, Lewis was just beginning to understand that this spot was “a focal location in western geography.”

Here at Travelers’ Rest converged a number of routes from the Missouri to the Columbia. . . [To the west] lay the Lolo Trail, the tortuous but shortest possible route to navigable Columbia waters; toward the south lay the passage to the headwaters of the Jefferson, to the Three Forks, and thence to the Yellowstone across the divide between that river and the Missouri; and eastward lay the route to the Great Falls of the Missouri via the Big Blackfoot River (tributary of the Clark Fork of the Columbia) and the Sun River (tributary of the Missouri).14

Lewis was synthesizing information he had obtained from Hidatsa informants at Fort Mandan, from his current Shoshone guide, and from three Flatheads or Nez Perces who had just come up the Lolo Trail in pursuit of horse thieves. On September 9 he reasoned that the Bitterroot River eventually connected with the Columbia, “but from the circumstance of their being no salmon in it I believe that there must be a considerable fall in it below.” In other words, it would be an impossibly risky route to follow. His guide also said he did not know that route, and “as our guide informs that we should leave the river at this place and the weather appearing settled and fair I determined to halt the next day and rest our horses and take some celestial Observations.”15

The next day he directed two of the hunters to proceed farther down the Bitterroot, to where it joined with the Clark Fork. “I think it most probable that this river continues it’s course along the rocky Ms. Northwardly as far or perhaps beyond the scources of the Medecine river and then turning to the West falls into the Tacootchetsees.”16 As the next sentence explains, Hidatsas at Fort Mandan
had predicted “a large river west of, and at no great distance from the sources of the Medecine river, which passed along the Rocky Mountains from S. to N.” If this river turned west it must drain into the Pacific, most likely through the Columbia. Since Lewis also knew the maps and journal of the earlier explorer Alexander Mackenzie, he reasoned that the intermediary link, entering the Columbia from far to the north, must be the river Mackenzie had named Tacoutche-Tesse. 1

Mackenzie had actually found the Fraser River, which is not part of the Columbia system. But Tacoutche-Tesse was the name of a long and crucial link to the Columbia on the most up-to-date maps Lewis had pored over with Thomas Jefferson and other geographical experts of the period. 17

Lewis's reasoning here is momentous, for he is balancing the expertise of Mackenzie with the information of local guides and advisers, and testing both against his own direct observations. His conclusions also lift him, as it were, above the Rockies and the other immediate barriers to his western progress, to a new mental conception of the drainage beyond the Continental Divide. Yet not a word from these passages appears in the journals of Ordway, Gass, or even Clark.

A single line does appear in Whitehouse, however, and it makes a fascinating turn on Lewis's final point.

Whitehouse's entry for September 10 is longer than Gass's or Ordway's and quite different from either. And at beginning and end it may hold echoes of Lewis's voice. Gass begins: “We remained here all this day, which was clear and pleasant, to let our horses rest and to take an observation.” 18 Clark is just as brief: “A fair morning Concluded to Delay to day and make Some observations.” 19 Ordway is briefest of all: “a fair morning, we make a Short halt here to wrest and hunt.” 20 But Whitehouse adds details: “a clear pleasant morning. not So cold as usual. as our road lead over a mountain to our left, we conclu our Captains conclude to Stay here this day to take observations, for the hunters to kill meat to last us across the mountain and for the horses to rest &c.” 21 Unlike the others, Whitehouse lists three full reasons for stopping—to rest the horses, make observations, and send out hunters. Lewis, too, notes these three reasons—resting the horses and taking observations at the end of his September 9 entry, sending out all the hunters at the start of September 10. One can almost hear Whitehouse putting a deferential question—“For the journal, sir: why have we halted?” —and drawing out a detail: the hunters must “kill meat to last us across the mountain.” Finally, there is the hiccup slip of the pen in mid-sentence. “We conclu [no, better make that] our Captains conclude to stay here this day.”

At the end of this entry Whitehouse has another unique line, unlike anything except Lewis's geographical reasoning: “our guide tells us that these waters runs into Mackinzees River as near as they can give an account, but he is not acquainted that way. So we go the road he knows.” 22 These lines seem to hold several compressed notions and another odd slip. “Our guide tells us”—this sentence begins in singular then shifts to plural, “as near as they can give an account,” then back to singular, “but he is not acquainted.” This shift may indicate that “they” were the officers, Lewis and Clark, giving the party (or the journal keepers) a briefing about the shift of
direction westward at this point, following the guide's advice to "us," the officers. Certainly the Shoshone guide could not read Mackenzie's maps or journal or address the party; he had to communicate with the captains through interpreters. So Whitehouse has to be relying here on what the officers have imparted to him. And someone, undoubtedly Lewis, has translated ideas about the "Tacootchetess" River of Lewis's journal to the "Mackinzees River" of Whitehouse. In other words, Lewis must have imparted some of his bookish and seemingly isolated reasoning to Whitehouse and perhaps to the entire party.

Whitehouse may not have understood Lewis completely. Maybe he only jotted down sketchy phrases and fragments. But at this crucial turning point Lewis evidently tried to explain the large design that governed his next move, if not the meaning of the whole expedition. That is a revealing incident, but one which a later reader can glimpse only because Whitehouse happened to append these lines to his entry for this day.

David Nicandri has recently examined these same passages very closely and discussed Lewis's reasoning and the tensions of the other journal keepers in detail. He argues that Lewis was constantly aware of Mackenzie's example as an explorer and author; that "the journals of Joseph Whitehouse prove indispensable" in showing how the captains reasoned together with their men; and that Whitehouse reached his own, independent conclusions about rivers and their courses. In an earlier passage, Nicandri praises Whitehouse, whose "unvarnished journal . . . clarified and confirmed" others' records "as his candid reckoning of affairs so often did." The evidence of the present essay seems to qualify these judgments. Whitehouse cannot be regarded as independent and detached from the sergeants and their journals, and in his remarks about Mackenzie's river he seems to have drawn his ideas and even phrases directly from Lewis or Clark.

The days at Travelers' Rest and Lolo Hot Springs provide just a sample of the complex interweavings of the expedition journals. But from this sample we can draw four rough guidelines for reading further. (1) The enlisted men's journals were collaborative. No matter whose name may appear on the title page, the contents derive from conversations with others and outright borrowings of details and phrasings. (2) David McKeehan's claim that "all the journals" were "examined, compared, and corrected" from time to time is misleading. The journals are not uniform. They do not show signs of heavy revision and correction. They seem to overlap from day to day in their general outlines, but the writers always vary in their language and observations. Often they disagree or note significant variations and elaborations. (3) The enlisted men and Clark sometimes write in similar ways, but Lewis's journals are quite distinct. (4) Nonetheless, even Lewis's most abstract thinking was shared with subordinates at times of crucial decision making. Lewis, as well as Clark, might directly contribute to even a private's daily records.

---
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LEWIS AND CLARK AND THE ARTICLES OF WAR

Out of necessity, the captains developed their own system of military justice — one that was harsh but fair, and critical to the Corps of Discovery's discipline and morale

BY WILLIAM M. GATLIN

From early on, Meriwether Lewis and William Clark knew their mission's success would depend on effective military discipline. In the face of the unknown hazards they were sure to encounter, it was imperative that the troops under their command unhesitatingly follow orders. In the United States Army of 1803 the framework for instilling and maintaining discipline was contained in the Articles of War and the often draconian punishments they authorized. Lewis and Clark also knew the Articles of War were written for large units linked in an intact chain of command, not for a company-sized group cut off from the rest of the army in a two-year trek through uncharted wilderness. The captains improvised by devising a system of military justice that met their situation, one that followed the spirit if not always the letter of the Articles of War.

Armies have long had written rules for the enforcement of military discipline. The term "articles of war" dates from 1688, when the British army set down its rules governing conduct. Early in the American Revolution, for its fledgling army the Continental Congress drafted articles of war loosely based on the British model. Soon after, a committee that included John Adams and Thomas Jefferson rewrote the articles so they conformed more closely to the British model. These were further revised in 1786. This became the version adopted by the first Congress in 1789, following ratification of the Constitution, and it remained in effect with few changes until 1806.

The Articles of War were "to be duly observed and exactly obeyed by all officers and soldiers." They required that "at the time of his so enlisting, or within six days afterwards" a recruit shall "have the articles ... read to him." Furthermore, "the articles are to be read and published once every two months, at the head of every regiment, troop, or company." In a military court, no defendant could reasonably plead ignorance of the law.

By long tradition, commanders dealt harshly with violations of the military code. An American soldier convicted of being drunk on duty, for example, could expect corporal punishment — usually flogging, "limited" after 1786 to 100 lashes. These were usually administered with cat-o'-nine tails, a whip made of nine cords, each tied in a knot at the end. Running the gauntlet was another form of corporal punishment. A soldier convicted of the more serious charges of mutiny or sleeping on guard duty faced possible execution. Military historian William Skelton studied the records of one American regiment...
for the period 1785-1787. In that three-year period there were 105 courts-martial, of which 66 led to guilty verdicts. Courts imposed capital punishment in 3 cases and corporal punishment in 63 cases, 57 of which resulted in flogging; 19 called for 39 to 80 lashes, 37 for 100 lashes, and 1 for 300 lashes.8

General Anthony Wayne firmly believed in corporal punishment. Lewis and Clark both served under Wayne during his campaigns against Indians in the Ohio Valley in the 1790s, and they may well have developed their sense of military justice from his example.9

The Articles of War established a system of military justice for the regular army and for state militias attached to it. A court-martial was defined as “a legally organized body to investigate, deliberate, decide, and adjudge, and award sentence, concerning offences committed against military law.”10 Two types existed: the general court-martial and the regimental, or garrison, court-martial. A general court-martial was ordered by a general or other senior officer commanding a large body of troops and required 5 to 13 commissioned officers as members.11 A regimental court-martial could be called by the commander of a smaller body of troops; it consisted of at least 3 commissioned officers, and it could not impose the death sentence or hard labor for longer than a month.12

The requirements in the Articles of War for a minimum number of commissioned officers to serve on a court and the rules about who could convene it made strict compliance impossible for Lewis and Clark. Neither officer had authority to convene a general court-martial. Lewis, as the senior officer in charge, may have had the authority to convene a regimental court-martial, but he would have lacked the necessary three commissioned officers as members. The authors of the Articles of War never contemplated a small group of soldiers indefinitely isolated from the rest of the army and commanded by just two commissioned officers.

**EARLY DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS**

The captains had problems with their recruits early on, well before they set off for the Pacific in the spring of 1804. On November 18, 1803, while proceeding down the Ohio River from Pittsburgh in the expedition’s keelboat, Lewis complained that some of the men had “left camp contrary to instructions” and gotten drunk.13 This was the first recorded disciplinary incident, but others would follow soon enough.

Most of the men picked by Lewis and Clark were young, rambunctious backwoodsmen bursting with energy that needed to be channeled and controlled. Toward this end, the captains started honing their disciplinary procedures after settling into their first winter quarters, at Camp Wood River in Illinois, opposite St. Louis. Clark drilled the troops and kept them busy hunting, making sugar, and working on modifications to the keelboat. The captains must have known it would take more than drills and guard duty to instill discipline, which also depended on the firm but fair administration of military justice. The Articles of War didn’t fit their circumstances, so they set out to improvise a system “agreeable to” them, as Clark phrased it, if not strictly in accord with the official documents.14

In January 1804, while still in their quarters in Illinois, Clark jotted a note to himself about military justice for the Corps of Discovery. The note is fragmentary and difficult to decipher, but it probably reflects the thinking of both captains and sketches out some basics about adapting the Articles of War for their purposes. In essence, he states that the captains will make the rules, and violations will be “Subject to Such punishment as directed by the articles of War.” For lesser offenses, a court-martial might consist of a sergeant acting as president and at least one other noncommissioned officer and five privates as members of the court. For capital offenses, one of the captains would preside, and in all cases he and Lewis reserved the right to reduce any sentence. Any court-martial “will act agreeable to the rules and regulations of the Articles of War and such others as may be established . . . from time to time” by the co-commanders.15

The note may reflect a discussion between the captains about military justice, or perhaps it’s a rough draft of a detachment order he planned to post. Either way, it clearly acknowledges the need for a plan to enforce discipline and punish disobedience once the explorers were in the field. The procedures sketched out bear close resemblance to those later implemented.

In an article comparing the Articles of War with the procedures followed by the captains, Robert R. Hunt concluded “that none of the courts-martial documented on the Expedition were authorized or legally empowered to try or sentence any of the accused soldiers.”16 This is correct. We should bear in mind, however, that following the expedition’s return, none of the captains’ superior officers questioned their application of justice, and none of the punished soldiers appealed their convictions. The procedures outlined by Clark, including noncommissioned officers and privates serving as members of a court-martial, may not have squared with the Articles of War, but they proved effective.
DISCIPLINE AT WOOD RIVER

The captains first put their system into effect at Camp Wood River. In his field notes, Clark recorded some of the disciplinary problems that winter of 1803-04. The notes are difficult to decipher, but they indicate a range of infractions, from the trivial (losing a tomahawk) to the more serious (fighting, insubordination, and threatening a noncommissioned officer).17

A case in early January involved a fight between two privates, William Werner and John Potts. Perhaps figuring a joint task would help them get over their differences, Clark ordered the two men to work together building a hut for a local woman who washed the men’s laundry.18

Two months later, Lewis publicly reprimanded Private Reuben Field for refusing Sergeant John Ordway's order to mount guard duty when both captains were away from camp. In his detachment order of March 3, Lewis said he felt “himself mortified and disappointed” at Field’s disorderly conduct, and reminded the men that Ordway had been in command in the captains' absence. He also took to task several other soldiers—John Colter, John Boley, Peter Weiser, and John Robinson—for leaving camp on false pretenses and returning drunk:

> The abuse of some of the party with respect to the privilege heretofore granted them of going into the country, is not less displeasing; to such as have made hunting or other business a pretext to cover their design of visiting a neighbouring whiskey shop.19

Lewis confined the miscreants to camp for 10 days. The order was read to the gathered corps on parade, and we can reasonably assume with historian John Bakeless that “the offenders squirmed.”20

These early disciplinary actions were handled administratively—i.e., by the captains, without recourse to a court-martial. (In the legal parlance of today’s military, this would be called nonjudicial punishment, or NJP.)
The captains restricted privileges and challenged the men’s pride, but tougher measures would be required a few weeks later when privates Colter, John Shields, and Robert Frazer disobeyed orders from Sergeant Ordway and threatened to shoot him. The captains ordered a court-martial, which convened March 29. The journals are short on details—they fail to record the court’s members and their verdict—but it appears the defendants were found guilty. Clark noted that Shields and Colter “asked forgiveness & & promised to doe better in the future.” The implication is that all three were put on notice but not punished.

Disobeying a sergeant’s direct orders and threatening to kill him were serious offenses, and in light of Lewis and Clark’s handling of similar problems later in the expedition, their quickness to forgive the accused seems surprising. But they were still learning, and their actions appear to have had a positive effect—there is no record of further infractions at Wood River, and several troublemakers (Field and Shields in particular) became outstanding members of the expedition.

**The Expedition Gets Underway**

The next incident occurred just two days after the expedition headed up the Missouri, bound at last for the Pacific Ocean. On May 16, 1804, the explorers stopped in the river town of St. Charles and waited for Lewis, who had remained in St. Louis on business, to rejoin them. St. Charles was the last settlement the men would see for a long while, and some of them decided to take the most of it. Contrary to orders, three men—Werner, Hugh Hall, and John Collins—slipped off the keelboat for some fun in town. Upon their return they were “Confined for misconduct” and put on trial the following day.

All three were charged with being absent without leave, and Collins drew additional charges of “behaving in an unbecoming manner” at a ball and speaking in a manner “tending to bring into disrespect the orders of the Commanding officer.” In their court-martial four privates (Field, Potts, Richard Windsor, and Joseph Whitehouse) sat in judgment, with Sergeant Ordway presiding. Werner and Hall pleaded guilty, and each was sentenced to 25 lashes. The court, however, recommended mercy for “their former Good Conduct.” Clark agreed and suspended their sentences.22

Collins pleaded guilty to being absent without leave, while declaring his innocence to the remaining charges. The court, “after mature deliberation & agreeable to the evidence adduced,” found Collins “Guilty of all charges” and sentenced him to 50 lashes. Clark upheld the conviction and the sentence was carried out that evening “in the Presence of the Party.”23

It appears that neither Collins nor Hall learned his lesson, for both were involved in an episode six weeks later. On June 29, with the corps north of today’s Kansas City, Sergeant Charles Floyd charged Collins with “getting drunk” on guard duty and allowing Hall, “Contrary to all order, rule, or regulation,” to draw whiskey from the barrel Collins was supposedly guarding. This time the court consisted of Sergeant Patrick Gass and privates Colter, John Newman, and John Thompson, with Sergeant Nathaniel Pryor presiding. Collins pleaded innocent but was convicted and sentenced to “one hundred lashes on his bear Back.” Hall pleaded guilty and drew 50 lashes. Lewis and Clark approved the sentences, which were again carried out in front of the full party.24

In this and similar situations, the captains relied on a court composed of privates and the occasional sergeant, with a sergeant presiding. Although the Articles of War didn’t require it, the men charged were tried by a jury of peers (that is, fellow enlisted men).25 This could work either for or against a defendant. As Lewis’s biographer Stephen Ambrose has observed, “No doubt every man in the party knew exactly how much whiskey was available, and how much of it was his by rights.”26 Perhaps this is why Clark could conclude that the men were always “verry ready to punish Such Crimes.”27

Clark referred to the “little punishment” inflicted on Collins and Hall, but we shouldn’t forget that flogging was in fact a brutal business. As Dr. Eldon Chuinard, an authority on medical aspects of the expedition, observed,

Nothing is noted in the journals about the suffering of these men either during the flogging, or the care of their wounds, or giving them relief from their heavy duties as the Expedition went on with its routines. Their backs must have been swollen and bleeding and raw from the abrasions caused by the lashes. The wearing of clothing next to their skins, or the exposure of their skin to the elements and insects, and the working of the muscles under the inflamed skin, must have been extremely painful. There is no indication in the journals that special consideration was given to them or pain-relieving medications provided to them.28

Up to now Lewis and Clark had dealt with relatively minor (and often alcohol-related) infractions. On July 12, with the corps approaching Indian territory, the captains confronted a far graver offense, one that could have led
“to the probable destruction . . . of the party.”29 Private Alexander Willard was charged with lying down and sleeping while on guard duty. Under the Articles of War any “sentinel . . . found sleeping upon his post . . . shall suffer death, or such other punishment as shall be inflicted by the sentence of a court-martial.”30 Willard admitted to lying down but pleaded innocent to falling asleep.31

It was the expedition’s first capital offense. Given its serious nature, the captains convened a court comprising just two men, both commissioned officers: the captains themselves. Perhaps they wanted to maintain control over the situation or to insulate the men from the grave responsibility of sentencing a fellow soldier to death. Whatever their motive, they found Willard guilty and sentenced him to 100 lashes, to be administered over four days—25 lashes a day, “the punishment to Commence this evening at Sunset, and continue . . . every evening until completed.”32 Chuinard notes that “Willard dutifully took the daily lashings inflicted on a back already raw from the preceding flogging.”33

Several weeks later the explorers passed the mouth of the Platte River. Beginning July 30, they camped for five days on a site they named the Council Bluff for a parley they held with chiefs of the Oto and Missouri tribes. Late in the afternoon of August 3, they resumed their journey and made camp for the night about five miles upriver. On August 4, when Private Moses Reed reported he’d left his knife back at the Council Bluff, the captains gave him permission to retrieve it. The rest of the party continued upriver with the understanding that Reed would catch up. When, after three days, Reed failed to return, the captains sent George Drouillard, the corps’s civilian interpreter and hunter, and three others to capture the man they now considered a deserter. If Reed didn’t give up peacefully, Drouillard was authorized “to put him to Death.”34

Two weeks later, Drouillard caught up with the main party, bringing with him Reed and six Oto chiefs. Reed was charged with desertion and stealing a rifle, shot-pouch, powder, and balls. The journals don’t say who served on the court-martial. It may be that the captains alone decided his fate, with the idea of making him an example for anyone else contemplating desertion. Reed pleaded guilty and requested, as Clark noted, that “we would be as favourable with him as we Could consistantly with our Oathes.”35

In the harshest punishment yet, the captains sentenced Reed to run the gauntlet. This extreme measure called for his fellow soldiers to line up in two rows, each man armed with switches for beating Reed as he ran between them.36 He was ordered to “run” the gauntlet four times. In point of fact, the convicted man usually “walked” the gauntlet, since it was common for another soldier to precede him, facing backward with musket and fixed bayonet to slow his pace.37 Reed may have received the equivalent of 500 lashes. The sentence horrified the Otos, who asked the captains to grant a pardon, but once “the Customs of our Countrey” were explained to them, wrote Clark, “they were all Satisfied with the propriety of the Sentence.”38

Reed was also expelled from the permanent party and from the army, in what amounted to a dishonorable discharge. The captains stopped his pay and gave him the worst tasks to perform. He remained with the corps through its winter at Fort Mandan, then returned to St. Louis on the keelboat.39

Apparently unchastened, Reed continued to act subversively. Two months later, on October 12, he and Private John Newman were confined for “mutinous expressions, was recruited there.
Expressions." Reed may have been beyond punishment, but Newman was not.

The captains convened a court-martial, with Clark presiding as a nonvoting member and nine men sitting in judgment: Sergeants Ordway and Gass and privates Shields, Hall, Collins, Werner, William Bratton, George Shannon, and Silas Goodrich. It was the largest court convened, which may reflect the seriousness with which the captains took the case. Newman was charged with "having uttered repeated expressions of a highly criminal and mutinous nature; the same having the tendency not only to destroy every principle of military discipline, but also to alienate the affection of the individuals composing this Detachment to their officers, and to disaffect them to the service for which they have been so sacredly and solemnly engaged." The journals don’t report the offending words, but as Chuinard observes, “whatever language Newman used, it was certainly the kind the captains considered to be disrespectful, which they could not tolerate if they were to maintain the command of the crew.” The defendant, who pleaded innocent, was convicted and sentenced to 75 lashes. Like Reed, the captains ordered him expelled from the Corps of Discovery. He was stripped of arms and accoutrements and assigned as a “labouring hand” on the red pirogue.

Before this incident Newman had not been a discipline problem. Most historians of the expedition attribute his outburst to Reed’s agitating. Some have offered alternative theories why the otherwise well-behaved Newman would voice “mutinous expressions.” David Holloway thinks it may have been the lingering effects of time spent in the Arikara villages, particularly with Arikara women. Chuinard suggests he may have uttered his incriminating remarks while drunk. Regardless of cause, it was a costly mistake.

The explorers halted on a sand bar on October 15 and executed the sentence. In a scene reminiscent of the Oto chiefs’ distress over Reed’s flogging, an Arikara chief traveling with the party “Cried aloud” in alarm, but once again Clark persuaded him it was necessary for discipline.

Unlike the pariah Reed, Newman regretted his behavior. During the bitter winter at Fort Mandan, in today’s North Dakota, he performed the tasks assigned to him and worked hard to redeem himself. Despite his efforts and his petition to be returned to the permanent party, the captains stuck to their decision, and the following spring Newman returned to St. Louis on the keelboat.

(It is a measure of Lewis’s fairness that, in a letter he later wrote to the Secretary of War, Henry Dearborn, he commended Newman’s “zeal” at Fort Mandan and his deportment aboard the keelboat, which “on many occasions owed her safety in great measure to his personal exertions.” On Lewis’s recommendation the secretary paid him for his services through the end of May 1805, the month of the keelboat’s return.)

The journals record one more court-martial, for what seems like a rather minor infraction. On the night of February 10, 1805, Private Thomas Howard returned to Fort Mandan from a visit to one of the Mandan villages. The gates were closed and barred, but rather than summoning the guard to open them, he scaled the wall. The captains might have dismissed Howard’s act if an Indian who witnessed it hadn’t followed him over the wall. Howard was charged with setting “a pernicious example to the Savages” and found guilty. On the court’s recommendation, Lewis suspended the sentence of 50 lashes.

If, in the words of legal scholar Edward Byrne, the very purpose of military justice is to “maintain a high level of discipline,” Lewis and Clark’s adaptation of the Articles of War should be judged a success.

From the time they left Fort Mandan in April 1805 to their return to St. Louis, in September 1806, there were no more discipline problems, minor or otherwise, and morale remained high. During the Corps of Discovery’s shake-down phase—from its encampment at Wood River to its arrival at the Mandan villages—the captains increased the severity of punishments, from reprimands and loss of privileges to floggings and banishment. By the spring of 1805, notes Bakeless, “the captains found their men entirely loyal, diligent, and devoted through all the perilous miles they traveled together.”

The record bears this out. In early June 1805, when the explorers paused at the forks of the Missouri and Marias rivers and debated which to ascend, few agreed with the captains’ decision to head up the south fork, but they followed them without a murmur. Later, during the 12-day portage around the Great Falls of the Missouri, they were battered by hail and blinded by gnats and mosquitoes while hauling prodigious loads on feet pierced by cactus spines, yet as Clark reported, “no man complains [and] all go Cheerfully on.” A similar spirit prevailed during the arduous crossing of the Bitterroot Mountains and the cold, rain-soaked winter at Fort Clatsop, at the mouth of the Columbia River. However harsh it may seem to 21st-century eyes, the captains’ brand of military justice played
an essential role in molding the Corps of Discovery. As one chronicler of the expedition has put it, “in some cases, they literally whipped [it] into a first-class unit.”

William M. Gatlin is architectural historian at the Mississippi Department of Archives and History, in Jackson, Mississippi.
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Oseph of the Corps of Discovery (or The Mouse that Stowed Away)

By Betty Bauer

Would you believe a mouse could journey 4,000 miles? Oseph never thought he would leave his home. He was a mouse that lived among the grasses with his sister and grandparents.

Oseph was a proud field mouse. His grandfather said he came from a long line of Heartland mice. Grampy Meffurd, who knew about the world beyond the grasses, thought that the field where they nested was in the center of the land. That's why he told Oseph and his sister Merredith they were Heartland mice. Hearing Grampy Meffurd tell this story was enough to make Oseph feel important.

But there was a part of Oseph that wanted to find something else . . .

One day he ventured to the edge of town. He heard a gentleman called "Merry Weather" asking men at St. Charles to go with him on a journey.

"It is an expedition for the president of our country," explained the gentleman. President Jefferson had asked Meriwether Lewis to lead a discovery journey. Captain Lewis then chose another Army officer, William Clark, to travel with him. The two men called each other Captain.

Oseph was interested and wanted to go on the expedition. He listened to the talk about the purpose of the trip: to find a water route to the northwest. For some reason Oseph never liked water. He worried about the Missouri River on which the men would be traveling. But he was curious about the journey. He investigated the big boat the captains called a keelboat. He scampered in and out of its contents. When he found out how many places he could be without seeing water, he began to feel comfortable about a river trip.

Oseph worried about leaving the land and his food until he saw the supplies on the keelboat. He found there were enough holes in bags and enough grain inside those holes for him. So he decided he would go on the journey. Now he needed to pack. He got the leather pouch that Grammy Matisse had sewn for him. It was just like the one that their grandmother made for Merredith to hold snippets of muslin. The pieces of a muslin apron were the only things that Oseph and Merredith had from their mother.

Oseph was sure to take his prized flute that Grampy had cut for him from a reed along the river. It was tiny but gave beautiful sounds when he could put his lips around it and blow. At first when the reed was still wet, it had deep tones. But as the flute dried and shrank, it became higher pitched. It made pretty music that soothed Oseph at night.

The last thing to go into the pouch was a tiny piece of paper. It was Merr­edit's drawing of the family nest. It comforted Oseph to see how his sister had put grasses below and above and around the spot that the four of them called home.

So it was that Oseph was ready to be a member of the Corps of Discovery. The two captains, the men who joined the expedition and Oseph pulled away from St. Charles on May 22, 1804.

"The journey should take two years," Merry Weather had said. Oseph thought that must be long time.

One night early in the trip Oseph pulled stalks of wheat instead of loose grain out of a bag. He thought about using them for a frame for his sister's drawing. He was sad as he looked at the picture of home that evening, and he wanted to do something to keep busy.

The more he worked, the better he felt. When he finished, he smiled at what he had done.

Oseph enjoyed everything about the trip, but he especially liked the Indian maiden Sacagawea that Captains Lewis and Clark added to the group along the trail. She was helpful to everyone, and she made Oseph feel like he did when he was with Grammy Matisse. Later when Sacagawea's baby boy was born, the mouse was very excited. He found many reasons to forget the journey and be near the Indian mother and Little Pomp. Some of the other Indians they met along the way were friendly, but none were as nice as the two on the expedition.

The men of the expedition ran into hardships as the journey progressed. They were often hungry and sometimes sick. When his insides felt funny, Oseph thought he too, like the men, should have some of Dr. Rush's tablets. He couldn't get the lid off the tin box that held the pills. But he discovered a tiny bit of one under the box as he struggled to open it. He scooped up the morsel
and swallowed it. The piece of tablet rolled around inside him like a storm cloud. He thought he would be sicker than he was before he ate the medicine. After a great jolt, Oseph was exhausted, and he slept a long time.

When he awoke, the gray skies had become heavy and white. He shivered. Snowflakes covered his fur. He found Sacagawea and managed to snuggle against her buffalo robe. He dried off as he warmed next to her and Little Pomp. Oseph liked the little fellow who was always happy along the trail. Little Pomp giggled when the mouse rode with him and tickled him. He giggled then the same way he laughed and enjoyed his Indian mother. She softly talked to Little Pomp with words the mouse did not understand.

Finally, the expedition reached the spot that the captains said was as far as they would go. Even though many men were sick or injured, they cut down trees and made huts in a little fort. Fort Clatsop was bigger than mouse homes, and it had a solid roof on top. Oseph was thrilled. But the men complained about crowded living conditions that got worse during the rough winter. Food supplies were low. But the thing that bothered Oseph the most was the fleas. Fleas tormented him at night and prevented him from getting good sleep.

When he heard men planning to see a big whale at the ocean, Oseph decided to go too. The whale was huge! The whale was bigger than the buildings on the streets of St. Charles back in the Heartland. The ocean was more water than he had ever seen. Oseph felt fearful. But he also thought a good bath might get rid of the pesky fleas that were living on him. So he scurried into a pool of water along the big whale about the time an ocean wave came rushing on shore. The water carried him back and forth, away from and then against the whale. With each thump against the whale, another flea or two left the mouse’s fur. He finally felt clean. When he had energy to move, he chewed on blubber and drank some whale oil. Soon he began to feel strong — just like he
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felt before he started the journey.
Because he was feeling good again, Oseph lay back in tall grasses. He looked at the blue sky. He first thought of how he had learned to be near water. Then he thought of the places he had been and the hardships he had experienced since he joined the expedition. It had been a long and hard journey, but it had been a good time. The trip gave him a lot to do. He felt satisfied to know he had been a part of the captains’ journey to the northwest section of a big country.
But he still felt a special place in his heart for the middle of the country and its Heartland mice. He was very proud to be a field mouse that was the smallest member of the Corps of Discovery.

***
Foundation member and children’s book author Betty Bauer lives in Overland Park, Kansas.

NAMES OF NOTE:
- The author saw the name Oseph, starting with a small letter, on an obliterated road sign in western Missouri near St. Joseph. The sign was along the Missouri River — the same waterway for the expedition of William Clark and Meriwether Lewis (hence Merry Weather).
- Meffurd (Grampy Meffurd) was a forerunner of the name Meffert, whose family two hundred years later produced a historian who led a study tour for the National Trust for Historic Preservation along the Columbia River. That is where the author met him.
- Matisse (Grammy Matisse) is a style of font on the computer that housed the rough draft of one of the author’s books. Henri Matisse was a revered French artist who used daring, bright colors with broad brush strokes.
- Merredith (Oseph’s sister) came from a similar name with only one “r” belonging to a tour manager who camped along the Lewis and Clark Trail in Montana.
- Sacagawea has many pronunciations. After studying the journey, the author prefers Sah-kaw-guh-wee-uh.
L&Cs Roundup

N.D. center begins makeover

The Lewis and Clark Fort Mandan Foundation of Washburn, N.D., has embarked upon a complete remake of its expedition exhibits at the North Dakota Lewis & Clark Interpretive Center. Working with Taylor Design Studios of Chicago, the foundation is creating a new presentation on the expedition story and its linkage to what followed in its wake, the Maximilian/Bodmer Expedition and eventually homesteaders. The exhibits will be in place in the winter or early spring of 2012. The foundation will host the Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation’s annual meeting in the summer of 2013.

Rendering of new entrance.

Angling exhibit goes online

“Undaunted Anglers,” a new online exhibit about the fish and fishing of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, can now be accessed at www.undauntedanglers.org.

Undaunted Anglers focuses on all aspects of fishing related to the expedition. It features more than 100 panels with text, illustrations, and photographs. Detailed information regarding fish species, methods used to catch fish, and relationships with Native Americans who were versed in fish and catching them are major themes throughout the exhibit.

Created by the Federation of Fly Fishers in 2005, the physical version of Undaunted Anglers was first displayed at the federation’s Fly Fishing Discovery Center in Livingston, Mont. It recently moved to its current location at the Missouri River Basin Lewis and Clark Interpretive Center in Nebraska City, Neb.

Also featured are educational resources and information on the conservation of fish species recorded by Lewis and Clark.

and change of clothes in his gig box, his trusty airgun by his side, he would drive off on his solitary excursions, never hinting to his most intimate friends what course he would take.”

The mainspring on Lukens’s airgun shows rasp marks similar to those on the file, above. The expedition’s gunsmith replaced the mainspring of Lewis’s airgun with one made from a file.

catalog of his estate sale in 1847 lists 1 large airgun, 1 small airgun, 6 unfinished airguns, 12 airgun canes, and 17 unfinished airgun canes. Lukens was definitely in the business of making airguns.

However, there is no evidence that Lukens would have been making airguns in 1803 or that he ever met Meriwether Lewis.

Foundation member Michael Carrick lives in Turner, Oregon.

Profile (continued from p. 32)

Notes

1 Isaiah Lukens’s estate catalogue in the Library Company of Philadelphia collection, p. 5. For a facsimile of the estate-sale notice, see Michael Carrick, “Meriwether Lewis’s Airgun,” WPO, November 2002, p.16.


6 Ibid., p. 54.

7 Isaiah Lukens’s estate catalogue.

8 For more on the expedition’s airgun, see Robert Beeman, “Meriwether Lewis’s Wonder Weapon,” WPO, May 2006, pp. 29-34.
Isaiah Lukens of Philadelphia: Mechanical Genius

The Philadelphia clock maker also made air rifles and at the end of his life owned the one Meriwether Lewis took to the Pacific

BY MICHAEL CARRICK

For many years, gun historians believed that Isaiah Lukens made the air rifle Meriwether Lewis carried across country on the expedition of 1803-1806. Furthermore, they believed that very gun was in the Henry Stewart antique firearms collection, now in the museum at his alma mater, the Virginia Military Institute. Their belief was based on the discovery of an air rifle in the Lukens estate sale described as “One large [airgun] made for, and used by Messrs Lewis & Clark in their exploring expeditions. A great curiosity.” This was item number 95 in a list of 694 items from the Lukens estate sold on January 4, 1847, in Philadelphia.

The link between the Lukens air rifle owned by Stewart and the one carried by Lewis was a broken, and repaired, mainspring. In the expedition journals, Lewis wrote that the mainspring of the airgun broke, and that John Shields repaired it.

In 2002, the discovery of an 1803 description of Lewis’s air rifle by Colonel Thomas Rodney, a retired State of Delaware Supreme Court justice, led me to believe that Lukens did not make it. Rodney interacted with Lewis twice in 1803 on the Ohio River en route to assume his judicial position. Lewis was moving the keelboat from Pittsburgh to St. Louis and they visited over a couple of days near Wheeling. Lewis provided a demonstration of his air rifle to Rodney, who wrote a detailed description of the incident.

Rodney described a 20-shot, repeating air rifle that matched the description of the Austrian Army Girandoni rifle of 1780. Lewis’s air rifle could not possibly be a single-shot air rifle by Lukens or anyone else. I published my hypothesis and immediately was challenged by just about everyone who had an interest in the status quo. I traveled twice to Philadelphia and spent a total of three days at the Franklin Institute and the Library Company delving into the life and business of Isaiah Lukens.

Lukens was born in 1779 and lived in Horsham (about 20 miles north of old Philadelphia), where he was an apprentice to his father, a clock maker. In 1811, at age 32, Lukens moved to Philadelphia to start his own business. The first listing for Lukens was in the Philadelphia Business Directory of 1813. The Library Company did not have an 1812 directory, and Lukens was not listed in the 1811 directory. Lukens is listed as a “turner” (as in machinist lathe) at 173 High Street. The latest listing for Lukens was in 1830, which referred to him as a horologist and mechanic at 15 Decatur Street.

Lukens was described as a bachelor who lived in his shop, and a man of eccentric habits with a speech impediment who lost an eye to a chip of steel while dressing a grindstone. According to engineer and inventor George Escol Sellers, “[Lukens] always took a summer vacation of from six to eight weeks. At these times he would lock up his shop, and with his fishing tackle, mineral hammer, and patience, he would spend the time fishing and generally amusing himself in his shop.”

Profile continues on page 31
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