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A Message from the President

As has always been the case, the Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation (LCTHF) is focused on the now: protecting the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail (LCNHT) and encouraging people to explore it—and the future: encouraging our members to leave a bequest so that our foundation can continue our mission as the keepers of the story and stewards of the trail.

Geotourism

For the “now,” our foundation is participating in a very exciting new project: the development of an online geotourism map for the entire length of the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail (LCNHT). Geotourism enhances the character of a place as it preserves and celebrates what is unique and authentic about an area: its environment, culture, esthetics, heritage, and residents.

To accomplish this, geotourism encompasses a range of travel experiences including recreation, culture and heritage, history, food, nature, adventure, the outdoors, water, music, and the arts. Geotourism also features local businesses including lodging, restaurants, shops, wineries, and breweries. In other words, points on the geotourism map will alert travelers to “everything that makes it fun to follow in the footsteps of Lewis and Clark,” according to Mark Weekley, superintendent of the LCNHT.

Superintendent Weekley is partnering with Solimar International, a firm devoted to the development and marketing of sustainable tourism, to create and implement a geotourism program for the LCNHT. The goal of the program is to secure input from the many and diverse partners along the trail. This broad representation is essential to the success of the program’s Interactive MapGuide website.

Interactive MapGuide Website

The Interactive MapGuide website will be designed to make it easy for people planning to travel along the LCNHT to identify the kinds of places that contribute to their having an authentic local experience. These include but are not limited to historic sites, Native American sites, museums and visitor centers, wildlife viewing areas, trails, outdoor recreational opportunities, local cuisine and culture, festivals and events, artists and galleries, and guides and tour companies. Website users will be able to create accounts that let them organize and save trip plans and points of interest.

Local residents will be asked to nominate the places that reflect the uniqueness and diversity of their areas. The nominations must actually come directly from the people who are personally responsible for each site such as the owners of businesses and directors of historic sites. Local residents will also contribute their stories, in their own voices, and participate in guiding the long-term vision and strategy for the LCNHT.

Stewardship Council

How will all this come together? First the geotourism project will establish the Stewardship Council to help guide the program as it is implemented. The Council will be composed of local representatives from the many partners along the trail. These local representatives will in turn encourage community participation in the process of nominating the diverse points of interest that travelers would enjoy. Once these materials are complete, the Council will oversee the website and, through it, support the marketing and promotion of the unique tourist experiences in each region. The Council will also work with communities, businesses, and people along the trail to gather and disseminate text and visual content about each region.

Community Outreach Meetings

The website lewisandclark.travel has been established to host locally generated content about authentic local places and experiences along the LCNHT. The success of this endeavor is thus totally dependent on the input solicited from local residents. To facilitate this, Rory Robinson, outdoor recreation planner for Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance—the “community assistance arm of the National
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Park Service [NPS]—has convened a series of community outreach meetings along the length of the LCNHT. Please contact Rory at rory_robinson@nps.gov (440/717-3776) or Kris-tine Struck at kristine_struck@nps.gov (402/661-1818) for more information. The audience for these workshops is anyone who is interested in tourism and who can nominate local businesses, landmarks, attractions, activities, and events that define the region’s character and unique appeal.

Currently scheduled are meetings at a location between Missoula, MT, and Tri-Cities, WA, during the week of August 14 and in the Portland, OR, area during the week of August 28. Details about the meetings are posted on the LCNHT Geotourism website in the updates section of lewisandclark.travel. Meetings have already been held in the following regions: St Louis, MO, to Omaha, NE; Omaha, NE, to Bismarck, ND; Bismarck, ND, to Great Falls, MT; and Bozeman, MT, to Missoula, MT.

We are asking all LCTHF chapter officers and members to help Rory and Kristine reach out to those in your areas who would be interested in being a part of this effort. We would like you to solicit nominations of those special places along your sections of the trail. The members of the Board of Directors of the LCTHF will work to coordinate the efforts of our individual members and chapters and act as the liaison with Rory and Kristine. The Board, chapters, members, and friends of the LCTHF clearly have their work cut out for them in helping Rory and Kristine to incorporate each local gem into one online Interactive MapGuide of the LCNHT.

Geotourism Project Goals

The goals of this all-encompassing geotourism project are many and varied:
• To provide the traveling public with an integrated online resource so that they may experience the LCNHT in an authentic, sustainable way
• To re-establish partnerships and renew collaborative efforts along the LCNHT
• To engage Native American communities and enable them to share their stories and leverage local tourism in ways that are compatible with their needs and goals
• To support local small businesses and raise travelers’ awareness of the wealth of amenities and experiences offered by communities along the LCNHT
• To educate the public about the role of the story of Lewis and Clark in our national narrative and the importance of preserving the LCNHT now and into the future.

Legacy Bequests to the LCTHF

Thinking about that future brings us to how crucial it is for members of our foundation to assure that our work will continue into the future by making a legacy bequest to the LCTHF. As the LCTHF proceeds on with carrying its mission into the third century, planned giving will play a key role by growing the endowment and providing critical support to enable the LCTHF to continue our programs. By designating a bequest to the LCTHF in your will, you can shape the future of historic preservation while fulfilling your personal philanthropic goals.

One such dedicated donor was Bob Shattuck, founder of the California Chapter and member of the LCTHF Board of Directors. In addition to donating his Lewis and Clark books to the William P. Sherman Library at the LCTHF headquarters in Great Falls, MT, Bob made the LCTHF the sole beneficiary of his life insurance policy and retirement savings and purchased an annuity that has given the LCTHF tens of thousands of dollars more. The Robert Shattuck Fund bears his name.

Ways to Make a Charitable Bequest

A number of our members, including members of the Board of Directors, have already provided for the LCTHF in their wills. There are several ways to make a charitable gift, also known as a bequest, to the LCTHF through your will or estate plans:
• **A Fixed Amount.** This is the most common type of bequest. A specific amount that you have indicated in your will is transferred to the LCTHF.

• **A Percentage of the Estate.** This is the most flexible way to give to the LCTHF as it enables the gift to change automatically as the size of the estate changes.

• **Residue of the Estate.** Also known as a residuary bequest, this gift to the LCTHF is made from whatever assets remain after all other beneficiaries have been provided for or in the event that others should predecease you.

You may use **Life Insurance Policies** to make a future gift to the LCTHF by:

• Contributing to an existing policy and making the LCTHF the owner and beneficiary of the existing policy.

• Contributing a portion of a large existing policy, leaving the balance to the existing beneficiaries.

• Purchasing a new policy and making the LCTHF both the owner and the beneficiary of the policy.

A **Designated Fund** in support of the LCTHF affords you the opportunity to support the program of the LCTHF about which you care the most. The designated fund may provide that the principal remain intact while the income is used for the specific program. Designated funds can be established with a minimum gift of $10,000 and can be added to at any time by you or others.

If you already have a will or trust, you do not have to rewrite the document to make a bequest. You need only add a codicil or amendment that announces your intention to include the LCTHF in your will or trust.

For additional information on how you can include the LCTHF in your long-range estate plans: Call our office toll-free: 1-888-701-3434; e-mail: giftplanning@lewisandclark.org; or visit our website: www.lewisandclark.org/giftplanning. When you have remembered the LCTHF in your will, please notify our office (lindy@lewisandclark.org) so that we may add you to the growing list of members who care about the LCTHF for their entire lives—and beyond. You will have earned the thanks of current and future generations.

**Farewell and Welcome**

With the August issue of WPO, we say thank you and farewell to our good friend Bob Clark who has been the editor of WPO for the past four years. Although no longer our editor, Bob continues to serve as the editor-in-chief of WSU Press, with whom our foundation will continue to have the publishing contract. We can look forward to ongoing contact with Bob. And we welcome Clay Jenkinson as the new editor of WPO. Clay has excellent and creative ideas for proceeding on to explore new territory with new features, authors, and illustrative material. We look forward to an exciting association.

Philippa Newfield
President
Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation

**PHOTO BY BOB GATTEN.**

Faye Moulton looks on as Library Technician Shelly Kath and Past President Margaret Gorski (l to r) try to convince Gary Moulton to bid on the set of Lewis and Clark Liquor Decanters during the live auction at the 49th Annual Meeting of the Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation in Billings, Montana, July 2017. Gary Moulton (with hands shielding his eyes) isn’t buying it. He probably has a set already.
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Hello, everyone.

Here begins my work as editor of *We Proceeded On*. First, I want to thank Robert Clark for his work as editor over the past four years. I hate to see him disembark, and leave things in the hands of so imperfect a captain!

It’s going to take a few issues for me to establish a rhythm. I need your help. Please write to me (clayjenkinson2010@gmail.com) to offer your advice and suggestions. My goal is to increase readership, to attract new writers and new scholarship to our enterprise, and to make sure WPO is a forum equally available to academics and thoughtful enthusiasts alike, those who want to scrutinize the minutiae of the expedition as well as those who want to pull us out of the river and into the wider perspectives of the history of exploration, the Europeanization of the continent, and the fascinating but troubled relationship between Euro-Americans and the Native American peoples of the western hemisphere. We lovers of the Corps of Discovery are equally interested in verifying Lewis and Clark campsites as in understanding the work of the German polymath and explorer Alexander von Humboldt. We all want to know more about Sacagawea, but we are equally interested in the role of women in Native American culture in the age of Jefferson and Jackson.

I believe WPO should be a place of lively dialogue. Please send letters to the editor, and not necessarily just on controversial subjects.

I want to make sure that all points of view are represented here, so long as they are based on solid evidence. As some of you know, I belong to the suicide school concerning Meriwether Lewis’s untimely death in October 1809, but I am certain we do not know as much as we can and should about the last months of Lewis’s life or just what transpired at Grinder’s Inn on October 10-11. WPO should not publish pure speculation, I believe, but any articles grounded in the known texts, citing such genuine evidence as is now available to us, acknowledging that no final narrative on this or any other important subject is likely to emerge, are welcome here. Like everyone else I have a point of view. On some subjects I have strong convictions. But WPO should never be a projection of any editor’s sole perspective.

My goal is that you will eagerly await each issue of WPO, that you will be both entertained and informed by what we publish, and that after reading WPO you will want to return to Gary Moulton’s authoritative edition of the journals and get yourself out onto the Lewis and Clark Trail to follow their epic adventure in your own way.

Finally, I’m deeply interested in the health of the Lewis and Clark Trail, beginning at Jefferson’s Monticello and ending at Station Camp on the shores of the Pacific. The new industrialization of the American West is putting unprecedented strain on trail segments we thought were permanently safe from adverse development. Please let me know of flashpoints along the trail, so that we can point our readership’s attention to places that need friends and, at times, advocates.

Clay Jenkinson
On their return journey in 1806, Lewis and Clark divided and subdivided their command in today's Montana so that they could attend to several geographical and geopolitical imperatives on behalf of their patron—that man of the Enlightenment—Thomas Jefferson. In simplest terms, Clark and his group bushwhacked from the Three Forks to today's Livingston, Montana, where he intersected the Yellowstone River. Lewis returned to the Missouri at the great falls, left a crew to attend to cache pits and the white pirogue, then, with three men, undertook his fatal excursion to the upper Marias River. Everyone would rendezvous later that summer (or fall) at the confluence.

The men (and one woman) of the expedition were overwhelmed by the abundance of wildlife in 1806 Montana. Except for Sacagawea, they had literally never seen anything like it. Astonished, delighted, perhaps a little unsettled, the captains described Montana as if it were a kind of secular Garden of Eden. Clark wrote (July 21, 1806), “Since I arrived at this Camp also antilops, wolves, piggins, Dons, Hawks, racins, Crows, larks, Sparrows, Eagles & bank martins &c. &c. The wolves which are the constant attendants of the Buffalo are in great numbers on the Scerts of those large gangsue which are to be Seen in every direction in those prairies.”

Clark was describing what is now sometimes known as a Multiple Species Association, a bioregional phenomenon where a range of species, some predatory, some scavenging, some prone to flight, co-exist in a kind of tense harmony: wolves and coyotes on “the Scerts” of the great herds. It must have been something to see Montana before the Anglo-American paradigm had its way with it!

Meanwhile, Lewis, approaching the great falls, wrote, “when I arrived in sight of the whitebear Islands the missouri bottoms on both sides of the river were crowded with buffalo I sincerely believe that there were not less than 10 thousand buffalo within a circle of 2 miles around that place” (July 11, 1806).

Finally, Clark seemed to think his near-daily effusions over the numbers of buffalo, elk, deer, etc., might impair his credibility in the minds of future readers of his journal. In one of his most delightful journal entries, Clark wrote:

Saw enenc number of Deer Elk and buffalo on the banks. Some beaver. I landed on the Lard Side walked out into the bottom and Kild the fastet Buck I every.Saw, Shields killed a deer and my man York killed a Buffalo Bull, as be informed me for his tongue and marrow bones. for me to mention or give an estimate of the differant Species of wild anbimals on this river particularly Buffalo, Elk Antelopes & Wolves would be increditable. I shall therefore be silent on the Subject further.” – July 24, 1806

But, as subsequent journal entries prove, Clark could not be silent about the marvels of Montana.

The American Prairie Reserve is attempting to restore Lewis and Clark’s eastern Montana, to the extent that a pre- or post-industrial northern plains grass sanctuary can find a way to co-exist with the development footprint that has been in place since the 1880s. The reserve’s goal is to knit together a 3.5 million acre grass and wildlife park where bison, elk, bighorn sheep, deer, prairie dogs, coyotes, and other species will have enough contiguous space to find their natural equilibrium. The public lands centerpiece of the project is the immense Charles
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M. Russell National Wildlife Refuge, 1.1 million acres along a 125-mile stretch of the Missouri River. APR is working in close cooperation with federal land management agencies—the BLM and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service—and with private ranchers to stitch together a modest version of George Catlin’s (1796-1872) proposed great plains national park, which he envisioned after his travels on the Upper Missouri in the early 1830s. The APR vision is a perfect example of the public-private partnerships that are increasingly characterizing conservation initiatives in the American West. APR plans to raise more than $500 million to purchase private ranches as they become available in the reserve footprint. The organization has created a company called Wild Sky Beef that markets beef and returns the proceeds to area ranchers who wish to cooperate with the project by ranching in a wildlife-friendly manner. APR also leases some of its lands to neighboring ranchers.

So far the APR manages 353,104 acres, 86,586 of which it owns in fee simple. The bison herd now numbers more than 1,000. On any given day in the APR, you can see prairie dogs, raptors, deer, elk, bighorn sheep, and buffalo.

The prairie reserve has its detractors, of course. A number of individuals of Phillips County and the surrounding area, including ranchers, have denounced the project for a range of reasons: 1) Why should wealthy non-resident elitists with no roots in the region presume they know what is best for eastern Montana? 2) The goal should be to perpetuate heritage commercial ranching, not some ecotopia; 3) We should be moving towards privatization of the public lands, not the other way around; 4) That many bison in one place will cause all sorts of unintended environmental problems, including disease epidemics that will impact commercial cattle herds. Etc. Still, plenty of area ranchers are quite happy to sell their ranches to the APR, and an increasing number of local residents see the APR as one answer to the problems of outmigration, low wages and a lack of economic diversity, and the dearth of families that want to take on the challenge of running cattle in what even they regard as the middle of nowhere.

In spite of what critics sometimes allege, the prairie reserve idea did not originate out of thin air as something to be imposed on a vibrant eastern Montana economy. Decades of rural decline and outmigration have left communities and elected officials scratching their heads in search of ideas that might lead to renewal. The APR’s staff and board do not pretend they can solve all of eastern Montana’s problems, but they are sure the project will be a source of clean eco-tourism and that it will create well-paying jobs in such communities as Malta, Circle, Jordan, and Lewistown.

Stay tuned. WPO will devote most of an issue to the American Prairie Reserve and Lewis and Clark soon. For the moment, know this: That if you want to see something like what the Corps of Discovery actually experienced in Montana 1804-06, there is no more evocative place than the APR’s fabulous grassland.
On the morning of January 1, 1806, Meriwether Lewis “was awoke at an early hour by the discharge of a volley of small arms, which were fired by our party in front of our quarters to usher in the new year.” With that line Lewis resumed maintenance of his journal for the balance of the expedition’s stay at Fort Clatsop, having stopped writing a connected narrative the previous fall. The gap in Lewis’ journal during the crescendo of his venture to the Pacific Ocean (September 23-December 31, 1805) is noteworthy in itself, and oft remarked upon in the literature of the expedition, but it is perhaps explained by the contents of the next full sentence. The detachment’s “repast of this day,” he wrote, “tho’ better than that of Christmass, consisted principally in the anticipation of the 1st day of January 1807, when in the bosom of our friends we hope to participate in the mirth and hilarity of the day, and when with the zest given by the recollection of the present, we shall completely, both mentally and corporally, enjoy the repast which the hand of civilization has prepared for us.” In the meantime, Lewis reported, “we were content with eating our boiled Elk and wappetoe, and solacing our thirst with our only beverage pure water.”

Lewis here took the liberty of speaking for everyone’s sentiment at the moment, but given the festivity implied in the firing of the volley he may have been speaking mostly for himself. In any event, he had inscribed thereby one of the more revealing passages amongst the millions of words he, William Clark, and the other journalists penned in the course of the expedition. A sure-fire indicator that this passage was considered a little too revelatory is proved by Nicholas Biddle’s editorial decision to delete the sentimentality from his composite account of the journals published in 1814. Biddle elides over Lewis’s emotional outbreak thusly: “for though we have reason to be gayer than we were at Christmas, our only dainties are the boiled elk and wappatoo, enlivened by draughts of pure water.” Elliott Coues, in his annotation of the original publication issued in 1893, with Lewis’s original manuscript journal in front of him, also passed over the captain’s glum text.

Expressions of homesickness were not unheard of in exploratory accounts. The most salient came during the first of Captain James Cook’s epic voyages of global maritime exploration when Endeavour exited Torres Strait and headed into the Arafura Sea between Australia and New
Guinea. By this very act, i.e., confirming that New Guinea was not a northern projection of the continental mass that earlier Dutch explorers had called New Holland, the discovery phase of that voyage concluded. Thereupon, Joseph Banks (1743-1820), the expedition’s chief naturalist, noticed an immediate change in the mood of the crew. Just weeks after Cook had engineered a seemingly providential recovery of the ship on the Great Barrier Reef, Banks reported, “The greatest part of them were now pretty far gone with the longing for home which the Physicians have gone so far as to esteem a disease under the name of Nostalgia; indeed I can find hardly any body in the ship clear of its effects but the Captn[,] Dr Solander and myself, indeed we three have pretty constant employment for our minds which I beleive to be the best if not the only remedy for it.”

J. C. Beaglehole, the editor of both Cook’s and Banks’s journals, noted that this was one of the first recorded uses of the term “nostalgia,” a neologism coined by Swiss scholar Johannes Hofer (1669-1752) in his 1688 doctoral dissertation. Today the word connotes a benign fondness for happier times and “the good old days,” but Banks’s usage is far closer to its original application as a medical label describ-
ing an acute and debilitating condition closely allied to melancholy and depression. The word’s etymological roots in Greek essentially stand for the pain of being away from home. The term’s novelty made editor John Hawkesworth wary of using it in the Admiralty’s official account of the *Endeavour*’s voyage. But more to the point, Banks was unmistakably conveying the view that, psychologically at least, the expedition was effectively over for everyone except for himself, Solander his assistant, and Cook. Beaglehole pointedly observed in his introduction to Banks’s journal that the *Endeavour* crew was “becoming bored with the voyage. They were not starved, they were well looked after, their health, at the end of two years out from home, was excellent; not one man died of sickness—an astonishing feat for any captain. What they wanted, however, was not the consolation of good health or reflections on the excellence of their commander’s administration, but a known port, the sight of European faces, and a great deal of fresh food of the kind that was recognized by Europeans as nutrition. After that they wanted a conventional voyage across known seas homeward.”

My own research into Cook’s voyages indicates that Beaglehole’s two-year marker originally ascribed to the first expedition holds up for the two voyages that followed as well. There was a lot of grumbling on *Resolution* during the austral summer of 1774 when Cook steered the ship toward the Antarctic Circle for the second time during his second year in search of *Terra Australis Incognita*. For this journey the team of Johann Reinhold Forster and his son George replaced Banks and Solander as the principal naturalists, but this time even the men of science succumbed to the nostalgic malaise. George Forster stated the “long continuance in these cold climates began now to hang heavily on our crew, especially as it banished all hope of returning home this year, which had hitherto supported their spirits. At first a painful despondence, owing to the dreary prospect of another year’s cruize to the South, seemed painted in every countenance.” Forster said Cook’s crew “resigned themselves to their fate” by degree until their outlook took on the cast of “a kind of sullen indifference.”

The discontent aboard *Resolution* took such forms as grumbling over the state of provision, which situation Cook was forced to redress all the while driving the ship toward its highest southern latitude southwest of Cape Horn. It was upon reaching 71°10’ that Cook inscribed one of the most memorable lines in the history of exploration. He referred to having gone not only “farther than any other man has been before me, but as far as I think possible for man to go.” This line later inspired both *Star Trek*’s Gene Roddenberry and the Apollo moon program’s Neil Armstrong.

When Cook turned from the ice his officers, if not everyone on board, thought *Resolution* would surely aim for the Cape of Good Hope thereby concluding the second voyage’s discovery phase. Cook, however, had other plans and determined on conducting a third season of high latitude voyaging, this time in the Atlantic Ocean. He was temporarily able to assuage the sentiments of a crew and a scientific detachment over an extension of the voyage into another year with the prospect of a “Winter within the Tropicks” and all such a sojourn portended climatically and sexually. George Forster wrote that the prospect of “enjoying the excellent refreshment which those islands afford, entirely revived our hopes, and made us look on our continuance on the western side of Cape Horn [sic] with some degree of satisfaction.” Nevertheless, the Forsters were soon grousing again about Cook’s route and timetable and the fatigue brought on by a long voyage. Nostalgic yearnings for home were having a pronounced negative effect on the number and intensity of the crew’s beachside hostilities.

---

“*This little fleet altho’ not quite so respectable as those of Columbus or Capt. Cook were still viewed by us with as much pleasure as those deservedly famed adventurers ever beheld theirs; and I dare say with quite as much anxiety for their safety and preservation, we were now about to penetrate a country at least two thousand miles in width, on which the foot of civilised man had never trodden; the good or evil it had in store for us was for experiment yet to determine, and these little vessels contained every article by which we were to expect to subsist or defend ourselves.*”

*Meriwether Lewis,*

*April 7, 1805*

*Fort Mandan*
The same pattern of disaffection is apparent on Cook’s final voyage in search of the Northwest Passage. This expedition reached the two-year point on the final approach to the edge of Arctic ice pack, the apex of the venture’s discovery phase, which occurred in August 1778. Once again, following the pattern that Joseph Banks had first noted nearly a decade earlier, the combination of fatigue and a sense of anti-climax combined to create shipboard discord. There was another bout of grumbling over the state of provender; this time the men objected to Cook forcing them to eat walrus meat. A month later, in Norton Sound, on the way back through the Aleutians and eventually to Hawaii, there was murmuring over the supply of beer and grog. This was a mere prequel to an even angrier outburst about the quality of the beer off the coast of Maui; behavior which Cook deemed nearly mutinous. And, most famously, there is Cook’s own fate to consider. Historian Frank McLynn recently distilled two generations’ worth of Cook historiography which looked at the third voyage solely through the lens of his death in Kealakekua Bay on the big island of Hawaii. He writes that “Cook was old and tired when he embarked . . . , no longer the man he used to be, increasingly cross-grained and short-fused and no longer up to the combined stresses of his Admiralty orders, dealing with hostile or recalcitrant Polynesians and the perils of the Pacific.” The thrust of McLynn’s argument is that while Cook may have been able to work through the exhaustion on the earlier voyages, rededicating himself to the mission when others began pining for home, the strain of command eventually became too burdensome even for the greatest and most persevering navigator of the era.

In light of Cook’s experiences and Banks’s nostalgia theory, what then of Meriwether Lewis at Fort Clatsop in January 1806? It may be argued that Lewis’s resumption of his journal after a three-month hiatus was the outcome of a New Year’s Resolution to be more diligent. Furthermore, Lewis’s renewal appears to be a direct application of Banks’s “remedy” of “constant employment” of the mind. Of course, Lewis had a preceptor nearer at hand than Britain’s Joseph Banks. His mentor and patron Thomas Jefferson, in many respects an American counterpart to Banks and the
New World’s principal exemplar of the Enlightenment, also insisted that a busy life was the best antidote to melancholia.9

Indeed, Lewis had few if any stretches of time where he was more productive in his cataloging of people, plants, and animals than the winter at Fort Clatsop. In short, to counteract poignant nostalgic pangs Lewis threw himself into one last burst of scientific endeavor. He may even have convinced himself that he could only redeem himself as an expedition record keeper by making up at Fort Clatsop for his silences earlier in the journey. Nevertheless, as I have argued elsewhere,10 Lewis, perhaps like Cook before him, was worn down by the burden of command and suffered a kind of slow-motion nervous breakdown, as reflected in his increasingly irritable manner and occasional suspension of good judgment on the return voyage. It is also worthy of remark that on his way home Lewis in Montana barely avoided the fate that befell Cook in Hawaii 27 years earlier.

Lewis literally dodged a bullet aimed at him by a Blackfoot warrior on the upper Marias watershed and he came close to being accidentally killed by one of his own men later that summer of 1806. In a sense he was fortunate to return home at all to “the bosom of [his] friends,” but, as has been well-documented in the literature about the expedition and its aftermath, his problems were not over. The most troubling circumstance for Thomas Jefferson was the extension of a pattern established during the course of the expedition and amply evident in retrospect, namely his inability to produce a published narrative worthy of the standard largely established by Captain Cook. Lewis’s field journal ended after he was shot on August 11, 1806, by Pierre Cruzatte. We don’t hear from him again until his post-expeditionary missives.

Lewis and Clark returned to St. Louis “about 12 o’Clock” on September 23, 1806, looking, observed a local gentleman, like refugees from the pages of *Robinson Crusoe*. Lewis was anxious to get word to Jefferson on the fate of the mission as soon as possible, going so far as preparing drafts while still floating down the Missouri. Seemingly the first thing he did is send a messenger to the postmaster in Cahokia on the opposite side of the Mississippi asking that the mail be held there until noon the next day so it could include a let-

---

*Pure Water*  
British seamen from Cook’s third voyage shooting at walruses from boats on the Chukchi Peninsula with ships in background. An engraving based on the original by John Webber. Courtesy David Rumsey Collection, Stanford University.
ter to the president. According to Clark, he and Lewis “rose early” on the 24th and “Commenc’d wrighting our letters,” one of which was specifically identified as intended for the commander-in-chief. Though dated the previous day, Lewis’s letter to Jefferson, together with Clark’s correspondence to friends and family in Kentucky, was dispatched to Cahokia in the care of the indispensable George Drouillard. If any more proof was necessary to document the fact that Drouillard was the member of the party most trusted by the captains, surely this is it.\(^{11}\)

Though rich in detail and much analyzed in expedition historiography, for present purposes the operative portion of Lewis’s report from September 23rd is this line: “The anxiety which I feel in returning once more to the bosom of my friends is a sufficient guarantee that no time will be unnecessarily expended in this quarter.” Here Lewis replicates the nostalgic yearning for home expressed at Fort Clatsop almost 10 months earlier. Lewis stipulated for Jefferson’s benefit that he had delayed the mail “for the purpose of making you this haisty communication,” which he further described as “laconic,” i.e., insufficiently detailed to do justice to the immense journey now finally completed. In fact, the document is lengthy and studied in its composition and personal expressiveness and is hardly inadequate. Keeping to his word, Lewis left St. Louis in mid-October, reaching Staunton, Virginia by December 11th and the nation’s capital on December 28th. He had succeeded in reaching the “bosom” of his coterie of family and friends just three days shy of the pledge he had made along the Pacific Coast a year earlier. Undoubtedly, the repast which the hand of Thomas Jefferson put before him at his semi-annual White House reception on January 1, 1807, was splendid fare compared to spoiled elk and wappato root of Fort Clatsop. And Bordeaux invariably trumps pure water.\(^{12}\)

After resigning from the army on March 2, 1807, Lewis prepared a memorandum regarding his forthcoming report, which notice was published in the *National Intelligencer* on March 14th. Partially intended to warn the reading public against spurious accounts that might appear before his official report was issued, Lewis made another New Year’s Resolution, of a sort, promising that volume one of the anticipated three would be in print by January 1, 1808, a mere 10 months distant. When the book failed to appear on schedule, Jefferson grew concerned. On July 17, 1808, he wrote Lewis complaining about not receiving “a line from you.” Ostensibly, this was a prosaic reference to the lack of communication from the former captain, but we know it was the expedition report, already half a year late in appearing, that was at the forefront of the president’s mind. “We have no tidings yet of the forwardness of your printer. I hope the first part [i.e., volume one] will not be delayed much longer.” Only three days earlier, on Bastille Day, Jefferson promised a Parisian friend, Bernard Lacépède, a copy of “Govr. Lewis’s work, as it appears,” which suggests that the president was expecting to ship one soon.\(^{13}\)

As we know, Lewis hadn’t made any progress on his manuscript and after another year passed Jefferson, now in more agitated state, raised the subject with Lewis again. “I am very often applied to know,” Jefferson wrote on August 16, 1809, “when your work will begin to appear; and I have so long promised copies to my literary correspondents in France, that I am almost bankrupt in their eyes. I shall be very happy to recieve from yourself information of your expectations on this subject. Every body is impatient for it.”\(^{14}\) Lewis never
responded to what would turn out to be Jefferson’s last letter to him. Indeed, the tone of it, and Lewis’s realization that his nonfeasance had mortified his patron and hero, probably contributed materially to the path of dissolution that led to his suicide the following October.

Historians have long puzzled over Lewis’s failure to publish but there is no scholarly consensus explaining it. In a multi-part article published in these pages last year, I contended that our failure to appreciate that travel accounts are a part of well-established literary tradition, with its own set of conventions drawing on implicit cultural norms, limits our ability to understand their narrative choices and contexts. That is to say, travel literature contained standardized episodes and expressive idioms that were either explicitly prescribed or contained implied meanings for the benefit of the knowing reader. For that reason, journal writers borrowed from each other regularly because they operated in the belief that the reading public came to their texts expecting to encounter similar tropes, stories, and motifs. The specific circumstances—dates, places, people—were of course different, but the narrative sentiments were relatively commonplace. For example, travel writers, including Jefferson, bemoaned their inability to do justice to the sublimity of something they were attempting to describe or, as Lewis put it, to “give to the enlightened world some just idea of this truly magnificent and sublimely grand object, which has from the commencement of time been concealed from the view of civilized man.”

Concomitantly, as an imaginative act, we too can draw on that same literary tradition and provide ourselves meanings from it and apply them analogously. This, one might say, is what all of literature, fiction or non-fiction, does. Consider then, as a window of understanding into Meriwether Lewis’s yearnings for home, the emotional experiences described by Richard Henry Dana, Jr. (1815-1882), in his Two Years Before the Mast, originally published in 1840. In 1834 Dana left his studies at Harvard and signed on as a common seaman aboard the Pilgrim, a brig engaged by a New England firm to ply the California coast in the trade for hides. Eighteen months into the voyage a sister ship, the California, arrived with a packet of mail from Boston, unleashing a wave of emotions among Dana and his shipmates. Dana wrote of the seaman’s “natural feeling for home and friends” and explained that “Everyone away from home thinks that some great thing must have happened, while to those at home there seems to be a continued monotony and lack of incident.”

The California’s appearance signaled that his time in the Pacific was about to draw to a close and, according to Dana, it “put life into everything when we were getting under way.” “One would have thought we were on our voyage home,” Dana continued, “so near did it seem to us, though there were yet three months for us on the coast” and the chain of ports he and his mates called on in regular sequence. “As I bade good-bye to each successive place, I felt as though one link after another were struck from the chain of my servitude.” So wrote a man feeling imprisoned by serial visits to trading stations running from San Diego to Monterey, California, a long way from the dismal Oregon Coast that had enveloped and perhaps overborne Lewis three decades earlier. When his last three-month tour of coastal ports concluded, Dana felt he had “just sprung from an iron trap.”

Four-and-a-half months later Dana was, per Lewis, home in the bosom of his friends and family. The concluding paragraphs of his original narrative provide further insight into the long-distance traveler’s nostalgia for home and perhaps thereby also help us understand the emotional vortex that snared Lewis and contributed to his failure to produce a published account. Dana started by relating the experience of “a sailor whose first voyage was one of five years upon the Northwest Coast.” When this seaman “found himself homeward bound, such was the excitement of his feelings that, during the whole passage, he could talk and think of nothing else but his arrival, and how and when he should jump from the vessel and take his way directly home. Yet, when the vessel was made fast to the wharf and the crew dismissed, he seemed suddenly to lose all feeling about the matter. He told me that he went below and changed his dress; took some water from the scuttle butt and washed himself leisurely; overhauled his chest, and put his clothes all in order; took his pipe from its place, filled it, and, sitting down upon his chest, smoked it slowly for the last time. Here he looked round upon the forecastle in which he had spent so many years, and being alone and his shipmates scattered, began to feel actually unhappy. Home became almost a dream; and it was not until his brother (who had heard of the ship’s arrival) came down into the forecastle and told him of things at home, and who were waiting there to see him, that he could realize where he was, and feel interest enough to put him in motion toward that place for which he had longed, and of which he had dreamed, for years.”

The seaman’s malaise was conveyed as a long prologue to Dana’s own experience with, and reflections about, this
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**President’s Report**

The Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation (LCTHF) has accomplished a great deal since the Bicentennial. We have instituted three grant programs, Bicentennial Trail Stewardship, Education, and Montana Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Sign Fund, which have distributed more than $300,000 in the past six years. We assumed editorial and technical responsibility for the website *Discovering Lewis and Clark* under the leadership of Kris Townsend. We have continued publication of our journal, *We Proceeded On*. Most issues are now available online thanks to Kris Townsend and Dan Sturdevant. We thank Bob Clark, WPO’s outgoing editor, and welcome our new editor Clay Jenkinson. We have reinstated both an online and print version of our newsletter *The Orderly Report*. We also have, under the leadership of Dick Fichtler, signed memoranda of understanding with a number of government agencies and civic organizations.

Now we need to move forward to build capacity by developing social capital. It is important for members to tell us how they wish to participate in the LCTHF community and what energies and talents they would like to bring to the community. Your officers and Board of Directors are asking members to tell us how you would like to help us build capacity. On which committees would you like to serve? This is important as committees are where the work of the organization gets accomplished. It is through committee work that members can make their voices heard and effect important changes.

Our members can also make a difference by making contributions to build our physical capital. As opposed to social capital which can be limitless, the physical capital which enables us to fund projects, publications, scholarships, and operations is not. These are also uncertain times in terms of federal funding. Our foundation is counting more than ever on your contributions to help us accomplish our goals. Please give generously to the fund drives of the LCTHF and also remember the LCTHF through legacy bequests. It is up to each of us to enable the LCTHF to proceed on now and into the future. *Philippa Newfield, President*

**Executive Director’s Report**

Thank you, our many members and chapters for being *keepers of the story and stewards of the trail*. Your tireless work with trail and educational projects to keep the story alive never ceases to amaze me! Each year, we hold three Chapter Presidents’ Chat phone calls and one in-person Chapter Officers Meeting during our annual meeting. These meetings are opportunities to let LCTHF know how we can be of assistance, learn or share best practices with other Chapters, as well as an opportunity for LCTHF to disseminate information from Headquarters through Chapters to members. We accomplish greater achievements when we work together as a team.

We ask for your help to promote our trail through the National Park Services’ Geotourism project. You will hear more information on this at our annual meeting. We ask your participation in this venture to share your cultural, tourism, and heritage resources. Our numerous volunteers, including members, board, chapters, and office and library helpers, make it possible to continue the work we do for our beautiful National Historic Trail. We are grateful for each and every one of you. The more volunteers we have in the field, the more work we can accomplish.

A virtually effortless way everyone can promote our trail is by sharing their passion for the Lewis and Clark story and trail through our Social Media Campaign. We are partnering with the National Park Service on a Communication Strategy plan. We ask you to post on LCTHF’s Facebook group page using hashtags (#LCTHF, #HikeLewisAndClark, #BikeLewisAndClark, #LCNHT, and #BoatLewisAndClark). You can add a hashtag to anything relevant. If you post about our newsletter or journal, use #TheOrderlyReport or #WeProceededOn. When someone clicks on that hashtag, it will take them to our website’s section on our newsletter or journal. Most of us use social media anyway, so this is a means to connect more people to the story, and increase the number of people that recreate on our trail.

The more users we have hiking, fishing, boating along our trail, the more folks appreciate our trail, the larger our collective voice in advocating for our trail and all thirty national scenic and historic sister trails. We invite you to get your Congressmen and women out on your segment of the trail for a hike, boat ride, or trail stewardship project. If funding decision makers are familiar with the benefits and multi-faceted recreational uses of trails, they are more likely to vote accordingly for continued funding for trails and to protect our public lands. *Lindy Hatcher, Executive Director*
The LCTHF welcomes donations to all of the funds listed below.

**Permanently Restricted:**

**Bronze Fund (We Proceeded On)** - Established in 1975 with proceeds from the sale of Robert Scriver’s bronze sculptures, the fund supports the publication of *We Proceeded On*. Each year, 5% of the fund’s value goes to the LCTHF budget for this purpose. Fund Balance: $188,192.91.

**Lewis and Clark Fellow Fund** (Executive Director Support) - Efforts in 1987 and 1991 led to the fund that provides support for a paid staff position. Each year, 5% of the fund’s value goes to the budget. Fund Balance: $65,075.77.

**Burroughs-Holland/Bicentennial Education and Research Fund** (Youth Educational Support and Academic Research Grants) - Established in 1991 in honor of Raymond Burroughs, a LCTHF member and author. Each year, 5% of the fund’s value supports youth and educational activities. Combined with the Leandra Zim Holland Memorial Research Fund, established in 2003 in memory of author Leandra Holland to provide grants on Lewis and Clark and Native American topics. Fund Balance: $87,370.81.

**Third Century Fund** (General Operations Support) - This fund, established in 2004, ensures continuing support for LCTHF operations adding 5% of the fund’s value each year to the LCTHF budget. Fund Balance: $269,984.42.

**Lewis & Clark Trail Stewardship Endowment: A National Council of the Lewis & Clark Expedition Bicentennial Legacy Project Fund** - Funded in 2006 with the proceeds of the Bicentennial commemorative coins by the U.S. Mint. Each year, 4.5 to 5% of the funds go to trail stewardship activities as recommended by the Bicentennial Trail Stewardship Advisory Committee. Fund Balance: $2,004,083.68.

**Temporarily Restricted Funds:**

**Montana Lewis & Clark Bicentennial Sign Maintenance Fund** (Montana Sign Projects) - In 2006, the Montana Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Commission donated funds for this Montana program. The fund is distributed at a rate of 10% each year and is projected to sunset after 10 years. Fund Balance: $47,673.88.

**Board Restricted Funds:**

**Past Presidents’ Operating Fund** (Special Projects) - In 2002, the Board of Directors restricted certain donations for later use on projects as determined by the Board. Fund Balance: $6,794.88.

**Robert Shattuck Library Fund** (Grants) - Established in 2003 with funds received from the late Mr. Shattuck, a long time member from California who named LCTHF as a beneficiary of insurance policies. This fund provided grants during the Bicentennial and is now used to support projects and researchers at the William P. Sherman Library and Archives. Fund Balance: $47,013.44.


Note: Fund Balances are as of March 31, 2017. Some transfers and deposits were made after these calculations.

### Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation Endowment Fund By Fiscal Year End

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Withdrawals</th>
<th>Div. &amp; Int.</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Ending Qtr.</th>
<th>Yr./Fee %</th>
<th>Gain/Loss/Qtr.</th>
<th>G/L %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2013</td>
<td>991.21</td>
<td>(104,678.31)</td>
<td>63,204.51</td>
<td>24,335.37</td>
<td>2,601,825.85</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>235,705.71</td>
<td>9.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2014</td>
<td>9,230.00</td>
<td>(72,260.00)</td>
<td>55,994.00</td>
<td>26,926.01</td>
<td>2,746,810.83</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>144,984.98</td>
<td>5.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2015</td>
<td>8,935.96</td>
<td>(127,032.00)</td>
<td>50,956.21</td>
<td>27,319.43</td>
<td>2,550,266.18</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>(196,544.65)</td>
<td>-7.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2016</td>
<td>18,980.17</td>
<td>(81,800.00)</td>
<td>58,136.63</td>
<td>25,542.05</td>
<td>2,689,574.34</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>139,308.16</td>
<td>5.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/31/2017*</td>
<td>28,803.07</td>
<td>(83,379.60)</td>
<td>26,978.47</td>
<td>13,298.77</td>
<td>2,792,607.31</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>103,032.97</td>
<td>3.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LCTHF Statement of Financial Position
### Comparison FY 2015 through March 31, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sept 30, 2015</th>
<th>Sept 30, 2016</th>
<th>March 31, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Checking</td>
<td>$22,474.21</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$13,549.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Pass thru Checking</td>
<td>7,450.47</td>
<td>10,652.26</td>
<td>42,173.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting Account</td>
<td>1,974.68</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Checking and Savings</td>
<td>31,899.36</td>
<td>12,652.26</td>
<td>57,722.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>6,731.20</td>
<td>7,935.75</td>
<td>7,644.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Current Assets</td>
<td>22,142.12</td>
<td>16,390.19</td>
<td>7,254.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Assets</strong></td>
<td>60,772.68</td>
<td>49,630.46</td>
<td>72,621.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,437.81</td>
<td>3,347.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
<td>97,081.75</td>
<td>97,081.75</td>
<td>97,081.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments at DAD</td>
<td>2,550,266.17</td>
<td>2,708,638.35</td>
<td>2,792,607.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Assets</strong></td>
<td>2,647,347.92</td>
<td>2,805,720.10</td>
<td>2,889,689.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$2,714,558.41</td>
<td>$2,858,698.07</td>
<td>$2,965,658.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Liabilities and Equity</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Checking Deficit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Current Liabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Liabilities</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Equity</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Net Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Designated (Unrestricted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Restricted Net Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Restricted Net Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Equity</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total Liabilities and Equity** | $2,714,558.41 | $2,858,698.07 | $2,965,658.27 |

Footnotes:
** This partial year has not been audited.
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2016 - 2017 Lewis and Clark Trail Stewardship Endowment Grants

During the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial, the U.S. Mint issued and sold Lewis and Clark Expedition Bicentennial Commemorative Silver Dollars. Some of the proceeds from the sale of the coins were provided to the Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation to create an Endowment for the purpose of preservation, protection, and interpretation of the natural, historic, educational, and cultural resources of the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail (LCNHT). This year, eleven grants were awarded to four chapters of the Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation and six other non-profit associations for projects at various locations along the LCNHT and in Eastern Legacy states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Recipients</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Grant Project Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bitter Root Cultural Heritage Trust</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Descent Trail (Lost Trail Pass) Interpretive Wayside Signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Trustees Southern Illinois University</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Archaeology &amp; Public Outreach at Fort Kaskaskia, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimson Bluffs Chapter of LCTHF</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Posters along Lewis and Clark Expedition sites in Broadwater City, MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Chapter of LCTHF</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Lewis and Clark Down the Ohio River in 1803 Brochure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illini Chapter of LCTHF</td>
<td>IL, MO, KS, IA, and NE</td>
<td>2017 Go Adventuring with Lewis and Clark IL Auto Tour Brochure Reprint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above: USDA Forest Service Environmental Education Community Outreach Coordinator Linda Southhall at Broadwater County Fair in MT with Crimson Bluffs Chapter posters funded by a 2017 LCTSE grant. Right: Page 1 of the Philadelphia Chapter’s Lewis and Clark Down the Ohio River in 1803 brochure funded by a 2017 LCTSE grant.

2016 - 2017 Montana Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Sign Maintenance Fund Grants

Grants awarded from this fund are specifically used to replace or maintain interpretive signs along the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail in the state of Montana. The Big Hole Valley Association received $2,000 grant to replace signs in Trail Creek, Gibbons Pass, Lost Trail Pass, and Lemhi Pass. The Bitter Root Cultural Heritage Trust received a $2,000 grant to replace signs in Sula Ranger Station, Sula Overlook, and Nee-Mee-Poo Trailhead.

Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation Grant Distribution: Six Year Total by Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Stewardship Grants</th>
<th># of TS Grants</th>
<th>Education Grants</th>
<th># of Ed Grants</th>
<th>MT Sign Fund Grants</th>
<th># of MT Sign Grants</th>
<th>Total Grants Awarded</th>
<th>Total # of All Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$295,325</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>$10,700</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$12,968</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$318,993</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
psychological phenomenon. He wrote: “There is probably so much of excitement in prolonged expectation that the quiet realizing of it produces a momentary stagnation of feelings as well as of effort. It was a good deal so with me.” Dana related that “coming up the harbor, and old scenes breaking upon the view, produced a mental as well as bodily activity, from which the change to a perfect stillness, when both expectation and necessity of labor failed, left a calmness, almost an indifference, from which I must be roused by some new excitement.” Here we have a story in two parts strongly suggestive of the emotional state Meriwether Lewis found himself in at the conclusion of his voyage. Dana, like his sailor friend, was finally able to wake “mind and body,” but for some travelers—think Meriwether Lewis—the “momentary stagnation” became permanent.

Having discussed James Cook earlier in this essay, it is worth mentioning in conclusion that the great navigator himself returned to the work of discovery almost immediately after his first two voyages returned to home port. With the support of the Admiralty’s ghost-writers, editors, engravers and publicists (an infrastructure that Thomas Jefferson would have been well advised to provide Lewis), all complementing the many able associates he had aboard ship, Cook was able to finish the official accounts of his voyages, the third posthumously. But it also seems clear in retrospect that the reason why Cook undertook these expeditions in such quick succession is that he had become accustomed to living at the edge of the world. He thrived there, and long distance voyaging, notwithstanding the risks and stresses inherent in such enterprises, brought him his greatest satisfaction. It is conceivable, therefore, that, aside from editorial support, what Meriwether Lewis most needed upon his return was not a governor’s chair but another expedition to lead.

David L. Nicandri is the director emeritus of the Washington State Historical Society. A frequent contributor to WPO, he is the author of River of Promise: Lewis and Clark on the Columbia (2009) and co-editor of Arctic Ambitions: Captain Cook and the Northwest Passage (2015). He is currently working on a book-length manuscript tentatively titled “Captain Cook in the Icy Latitudes: The Origins of Polar Climatology.”

Notes
9. To his daughter Martha, Jefferson wrote, from Aix-en-Provence, on May 28, 1787, “of all the cankers of human happiness, none corrodés it with so silent, yet so baneful a tooth, as indolence. body & mind both unemployed, our being becomes a burthen, & every object about us loathsome, even the dearest. idleness begets ennui, ennui the hypochondria, & that a diseased body. no laborious person was ever yet hysterical. exercise & application produce order in our affairs, health of body, cheerfulness of mind, & these make us precious to our friends. it is while we are young that the habit of industry is formed, if not then, it never is afterwards.” Thomas Jefferson to Martha Jefferson May 28, 1787. http://tjrs.monticello.org/letter/1679
16. Moulton, Journals, 4:285
18. Ibid., 234-236, 250.
19. Ibid., 335-336.
20. Ibid., 336.
Dr. Elliott West
First of Two Parts
by Clay S. Jenkinson

Editor’s Note: Here begins a regular new interview feature of We Proceeded On.

WPO: Dr. West, you’ve had a distinguished career writing about the settling of the American West, yet Lewis and Clark has never been one of your central themes. Why?
EW: Most of my interest has been later in the century, in the period from the 1840s until the turn of the century. But there’s something about Lewis and Clark, if you’re an American historian and certainly if you’re a western historian, that is both seductive and unavoidable. I would argue that you really couldn’t understand some aspects of the history of the West, including the West as a mythic force in American life, unless you get a grip on the expedition. I mean the two captains and those who went with them but even more I mean the context of the time, including the role of Indian peoples, how they perceived the expedition, how they responded to it, what they took away from it. It is an endlessly provocative and revealing story, and it is absolutely essential to study if you’re going to understand what came after, which includes the period that most interests me.

WPO: Why is it so compelling and so essential to come to terms with this story?
EW: Let’s start by stating what the expedition wasn’t. We tend to assume that the expedition was this critical moment in the opening of the far West, especially in the opening of the country that Lewis and Clark traveled into and through, the Northwest. But that’s not true. The great thrust of expansion after the expedition and after Jefferson was not to the west and north, but to the west and south, into Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas and Missouri. That’s where the great energy was. When you think about it, it would be close to forty years before there would be a significant American presence out in the Pacific Northwest.

“You can spend your life studying this expedition and still every time you go into it you come away with something new.”

The expedition had a great influence on the development and expansion of the fur trade, and that had long-term con-
sequences for western expansion. But there was not this trigger of expansion into the Northwest. That said, the expedition is an endlessly revealing episode. It’s like a rock that has all sorts of facets to it. Every time you turn the rock a little bit and the light strikes it with a different angle, it throws off in a different direction, turns a different color. You can spend your life studying this expedition and still every time you go into it you come away with something new.

WPO: Why is the Lewis and Clark story remembered as the American Epic, to the exclusion of other exploration stories, like Zebulon Pike?

EW: That’s a wonderful question, one that takes us into what you might call the mythic history of Lewis and Clark. As anyone who studies Lewis and Clark knows, the expedition was more or less missing from the American interest until the 100th anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase. It wasn’t until 1903 and 1904 that Lewis and Clark suddenly reappeared in the national interest. What is it about this thing that endlessly fascinates us? Part of it is the characters. You can study Freeman and Custis, or you can study Lewis and Clark. One of those couples is much more compelling and interesting than the other. The difference in their personalities, how they got along, or didn’t get along, that whole element. And the cast of characters is fabulous when you get into it. The more you get into it, the more you’re drawn to it. It’s like any good play, any good story, any good novel. It’s the casting, and it’s the characters.

But I would argue that there is something more. The story of the expedition conforms almost perfectly to what Joseph Campbell called the monomyth, a story you could find in every culture. Every people have a story in which they announce to themselves and to others who they are and how they came to be. It’s a story that follows a certain dramatic pattern. It begins with a calling and a dramatic departure into the unknown. Then there is a series of ordeals as the heroes follow this path toward a goal, a goal given to them by some divine entity. They pursue this goal, they endure a series of hardships and ordeals, and then there is a final testing in which they learn an essential lesson. Finally they return, bringing the lesson back to where they began.

Think of the expedition in those terms. They’re called by the semi-deity figure of Thomas Jefferson. He gives the challenge, the goal. Find out what’s out there, and more than that find out what this place means to us. Find out who we are as a people. They went through the famous series of tests, including the winter at Fort Mandan, the grizzly bears, the terrible testing of the geography, the Lakota. And then there’s the awful second winter in which they face despair and suffer through it. They transcend it, and they come home to the Great Father on the hill at Monticello. They bring back the physical answer of what is out there, but more than that they bring back this idea. This is the American future. This is where our future lies as a people.

As I said, the immediate impact, the actual facts of the expedition, don’t exactly conform to that template. But the point is that this becomes a kind of American creation story. It’s a story we can believe in, a story that explains to others and to ourselves who we are and how we came to be. These men exemplify certain characteristics we like to think of as distinctly American. They’re courageous, persistent, innovative, and quick on their feet. They exemplify things that we take pride in as Americans. To me that’s the answer.

And then there are the journals, this masterpiece of American literature that continues to engage us and enthrall us. The journals entertain us, but they leave us with questions. There’s nothing like these journals for any of those other expeditions, nor for any comparable event in American history.

WPO: What’s the lesson? For Dorothy it’s that there’s no place like home. What’s the lesson of this journey story?

EW: That’s an interesting question because when I present this, I use the Wizard of Oz and the story of Dorothy as the classic American example of the journey story. If you’re looking for the factual lesson, that’s a whole different question. The answer to that is very complicated. The mythic lesson is that America’s identity and its future lie to the west. It lies in the spirit of exploration, in this bonding with the land, in this sense of a people with purpose. The expedition exemplifies that.

It also gives us a trail. This is a story where you can go out and walk with them. This is very important. You can follow
the expedition, you can identify with it in this absolute, concrete and immediate way.

**WPO:** But when you look at the myth and ask that Oz question, it becomes a problematic story. There's no water route to the Pacific. The native peoples listen politely to Lewis and Clark but then go right back to their old ways. Lewis never writes the book, and he's dead three years later. And as you say, they didn't really open the West.

**EW:** Absolutely. You have to distinguish between those two angles of vision. It's important, and it's essential if you're a historian, that you keep in mind that you're really talking about two entirely different topics. The problematic part of it is that they brought back the lesson that it's America's destiny to go out there, that it's fated.

Well, what if you're Salish? What if you’re Nez Perce? What if you’re Kootenai? That’s a problem. To those indigenous sovereigns it was not fated. To non-Indians it was based upon the assumption that this was a superior way of life that was bound to come and take control of this area. And what followed from it was not a pretty story.

One of the interesting implications of the long lag between the expedition and the actual coming of Americans out to the Pacific Northwest is that in some ways it lets Lewis and Clark off the hook. You don’t make that immediate connection between their expedition and the calamitous effects for native peoples out there. But we must, two centuries later, come to terms with the implications.

“**One of the interesting implications of the long lag between the expedition and the actual coming of Americans out to the Pacific Northwest is that in some ways it lets Lewis and Clark off the hook. You don’t make that immediate connection between their expedition and the calamitous effects for native peoples out there.**”

**WPO:** So in a sense we’ve locked them into their status as innocents?

**EW:** Yes.

**WPO:** We say that their relations with Indians were on the whole harmonious. We say that only two Indians were killed, and that was in self-defense. We say that Lewis carried Jefferson’s high-minded notion of trade for qualified objects at fair prices without alcohol. We’re allowed by the peculiarities of the story in large part to exempt Lewis and Clark from the tragedy of the 19th century.

**EW:** Yes. I have a book on the Nez Perce, *The Last Indian War*. The Nez Perce story is that on the return trip they formed this alliance with Lewis and Clark, a formal council. From the Nez Perce perspective, and I think it’s the right perspective, they, the Nimíipuu, kept their word. In spite of horrendous provocations, there were maybe two Americans killed by Nez Perce between 1805 and 1877. They kept their word. We didn’t.

You could argue that there are ways in which the Nez Perce war is the awful coda to the Lewis and Clark Expedition. There is a persistent tradition among the Nez Perce that Clark fathered a child on the return trip, a child whose name translated as Daytime Smoke. As an elderly man Daytime Smoke was with Joseph and the others who fled their homeland in 1877, going over Lolo Pass in the opposite direction from which Lewis and Clark arrived, and then off onto the plains of Montana. Eventually Daytime Smoke was taken into exile down in Oklahoma, and he died there. That’s a sobering connection to the Lewis and Clark story.

In one long lifetime we see this trajectory of the story of this amazing people, and it’s not a happy one. So you can argue that if you look at the long-term consequences rather than the immediate effect, it’s calamitous. Yet because of the lag in time, we don’t see Lewis and Clark that way. We have given them a break.

**WPO:** The myth of inevitability is one of the most persistent myths of Native American conquest. If Lewis and Clark had never existed, isn’t it likely that Wounded Knee would still have happened? It’s not as if Lewis and Clark were agents in a linear world of causality here.

**EW:** It’s very difficult for me to imagine how, past the expansion of the 1840s, Indian peoples would not have lost at least their political and military independence. I think the details could have been quite different. But it seems to me to be pretty close to inevitable. And while Lewis and Clark played a part in that, I think that something like that would have happened in any case.
WPO: Some historians are pretty hard on the Lewis and Clark story. They say it’s largely mythological, that most Americans would rather live in this romantic journey story than actually puzzle out the problematic dynamics that Lewis and Clark were helping to unleash.

EW: I think our approach has to be realistic rather than look at it exclusively from a happy mythic angle. It behooves us to step back and ask ourselves if those agreeable myths are really the values that this story embodied. Are those the values that we want to keep? I think there’s an obligation to ask ourselves when we look at it in its realities if doesn’t it behoove us to rethink these fundamental tropes that we have taken away from it, the most obvious being our treatment of Indian peoples? To look at things rigorously doesn’t diminish the greatness of the story or even the heroic nature of it. It deepens the story.

WPO: If you start taking elements away from the Lewis and Clark story, when does it become not much different from Pike? You have Jefferson, Sacagawea, York, Drouillard. You’ve got extraordinary individuals like Posecopsahe (Black Cat) and Sheheke (Big White). And you’ve got Lewis and Clark. Who are the individuals that make this story so compelling?

EW: You start of course with Jefferson, who is endlessly fascinating and problematic. With Lewis and Clark, it’s the interplay when you put them together, the character dynamic between the two that makes it so interesting. With Lewis you’ve got this very strange character whose life before and certainly after is full of questions we'll never answer. He’s this curious character who’s always asking to be psychoanalyzed.

Then you’ve got these other folks like Sacagawea and York. What makes them more interesting is that they, too, turn out to have these mysterious endings. We’re never sure quite where they ended up. And you have those like Colter who fly off from the expedition to do extraordinary things of their own.

WPO: If you took Sacagawea out of this story it would be much less interesting to a lot of people. What is it about Sacagawea? What are the questions you want to tease out about this woman?

EW: There are the traditional ones. Do we identity her as Shoshone or Hidatsa? I think the interest in Sacagawea is one of those cases where the changing course of American historical interest has a lot to do with it. The increasing interest in women’s history had an impact upon this. Stephanie Ambrose Tubbs wrote that wonderful book about giving Sacagawea a break, Why Sacagawea Deserves the Day Off. We load her with a great number of our own projections.

She has become this symbol for so much. I think that because we don’t know a lot of details about her, we read into her story all kinds of motives and psychological angles that we have no basis for. But it’s a way for us to explore these questions for ourselves. The same thing holds true for York. The fact that we know so little enables us to project whatever we need to at any given time.

WPO: What is her cultural identity? Shoshone-Sacajawea, Hidatsa-Sacagawea, a medley of both?

EW: I think she was Shoshone, born Shoshone, although I’ve got very good friends among Crows and Hidatsas who would not like me saying that. I’ve gotten myself in deep water a couple of times.

It seems to me that the story points overwhelmingly in the Shoshone direction. But part of the lesson of Sacagawea is the how the West was this place of continual shifting of identities. There was extraordinary exchange among all these peoples, including cases like hers where a person is taken captive and then essentially sold. Identity was so fluid out there at this time. Maybe that’s the lesson of her story. We can’t really say who and what she was.

WPO: We know something of that, don’t we? When Lewis and Clark had the chance to leave her behind at the Shoshone village, she insisted on coming with Charbonneau. Her primary identity seems to have been her attachment to Charbonneau. Perhaps he was the source of her stability.

EW: Stability is the word. He was her safe harbor for the moment. The interesting question to me has always been, once she got back out there and in this extraordinary coincidence runs into her
brother, what’s her thinking? Do I jump ship here? It must have been something for her to have options.

**WPO:** Does it bother you as a historian that the two most famous Indian women in American history were both accommodationists who found it possible to help the conquerors succeed?

**EW:** That is problematical. You see the same thing in the story of Cortez and the Indian woman [La Malinche] who becomes his lover and his agent in the conquest of the Aztecs. It’s a great question. Do we privilege her story because she was useful in that way?

**WPO:** Let’s turn to William Clark, much loved in the Lewis and Clark world. Clark is often preferred over poor, mixed-up Lewis. But if there were no Lewis, if it were just Clark, this story might be as little known as the Zebulon Pike story. Is Clark enough to carry this myth?

**EW:** I don’t think so. He was too stable, a rock. Look at his long and successful career. Not just a great explorer, he was a smooth politician, was very good at working with Indians, served as the Indian Superintendent for the longest span of any person who ever held a post like that. Clark was a good family man and raised a large family. He was a good keeper of records. So maybe not, maybe you need the strangeness of someone like Lewis to give spiciness to the story.

**WPO:** They spend two-and-a-half years together out there. How would you unpack the relationship between the two captains over this long period of time?

**EW:** Everybody who writes about the expedition deals with that at some point and to some degree. There’s always the question of what’s not in the journal. What squabbles and irritations did they get into that we don’t know about? It strikes me that Clark exemplified the very qualities that made him such an effective Indian superintendent and that made him an effective political survivor through all of those years, all of those presidential administrations.

Clark could understand others at a gut level. He had political instinct for keeping things even, for getting along, and for separating what’s essential from what is not worth fighting about. It’s a very useful thing if you’re a politician, and I think the relationship between Lewis and Clark in that sense was political. It was Clark who had the political gift of making things work.

**WPO:** If Clark had turned Lewis down, and Lewis ends up commanding this expedition alone, what are the consequences?

**EW:** Absolutely disastrous. There were those long periods when Lewis in effect took off. He could not abide being in close contact with people on the expedition. There was something going on. There have been all sorts of attempts at psychoanalysis to explain this. I cannot imagine the morale or the command structure of the expedition holding up if he had been the only one. He didn’t have what it took.

**WPO:** Speaking of people who must have had an interesting return, how about York?

**EW:** Again, he is like Sacagawea in the sense that we know so little about him that we’re able to project onto his story what we want. He grew up close to Clark so there must have been an understanding between the two based on the assumptions of race relations at the time. The question that has always intrigued me was, within the parameters of what was acceptable between white and black at that time, what kind of wiggle room was there between these two men? How did that change when they got back? What did York think? How did his perceptions of himself and his relationship with Clark evolve on the expedition? Did that inform the story of the two of them once they got back?

**WPO:** Drouillard can walk away. York can’t walk away.

**EW:** No he cannot. So then things go bad between them when they get back, partly because York remembers what he had done and how he had shared the difficulties of this expedition. And then there’s the essential question of what happens to him, where does he end up?

There is this persistent mythological story that he goes back out West and becomes a mountain man among the Crows. He’s like Sacagawea in that sense. He allows us to fantasize about how we would like the story to have ended.

**WPO:** Out on the trail York gets to carry a gun. He is alone for some periods of time. Indians find him fascinating because he appears to have some kind of medicine. Imagine Clark watching this run of York, who’s suddenly fascinating and as interesting as he’s ever going to get as a human being. Clark is maybe thinking, “How am I going to handle this when we come back? Am I okay with him being this big a figure?”
EW: Exactly. That’s what I’m suggesting. The dynamic between the two started years back. How did it evolve on the expedition, and then how it plays out once they get back? What a question. A fascinating character study of these two guys, master and slave, and yet so much more than that.

WPO: It does not put Clark in a very favorable light.

EW: No. He beats him when they get back. So it also gives us insights into the larger context of that time. What were the racial parameters in the first decade of the 19th century in a situation like that? What was acceptable and what wasn’t? What kind of boundaries and limits were there in such a relationship?

WPO: Many have a kind of a Harriet Beecher Stowe idea about slavery, that it’s inevitably a vicious, openly racist, constantly belittling, rapacious relationship. But we know that there were friendships, that people grew up together, and had a familiarity and trust that maybe you and I don’t have with people of other races.

EW: Stories of race and slavery are emphatic on that point. It’s a far slipperier, far subtler relationship, especially in something like this where these two had essentially grown up together, known each other for a long time. I think it would have been a complex relationship even without the expedition. But you throw that in and it gets to be one of those mysteries we’ll never quite get a full grip on.

WPO: Let’s talk about Jefferson. This is the only expedition that he supervised with painstaking care. With the others that Jefferson had a hand in, there was not the emotional investment we see with Lewis and Clark.

EW: In the first place, Jefferson was invested to a considerable degree in those other expeditions, particularly Freeman and Custis. He called it the great expedition. There was more money given by Congress for that expedition than was given for Lewis and Clark.

The question boils down to what Jefferson thought about Lewis and Clark as opposed to these others. There was this constellation of questions that were there for Lewis and Clark that were not there in the other expeditions. Those expeditions were primarily and essentially diplomatic. He was trying to establish an American presence in this cockpit of empires that was the American West. The whole point of those other expeditions was to puzzle out the course of the Red River because it was supposedly going to be the southern boundary of the Louisiana Purchase.

After all, south and west represented a far greater challenge in terms of a foreign presence than north and west. The Spanish were much more of a presence in the Southwest than the English or other competitors were to the Northwest.

In both cases Jefferson was trying to feel out the opposition and get a sense of how the land might be used to his advantage. You start with that. I think the one to the north and west seems to have piqued his interest in ways that the others did not.

The key is in his instructions for Lewis. When you read between the lines you start to get a feel for the thinking behind them. It’s a much richer set of questions. It has to do with science, with ethnography, with understanding.

Jefferson sent out vocabularies with Lewis to be translated, and one of the words he included was “mammoth.” He was convinced that he would find these creatures out there. He was pursuing questions that had to do with the new world and its place in the larger story of life on our planet.

WPO: How can a polymath like Jefferson think that the mammoth is grazing out in Montana? This is a question that requires us to realize how different that world was from our modern set of assumptions.

EW: It has to do with the Enlightenment view of science and of life. The Enlightenment perspective held that all life was essentially progressive, and that meant that as animals evolved, they got larger. It was unthinkable that once you had large animals, they would disappear or get smaller. To us it’s an almost childlike way of thinking about things.

But this view was firmly held by the best minds, including Jefferson. He knew that there had been mammoths in the East. If there were mammoths in America at one time, they had to still be there. They went to the Black Hills or something. That was his thinking.

“Jefferson was trying to establish an American presence in this cockpit of empires that was the American West.”
On June 14, 1805, Captain Meriwether Lewis had his most dangerous encounter with a grizzly bear. One day after discovering the falls of the Missouri River, determined to explore the upper falls by himself, Lewis set out from camp alone about 10 a.m. He indeed found and described the upper falls, but in the course of a long and remarkable day of exploration, he had dramatic encounters with a grizzly bear, some sort of cat he called a “tyger cat,” and three charging bison bulls. The grizzly encounter might well have terminated Lewis’s life and thereby the expedition.

By the time these uncanny encounters had ended, Lewis concluded, with mock-heroic bemusement, “It now seemed to me that all the beasts of the neighbourhood had made a league to distroy me, or that some fortune was disposed to amuse herself at my expence.” No longer desiring to spend the night alone with the beasts of the neighborhood, the leader of the Corps of Discovery determined to hike back to the main camp. I “did not think it prudent,” he wrote, “to remain all night at this place which really from the successsion of curious adventures wore the impression on my mind of enchantment.” As he walked home in the moonlight, mus-
ing on one of the most interesting days of the journey so far, Lewis wondered from time to time if he were dreaming, “but the prickly pears which pierced my feet very severely once in a while, particularly after it grew dark, convinced me that I was really awake, and that it was necessary to make the best of my way to camp.”

When the Corps of Discovery arrived at the Great Falls of the Missouri better than two centuries ago near present day Great Falls, Montana, the Serengeti-like landscape teemed with elk, bison, and antelope. Its willow and cottonwood bottomlands were also home to numerous grizzlies. At this point in their journey, the expedition members had sufficient encounters with the “turrible” beast on the high Missouri to determine that they were a threat to the safety of the expedition. On May 11, 1805, Lewis had written, “these bear being so hard to die reather intimedates us all; I must confess that I do not like the gentlemen and had reather fight two Indians than one bear.”

On the outward journey to the Great Falls 54 grizzlies were observed with 20 being killed, six wounded, and 28 sight observations. The first grizzly encounter, as reported by both Clark and (briefly) Lewis, was just south of today’s Bismarck, North Dakota, on October 20, 1804. On that occasion Pierre Cruzatte shot the quadruped, Lewis wrote, “wounded him, but being alarmed at the formidable appearance of the bear he left his tomahalk and gun.” Since then, however uneasy it makes lovers of the wilderness feel, expedition members killed every grizzly bear within convenient reach, not usually for the sake of Enlightenment science, but to clear and secure their path, and also—it sometimes seems—for spite.

Grizzlies were so numerous and aggressive in the Great Falls area that bear alertness became a preoccupation. The captains ordered the men to sleep with their guns close at hand and forbade them to venture alone along the river. Seaman, Lewis’s Newfoundland dog, did his part by barking whenever a bear came near camp.

Although the grizzly bear had been encountered and noted in a number of first-hand accounts prior to the Lewis and Clark Expedition, the first reliable attempt to provide scientific information on the grizzly bear, *Ursus arctos*, came from the active pen of Meriwether Lewis. In the journal entries of the spring and summer of 1805 he tells of a superbly designed, high-shouldered quadruped possessing unpredictable vagaries, seasoned with a testy disposition, whose authority was absolute in asserting its continental supremacy—a uniquely designed mauling machine that was more than capable of killing men who dared to encroach into its domain.

It was Meriwether Lewis who first suggested the term “grizzly” to characterize *Ursus arctos*. Lewis and Clark commonly referred to the grizzly as the white, brown, yellow, and grey bear. On several occasions they do call it a “grizly.” Perplexed by the range of coloration of what they knew to be a single species, Lewis tried out the semi-scientific “variegated bear” on May 17, 1806, but—it is not surprising—that nomenclature failed to achieve acceptance in the decades that
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followed. In 1815 naturalist George Ord first gave the grizzly a Latin binomial, *Ursus horribilis*, “horrible bear.” (The label was later updated to *Ursus arctos*). Naturalist (and president) Theodore Roosevelt, who killed a few grizzly bears himself, beginning in August 1884, opposed Ord’s terminology and characterization, arguing a more appropriate name would be “grisly” meaning horrifying or ghastly.

The grizzly bear evolved in Siberia and passed from Asia into North America across the Bering Land Bridge during the last ice age. Spreading south, it eventually occupied a swath of territory from Alaska to central Mexico and from California to Minnesota. Evolution on the cold, open, windswept tundra favored size and ferocity. As nature writer Thomas McNamee puts it, “The American grizzly’s ancestors were the meanest specimens Eurasia had to offer.”

A typical adult weighs 500 pounds, but despite its bulk it can run in bursts of over 30 mph and at a sustained clip exceeding 20 mph. The first valid confirmation of a grizzly’s running speed was documented in Yellowstone National Park in April 1930. Former park naturalist Dorr G. Yeager and naturalist Carl P. Russell had an excellent opportunity to “clock” the speed of a sow grizzly and two cubs for two miles while driving to the Norris Geyser Basin. They encountered the grizzlies scrutinizing their car, and then to their considerable relief, the three bears “turned and headed down the road at a rolling lope.” Pursuing at a respectable distance, the scientists followed the bears approximately two miles at a speed of 25 miles per hour. At no time during the chase did Yeager and Russell attempt to push the bears to their maximum speed.

Another documentation on the speed of grizzlies was recorded by former district ranger Everett LeRoy (Ben) Arnold in Yellowstone Park while driving from Mammoth to Tower Falls. He encountered a sow grizzly and three yearlings in the road about two hundred yards ahead of the car. The bears, seeing the car, immediately turned and ran down the road for a full half mile before leaving the pavement and running into the timber. For the last quarter mile, they averaged 30 miles per hour “and were not crowded at all,” according to Arnold.

If a grizzly can run at a speed of 30-plus miles per hour, what is the fastest a human can run? If you take the average speed of the current world 100-meter record held by Usain Bolt (9.58 sec), you get about 10.44 meters per second (23.35 miles per hour or 37.58 kilometers per hour). However, if you were to record Bolt’s instantaneous speed at different points, such as at the 60-meter mark, the runner achieves a maximum speed much greater than this of 27.79 miles per hour (44.72 kilometers per hour). Deceleration would begin to occur after the 60-meter mark.

You would expect that over a distance of 200 meters Bolt would slow down after achieving top speed during the first 100 meters. However, Bolt’s 200-meter world record of 19.19 seconds works out to be an average speed of 10.42 meters per second (23.32 mph), practically the same average speed as for his 100-meter world record run.

With this basic understanding of top short-distance speeds between a human and a grizzly, let’s take a close look at Meriwether Lewis’s encounter with a grizzly bear on June 14, 1805. Lewis, well ahead of the expedition members, came face to face with a grizzly. The captain had just shot a buffalo and was studying its death throes when he noticed the bear lumbering toward him just 20 paces away. Violating a cardinal rule of wilderness travel, Lewis had neglected to reload immediately after shooting the buffalo, so he faced the bear with an empty rifle. To his dismay, he noticed there was not a tree within 300 yards nor any depression where he might conceal himself while recharging his gun. His only usable weapon was his espontoon, a largely ceremonial spear that could also serve as a walking stick, a probing device, and a means of steadying a rifle to increase accuracy.

“If in this situation,” Lewis later relates in his journal, “I thought of retreating in a brisk walk as fast he was advancing until I could reach a tree about 300 yards below me, but I had no sooner turned myself about but he pitched at me, open mouthed and full speed, I ran about 80 yards and found he gained on me fast, I then run into the water the idea struck me to get into the water to such depth that I could stand and he would be obliged to swim, and that I could in that situation defend myself with my espontoon; accordingly I ran hastily into the water about waist deep, and faced about and presented the point of my espontoon, at this instant he arrived at the edge of the water within about 20 feet of me; the moment I put myself in this attitude of defence he suddenly wheeled about as if frightened, declined the combat on such unequal grounds, and retreated with quite as great precipitation as he had just before pursued me.”

The bear then galloped at full speed for three miles across the open plain. Lewis later wrote that “the cause of his alarm still remains with me mysterious and unaccountable … I feel myself not a little gratified that he had declined the combat.”
From Lewis’s journal entry, we note the following information:

- The distance between Lewis and the bear prior to the start of the chase was 20 paces, which would be approximately 50 feet.
- The distance to the Missouri River from the start of the chase was about 80-plus yards.¹¹
- Lewis was carrying a rifle, shot pouch, and espontoon during the run, which would slow his pace.
- Trees that might serve as escape havens during the chase were absent.
- The enraged bear, “open mouthed,” appears to have initiated a lightning-fast charge.

With this basic information, a plausible re-creation of Lewis’s bear encounter can be developed, assuming:

- The distance between Lewis and the bear was 50 feet at the start of the chase.
- Since we have no information on Lewis’s top running speed, we will use Bolt’s record 23 mph average top speed for 100 meters.
- The grizzly has an average top speed of 30 mph.
- Since we do not know how long it would take to accelerate to top speed at the start of the chase, we will assume for the sake of argument that the start-up speed for Lewis is 23 mph and 30 mph for the bear.

The outcome of the simulated chase can be determined by the following:

- 1 mile = 5,280 feet.
- Grizzly: 30 mph = 158,400 feet per hour = 44 feet per second, thus 0.88 seconds to go 50 feet.
- Lewis: 23 mph = 121,440 feet per hour = 33 feet per second. In 0.8 seconds Lewis would run 26.8 feet.
- Therefore, the grizzly must go 50 + 26.8 feet (a total of 76.8 feet). At 44 feet per second it would take 1.75 seconds for the bear to catch Lewis.

Such a simulated outcome never materialized. What then might serve as an explanation as to why Lewis was not severely mauled or killed by the bear?

My calculations assume that Meriwether Lewis was able to run at close to the same speed as the world record holder Usain Bolt. This may not be so. Although he was undoubtedly in great physical shape at the time of the incident, Lewis was not a professional runner. Nor, when the Corps of Discovery engaged in a kind of Bitterroots Olympics with the Nez Perce in the spring of 1806, was Lewis put forward as the expedition’s best runner. We know from his June 14, 1805, journal entry that he fled the bear while carrying his rifle (approximately ten pounds), his espontoon, and his shot pouch. Surely these accoutrements would have slowed him down considerably. By 21st century standards, his footwear must be said to have been inadequate. Still, to paraphrase the British lexicographer and essayist Samuel Johnson, knowing you are to be eaten by a bear concentrates one’s exertions wonderfully.

It is at least possible that the bear did not run at Captain Lewis with the full intent of catching and mauling him. It is possible that the bear merely wanted to drive off the nearest competitor for the meat of the bison Lewis had killed, and while Lewis reported that the bear “pitched at me, open mouthed and full speed,” he might understandably (and inadvertently) have been exaggerating the attack because he was terrified. My own lifetime of experience with grizzly bears does not support that conclusion (see my footnote), but it cannot be ruled out. What we know is that the bear did not catch Lewis as he sprinted towards the banks of the Missouri River. If my calculations above are correct, the bear should have been able to catch up with Lewis, encumbered as he was with equipment.¹²

Did Lewis, in any way, embellish his encounter with the grizzly? I would be very hesitant to say yes to that question. Like others I have found Lewis to be an astute biological reporter who made a conscious effort to record events and observations as accurately as possible. In his biographical sketch of Lewis in 1813, former president Jefferson praised Lewis’s “fidelity to truth so scrupulous that whatever he should report would be as certain as if seen by ourselves.”¹³ The journals, thanks to Lewis and the other diarists, bulge with detailed information and basic summaries of daily events, fruits of close and confined attention to each day’s experiences on the great journey.

Lewis was thirty-one years old at the time of this bear encounter. He must have been in top physical condition. In addition to this, one also should consider the role of the hormone epinephrine, commonly called adrenalin, that is released
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by the adrenal glands in emergency situations. Sudden stress, such as an impending fight or some other dangerous situation, triggers the sympathetic nervous system to induce the fight or flight response, sometimes called hyperarousal response. It’s a way that your body readies itself for the emergency. Epinephrine released into the bloodstream spreads throughout the body, activating specific tissues to deal with physical harm. Airways relax to maximize breathing capacity, and metabolism increases. In addition, muscles go into glycolysis which produces energy-rich molecules fueling them for extraordinary action. While blood flow to the muscles is increased, blood flow to vulnerable extremities is decreased. We should not rule out that a combination of excellent physical condition plus an adequate secretion of epinephrine could result in an outstanding running performance. Fear and excitement often produce counter-intuitive results.

There is also the possibility that Lewis overestimated the distances (bison to bear, kill site to river) during a period of understandable panic. Under such circumstances, he might not have been a reliably objective observer of distances. Unless one backtracks and measures the distance traveled, one cannot be altogether sure. There is no evidence that Lewis paced off the scene after the danger was over on June 14.

Bear authorities today are in agreement with the cardinal rule that when confronting a grizzly it is best to stand your ground, offering the bear your profile and avoiding direct eye contact. Trying to run from a grizzly that can run nearly as fast as a greyhound in a wide variety of habitats, uphill or downhill, is always a bad idea; though, apparently, not so for the Captain. One has to wonder what the outcome would have been if Lewis would had stood his ground.  

Ken Walcheck is a retired wildlife biologist, and currently remains active in researching Montana natural history documentations with a main interest in the Lewis and Clark journals and the explorers’ natural history documentations.

Notes
2. Moulton, Journals, 4:141.
3. Moulton, Journals, 3:188.
4. Much of our knowledge of the grizzly and its world at the time of our first contact between Europeans and Native Americans comes from the meticulous notes of Meriwether Lewis and his fellow explorers. They passed through a land of “visionary enchantment” prowled by the great variegated bear that would one day become a symbol of so much that was lost.
7. Ibid. 74.
9. Ibid. 6.
10. Moulton, Journals, 4:292-293.
11. The actual distance to the Missouri River is confusing from Lewis’s entry. He writes “I thought of retreating in a brisk walk as fast as he was advancing until I could reach a tree about 300 yards below me.” The words “below me” suggest the river was downhill at a distance of 300 yards. He then continues to say “he pitched at me, open mouthed and full speed, I ran about 80 yards and found he gained on me fast, I then run into the water.” Did Lewis run 300 yards or 80 yards? I am inclined to believe 80 yards as I find it difficult to believe that one could outrun a grizzly the length of three football fields regardless of how much epinephrine was pumped into the circulatory system.
12. As a retired wildlife biologist who is quite familiar with bears and past Montana grizzly-human encounters, I have not found one documented incident where a human outran a charging bear. Sure, some have escaped by climbing trees, adjacent outhouses, buildings, or other structures, but not so for one who is betting on outrunning a grizzly. Running is always a bad idea. I have had several close calls with grizzlies with the most vivid encounter occurring in Denali National Park. I was hiking with the Chief Park Ranger in a treeless tundra reach of the park when we encountered an adult grizzly who immediately stood up on its hind legs and woofed at us. We stood our ground and quietly talked to the bear. The bear dropped down on all fours and started to circle us. As we turned with the bear, it suddenly stood again, looked at us, dropped down, turned and ran off. This was a classic example of never knowing what a bear is going to do. Running would have been a big mistake. I might further mention that bear spray at this particular timeframe had not been developed. Scott McMillion, author of Mark of the Grizzly, who has documented past and recent grizzly attacks in Montana, has found no evidence of anyone outrunning a grizzly.
Dear Editor,

I recently read Kira Gale’s “A Cold Case Mystery,” published in the November 2016 issue of We Proceeded On, and came away disappointed. Admittedly I am of the belief that the currently accepted historical evidence points to Lewis committing suicide on October 11, 1809, instead of being murdered. However, I am not disappointed that Ms. Gale proposes that Lewis could have been murdered instead of taking his own life. My disappointment is due to the circumstantial and speculative quality of the information Gale attempts to use as evidence to support her article.

The subtitle of Ms. Gale’s article is, “Why Didn’t Meriwether Lewis’s Two Best Friends Investigate His Death?” The first piece of information that Gale offers attempts to answer this question. She claims that Clark received letters forged in the name of a Captain Gilbert C. Russell, who had detained Lewis at Fort Pickering when he arrived there in a poor mental and physical state. These letters were allegedly full of lies that were meant to make Clark believe that Lewis was so distraught that he had made previous attempts on his life prior to his arrival at Fort Pickering, and that ultimately he committed suicide. She writes that Clark naively believed the contents of the Russell letters he received and therefore did not investigate. Gale claims that Thomas Jefferson did not investigate Lewis’s death because he knew that Lewis had been murdered via a conspiracy. An investigation would have created too much political turmoil in Washington and thus cannot be compared to the authenticated letters Jefferson received. Comparing the language Clark uses to describe the contents of the Russell letters he received to the actual language Russell used in his letters to Jefferson is interesting, but fails the evidence test.

Gale offers no evidence to support her theory that Jefferson knew Lewis was murdered. Her theory is based entirely on wishful thinking and her speculation and conjecture. This imaginative method is what one would expect to find in a historical novel and therefore cannot be considered as legitimate evidence. Her theory that Jefferson chose not to investigate Lewis’s death to avoid political turmoil in Washington is baseless. Jefferson’s term as President had ended in March of 1809, making him a private citizen when Lewis died. He would have had no political concern or reason at this point to avoid an investigation.

It is the duty of historians to ask questions and demand explanations of the historical record. This duty also requires an adherence to a rigorous standard when submitting evidence to support a theory or an explanation. This article does not adhere to these basic standards, universally shared in the scholarly world. Therefore, I respectfully disagree with Ms. Gale’s theory that Lewis was murdered, reject the reasons she proposes as to why his two best friends did not investigate his death, and cannot endorse or respect her standards of historical scrupulousness.
— Dan Bartley
Richland, Michigan

Dear Editor,

Your recommendations for new reading [creative fiction reviews in the last issue] were well received. New takes on the expedition are always welcome. There is no better way to appreciate and enjoy the story of the expedition than from the mouths of the explorers themselves. Although lengthy, Gary Moulton’s epic endeavor, The Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition (13 volumes), is a great way to proceed on with the story. Taken one volume at a time, you’re in for months or even years of pure reading pleasure.
— Tom Jacobs
Flagstaff, Arizona

Dear Editor,

With this issue of We Proceeded On we bid farewell to our editor, Bob Clark, and welcome our new editor, Clay Jenkinson.

Bob has served us well as the editor of our “keelboat”—our quarterly jour-
nal, *We Proceeded On*—for several years. Whether readers liked all the articles, or agreed with them, Bob has offered us much to think about, from Lewis’ death (again), to tribal perspectives, to natural history and friendships during the journey, to reviews of many new works that challenge what we thought we knew.

Bob has handled controversy and complaints with grace, and he has set a very high standard of scholarship for contributors. I think Thomas Jefferson would be pleased!

As a member of your Editorial Board, a contributor to *We Proceeded On*, a historian, and a member of the Board of Directors, let me say “welcome” to Clay; and to Bob, “huza! huza! huza!”

Thank you, Bob, for a job well done!
— Barb Kubik

*Vancouver, Washington*

---

**Dear Editor,**

In 1976 Donald Jackson and Paul Russell Cutright were concerned about scholarship. In his *History of the Lewis and Clark Journals*, Cutright wrote: “We are deeply concerned, however, with the literature responsible for perpetuating errors. Needless to say, a mistake once committed to print may be repeated, and if it is repeated often enough may become fixed in the minds of readers as established fact. In Lewis and Clark literature there are more than a few such examples of reiterated untruth or distorted fact. Whenever opportunity arises, historians of the Expedition equipped to speak authoritatively should expose and correct them.”

In 1999 I came into the Lewis and Clark community with a science background and assumed that I would find zealous and meticulous documentation in the expedition history books and articles that I read. However, many of the books and articles published during and since the bicentennial (2003-2009) have been lacking in adequate and accurate documentation, too often contaminated with over-reaching speculation. This was probably the result of the author not seeking enough critical reviewers prior to submission for publication, and the failure of the editor and in the case of WPO, the editorial board’s failure to have adequate review once submitted.

My first inkling to this problem came about 2005 when an article I had researched for years came back rejected with three “factual corrections.” Two of the “corrections” were themselves incorrect, which suggested that at least one reviewer was incompetent. Admittedly my writing style was poor and my well-over 100 endnotes had dozens of “typo” mistakes. Unfortunately, the meticulously researched article, which contained significant new information, remains unpublished.

The new WPO editor, Clay Jenkinson, has said, “There is much information yet to be mined from the journals through meticulous, imaginative scholarship.” I wish him well in his new job and I will hopefully supply a few nuggets of information that will correct some past errors and misinterpretations, and shed new light on the expedition.

— John W. Fisher

*Lewiston, Idaho*

---

“*The history of the world is the history of exploration—and its consequences.*”

Martin Dugard,

*The Explorers: A Story of Fearless Outcasts, Blundering Geniuses, and Impossible Success*, 233

---

**Attention Lewis and Clark Trail Stewards!**

The LCTHF has three Grant Programs:

- The Lewis and Clark Trail Stewardship Endowment
- The Burroughs-Holland/Bicentennial Education Fund
- The Montana Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Sign Maintenance Fund

For criteria, deadlines and applications, visit [www.lewisandclark.org](http://www.lewisandclark.org) and click on “What We Do”

Additional info: call (888)701-3434, e-mail Lindy Hatcher at grants@lewisandclark.org, or ask any LCTHF board member
Published as part of the series Discover the Great Plains, Great Plains Geology offers R.F. Diffendal’s personal view of the Great Plains garnered through his travels to various sites of interest. The first section of the book discusses the wide range of interpretations of the physical boundary of the Great Plains and Diffendal offers his well-reasoned definition of an appropriate boundary based on geologic features.

The second section of the book attempts to encapsulate the geological history and processes that formed the Great Plains. This summary inherently suffers from a necessary brevity, but is also hampered by oversimplified generalizations of the primary factors in the development of the Rocky Mountains and the Great Plains landscape. As an example, suggesting that crystal volume expansion played a role in uplifting the Rocky Mountains while not discussing (or providing an illustration) of the all-encompassing significance of the subducting oceanic Farallon Plate was a missed opportunity to explain which ancient tectonic plate scraped along bottom of the North American continent for some 1,000 miles to cause the mountain range uplift. Other claims that certain mass extinctions in the geological record were due to meteorite impacts omit other more likely or concurrent causes and the all-too brief narrative on evolution of life forms and their effect on chemistry of the oceans, atmosphere and soils doesn’t cite what those crucial changes were or how they occurred.

The third section of the book offers condensed descriptions of the 57 sites of geological, paleontological or archaeological interest that Diffendal has visited. Eight of these sites have some affiliation with the Lewis and Clark Expedition, either because the captains described the feature in their journals (Upper Missouri Breaks National Monument; Giant Springs; and Pompeys Pillar National Monument, all in Montana) or they had taken notice of the surrounding geomorphic landscape (Niobrara State Park, NB; Big Bend of the Missouri River, SD; Theodore Roosevelt National Park, ND; Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, ND; and the Judith Mountains, MT). In these capsule accounts, there doesn’t appear to have been an effort to perform site-specific research or review recent sources of geological mapping. For example, Diffendal identifies the Cretaceous-age formation composing Pompeys Pillar as the Hell Creek Formation, yet the Geologic Map of the Billings 30’ x 60’ Quadrangle, Montana by David A. Lopez (2000) has these rocks classified as the Lance Formation. Errors more substantial than formational nomenclature are also evident when Diffendal states that there are “Cretaceous[-age] granites” composing the Judith Mountains, when in fact all of the Cretaceous-age formations are sedimentary in origin, per the Geologic Map of the Lewiston 30’ x 60’ Quadrangle, Central Montana by Karen W. Porter and Edith M. Wilde (1999). And despite the understandable desire to be abridged, opportunities to further educate readers on impressive geological phenomena were missed, including describing the remarkable depth (~700 feet) from which upwelling groundwater migrates from the Madison Limestone to discharge at Giant Springs. Nor did Diffendal mention the name (shonkinite) or the unique mineralogy of the intrusive igneous rock composing the famous dikes and sills in the Upper Missouri Breaks NM.

A more useful book for Lewis and Clark travelers traversing the Great Plains would be an earlier Diffendal volume (co-written with Anne P. Diffendal) entitled Lewis and Clark and the Geology of the Great Plains (2003). That publication contains a useful correlation chart of Great Plains rock units that contextualizes how different rock formations that one may encounter along the expedition route are temporally related. It also contains a graphic illustration that illustrates how sea level fluctuations cause lateral and vertical changes in the deposition of rock strata,
and block diagrams that depict key structural faulting and intrusive relationships. That publication is not without its own inaccuracies (some repeated in *Great Plains Geology*), but it contains many more Great Plains geological features encountered by the expedition. There are also other exceptional books regarding the geology of the Lewis and Clark Trail that are superior to the superficial information provided in *Great Plains Geology*. Interested readers should refer to the superb (and standard-setting) *Geology of the Lewis & Clark Trail in North Dakota* (2003) by John W. Hoganson and Edward C. Murphy, *Magnificent Journey, A Geologic River Trip with Lewis and Clark through the Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument* (2004) by Otto L. Schumacher, and any available web posting by Bob Bergantino for other sites in Montana such as Pompeys Pillar.

Readers may find the other abbreviated locale descriptions in *Great Plains Geology* from Canada, Wyoming, Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas of some interest. Because they are not directly related to the broad corridor of Lewis and Clark sites, they were not evaluated for their technical accuracy for this review.

John W. Jengo, PG, is a registered Professional Geologist in several states and the author of numerous *We Proceeded On* articles about Lewis and Clark’s geological and mineralogical observations and discoveries.
For the seventh time since opening in 2003, the Lewis & Clark Boat House and Museum in St. Charles, Missouri, felt the effects of the flooding of the lower Missouri River. Heavy rains during the last week of April produced flood conditions along the lower Missouri River valley. At the Boat House and Museum, the river rose twenty-one feet between April 24 and May 4, cresting at 35.91 feet. Flood stage is 25.0 feet, and the river begins creeping into the lower level of the Boat House at 30.0 feet.

Anticipating the rising water, members of the Lewis & Clark Discovery Expedition of St. Charles and friends in the community, including a foreign exchange student, worked to minimize damage to the full-size replica boats and other equipment housed in the lower level. The boats were moved to a fenced and secure parking lot on higher ground, and tools and equipment were raised to higher shelves, a newly constructed loft in the workshop and to the museum classroom on the second level. Rescue work was completed on Sunday, April 30. Even though the museum itself was high and dry, the stairway and elevator leading to it were inaccessible. The parking lot and nearby Frontier Park were also flooded. The museum was closed for the first week of May as the water depth eventually reached six feet in the entrance area. We were sad to cancel the eight school field trips scheduled for that week.

The river also deposited a huge collection of driftwood logs and other debris on our riverbank and did heavy damage to outdoor displays.

By the evening of Sunday, May 7, the river had fallen to 29.5 feet, allowing cleanup to begin. Three volunteers were available that night to make the entrance area accessible, cleaning mud from the floor and stairs. The museum was open to the public and we were able to host as planned a school field trip the next day at the normal scheduled time of 10:00 a.m.

Several inches of mud that collected in the lower level storerooms, workshop, and restroom were removed over the next two weeks. The boats returned home and most of the equipment was back in place on May 18. A big thank you goes to the volunteers from the Discovery Expedition who contributed their time and labor to the flood recovery enabling us to claim — "We Proceeded On."