• Who Built the Barge?
• Lewis and Clark on the Ecola Shore
• The Last Hours of Lewis’ Life: A New Look
• Book Review: Daniel Boone
I'm a compulsive list maker. Last night, reading Gary Moulton's excellent *The Lewis and Clark Expedition Day by Day*, I noticed how often members of the expedition got frostbite during the long raw winter in today's North Dakota. It's more than you think. I want to know which members were frostbitten and where, how many more than once, how many suffered in any permanent way. We know that a Native American boy of about thirteen was caught out on an extremely cold Dakota day and Lewis wound up amputating some of his toes in two separate surgeries at the end of January 1805.

And I want to know which members of the expedition could not swim. The captains mention a number of times that there are non-swimmers among the Corps of Discovery. Who are they? Was this in any way a consideration when the captains recruited volunteers for a river journey? We know from the Christmas entries at Fort Clatsop in 1805 that the captains gave twisted of tobacco to the tobacco users and handkerchiefs to those who didn't chew. I'd like to know which were which. Whenever the expedition lingered near a Native American village, many of the men sought sexual pleasure with Native women. Some got venereal diseases. I'd like to know who sought such pleasures and who abstained, particularly after they were first subjected to the cure: mercury dosing via the expedition's cruel and unusual penile syringe. We are led to believe that the captains refused sexual hospitality among the Lakota and the Arikara, among others, but we know, too, that Clark almost certainly fathered a child during the Corps' long stay with the Nimipu (Nez Perce). My reading of Meriwether Lewis is that he was almost certainly essentially asexual. That, of course, could be completely wrong.

Sometimes as I wind down late in the evening, I try to enumerate all the Native American groups Lewis and Clark met in their twenty-eight-month trek across the continent — and back again. I do pretty well until they get on the Pacific side of the Bitterroots. I once talked Garrison Keillor into recording them all in his fabulous Lake Wobegon voice, for a thirteen-part NPR documentary on the expedition. It's pure pleasure to listen to him voice *Walla Walla* and *Shoshone and Hidatsa*, because his genius makes you hear those words as if for the first time. I also sometimes try to pin down the exact number of horses that are associated with the expedition. This would seem to be a relatively simple matter, but it isn't. What about the horses they began with, one of which Shannon had with him when he got lost in the Iowa-Nebraska corridor? What about the horses they bought or stole in the lower Columbia, the rafts they built replacement canoes Clark (sighing heavily) had built after the Expedition buy from Native peoples? What songs did they sing as they journey? How many of the men ate dog with alacrity and how many found it upsetting, if necessary? For that matter, how many dogs did the expedition buy from Native peoples? What songs did they sing as they poled and rowed and tugged their way to the upper Jefferson River? What jokes were bandied about? Who earned a well-deserved reputation for snoring, for belching, for...?

And, of course, is it possible to produce an exact list and map of the expedition's watercraft, beginning with the barge (see William K. Brunot's article herein), the two pirogues, temporary Ohio pirogues, the six small canoes fashioned at Fort Mandan, the iron boat *Experiment*, the replacement canoes Clark (sighing heavily) had built after the *Experiment* ignominiously sank, the canoes fashioned at Orofino, Idaho, the boats they bought or stole in the lower Columbia, the rafts they built or borrowed, etc.?

I wish someone would produce a comprehensive obsessive-compulsive encyclopedia of Lewis and Clark statistics on all of these subjects, and much more, including the (was it twenty-nine?) Indian vocabularies Lewis compiled, the artifacts the captains sent back from Fort Mandan and brought back at the end of the journey, and where they all wound up, at least those that were not dispersed or lost in the P. T. Barnum New York City fire of July 13, 1865. Inquiring minds want to know. Meanwhile, the great Gary Moulton has provided us two fabulous resources: the thirteen volumes of *The Journals of the Lewis & Clark Expedition*, which, with Jackson's *Letters of the Lewis and Clark Expedition*, provide the foundation for all accurate lists, and his more recent *The Lewis and Clark Expedition Day by Day*, which is not only a terrific resource but a very enjoyable read, a kind of summing up by the outstanding Lewis and Clark editor of all time.
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A Message from the President

Elsewhere in this issue you will find the 2020-2021 Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation (LCTHF) Annual Report. I urge you to look it over to see the current state of our organization. Within it are also described the highlights of the year just concluded. While we can all be rightfully proud of what LCTHF has accomplished, I prefer not to dwell on our successes in this space for the present. I would like to issue you a challenge instead.

One part of our operation that can further our cause in many ways has not been used to its full potential in recent years. LCTHF has two dedicated, restricted funds, one for Education and Scholarship and the other for Trail Stewardship, from which we grant monies for eligible projects. Both are oriented toward funding tangible, visible projects that benefit the public and increase the visibility and effectiveness of our organization.

Allow me to give you a brief rundown on both funds. Dollars are made available from both through a five-year, twenty-quarter rolling average that smooths out the vagaries of investment returns. Each year, we budget and make available for grants five percent of the total of the most recent rolling-average period, less an administrative fee. LCTHF committees review the grant applications and rank them by various criteria to determine which projects merit funding. They forward their recommendations to the LCTHF Board for final approval.

The Burroughs-Holland/Bicentennial Education Fund was established by gifts from the family of author Raymond Darwin Burroughs, through a bequest from the estate of Lewis and Clark author Leandra Zim Holland, from royalties and logo fees derived through the National Council of the Lewis & Clark Bicentennial, and from generous donations by LCTHF members. Releases from this fund are used to support projects that benefit K-12 educational activities and/or scholarly research on topics related to the LCTHF’s goals and/or to the original grant sponsors’ intentions. In recent years, the total amount of funds available annually for grants has been on the order of $4,500-$5,500, with most individual grants awarded in amounts of around $500 to $1,000. The LCTHF Education and Scholarship Committee, chaired this year by Barb Kubik of Vancouver, Washington, reviews these applications and makes recommendations to the LCTHF Board.

The bulk of our second major grant program, the Lewis & Clark Trail Stewardship Endowment, came under the administration of LCTHF after the conclusion of the Bicentennial through an agreement with the U.S. Treasury, the National Council of the Lewis & Clark Expedition Bicentennial, and the Missouri Historical Society. Funded primarily through the proceeds from the sale of Bicentennial coin sets, LCTHF received a corpus in the vicinity of $1.8 million. Through additional donations and investment income, and even after paying grants out for some fifteen years, the fund balance has grown, and the amount available for grants after administrative fees is on the order of $75,000 annually. The LCTHF Trail Stewardship Committee, chaired by Rob Heacock of Liberty Lake, Washington, evaluates applications and recommends awards of up to $7,500 per project to the LCTHF Board.

The LCTHF Trail Stewardship Committee also oversees two other, smaller programs that fund the replacement of roadside Lewis and Clark informational signs. One is strictly for signs within the state of Montana.
The other we administer on behalf of the National Park Service and is applicable, when certain criteria are met, anywhere along the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail.

For the past several years, we have not received enough qualified applications to spend all the available money released from the major funds. Since the money in all the funds is restricted to specific purposes, we cannot use it in other ways. While it is nice that the balance then grows at a faster rate than it would have had the full amount of the release been granted out, we miss out on the opportunity to create projects or make improvements that will enlighten people now and remain in the public square for years to come.

Here’s where you come in. May I ask you to put on your thinking cap and come up with worthy projects we would be happy to support? Working on such projects can be a marvelous way to reinvigorate a local group while also helping LCTHF to fulfill its mission. Moreover, you will derive a wonderful feeling of personal satisfaction when your project comes to fruition. The deadline for applying for grants is September 30 each year, so there are still several months in which to get a proposal together for 2022. Further information, guidelines for acceptable submissions, and application forms may be found at LCTHF’s website: https://lewisandclark.org/grants. It is my hope that we see a large increase in applications so we can take full advantage of the resources at our disposal to support projects that promote increased understanding of the Lewis and Clark adventure in all its facets. Let us all strive to become even better “Keepers of the Story and Stewards of the Trail.”

Proceeding on together,
Lou Ritten, President
Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation

---
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Adventures of the Expedition Barge, 1804-1805

May 8, 1804 – Clark – at Camp Wood, Illinois
“Verry hot day, after Loading the Boat maned her with 20 oares & went the middle of the river & up the Mississippi a few miles, took the diferent Courses of the rivers in the point.” Moulton II:213

May 24, 1804 – Clark – Franklin County, Missouri
“a Verry bad part of the river, we attempted to pass up under the Lbd. Bank which was falling in So fast that the evident danger obliged us to Cross between the Starbd. Side and a Sand bar in the middle of the river, we bave up near the head of the Sand bar, the Sand moving & banking caused us to run on the Sand. The Swiftness of the Current wheeled the boat, Broke our Toe rope, and was nearly over Setting the boat, all hand Jumped out on the upper Side and bore on that Side until the Sand washed from under the boat and wheeled on the next bank by the time She wheeled a 3rd Time got a rope fast to her Stern and by the means of Swimmers was Carred to Shore” Moulton II:250

June 4, 1804 – Ordway – Jefferson City, Missouri
“our mast broke by my Stearing the Boat (alon) near the Shore the Rope or Stay to the mast got fast in a limb of a Secamore tree & it broke very Easy.” Moulton IX:9-10

June 9, 1804 – Clark – Saline County, Missouri
“in passing up on the S. opsd. the Isd. the Sturn of the boat Struck a log which was not perceivable the Curt. Struck her bow and turn the boat against Some drift & Snags which [were] below with great force; This was a disagreeable and Dangerous Situation, particularly as immense large trees were Drifting down and we lay immediately in their Course. — Some of our men being prepared for all Situations leaped into the water Swam ashore with a imediately in their Course, — Some of our men after Loading the Boat maned her with 20 oares & went the middle of the river & up the Mississippi a few miles, took the diferent Courses of the rivers in the point.” Moulton II:213

June 21, 1804 – Clark – Lafayette County, Missouri
“Crousat viewed The water on each Side of the Island which presented a most unfavourable prospect of Swift water over rolicing Sands which rored like an immense falls, we Concluded to assend the right Side, and with much difficulty, with the assistance of a long Cord or Tow rope, & the anchor we got the Boat up with out any furthr dang. [damage] than Bracking a Cabbin window & losing some oars which were Swong under the windows” Moulton II:313

July 14, 1804 – Clark – near the Missouri-Nebraska line
“The bank was falling in and lined with Snags as far as we could See down,— in this Situation The Storm which passd over an open Plain from the N. E. Struck the our boat on the Starbd. quarter, and would have thrown her up on the Sand Island dashed to peces in an Instant, had not the party leeped out on the Leward Side and kept her off with the assistance of the ancker & Cable, unto the Storm was over, the waves Dashed over her windward Side and She must have filled with water if the Lockers which is covered with Tarpoling & (prevented) Threw of the water & prevented any quantity Getting into Bilge of the Boat. In this Situation we continued about 40 Minits. when the Storm Sudenly Seased and the river become Instancetaniously as Smoth as Glass.” Moulton II:377-78

September 21, 1804 – Clark – at the Great Bend of the Missouri River, Hughes County, South Dakota
“at half past one oClock this morning the Sand bar on which we Camped began to under mind and give way which allarmed the Sergeant on Guard, the motion of the boat awakened me; I get up & by the light of the moon observed that the land had given away both above and below our Camp & was falling in fast. I ordered all hands on as quick as possible & pushed off, we had pushed off but a few minets before the bank under which the Boat & perogues lay give way, which would Certainly have Sunk both Perogues, by the time we made the opsd. Shore our Camp fell in.” Moulton III:98

September 27, 1804 – Ordway – near today’s Pierre, South Dakota
“an accident happened as they came on board by the neglect of the men at the helm of the pearogue, who Steared hir above the big boat. She Swung round with the current and She came full force down against the Bow of the Barge Broke the cable of hir. we found we were all on float, roused all hands and got Safe to Shore on S. S. the Indians hearing us, and expected that the Mahars Indians had come to attack us. they all ran to our assistance on the bank of the river & fired Several guns for an alarm only.” Moulton IX:70

Feb 3, 1805 – Lewis – Fort Mandan in today’s North Dakota
“the situation of our boat and perogues is now allarming, they are firmly inclosed in the Ice and almost covered with snow. The ice which incloses them lies in several stratas of unequal thicknesses which are seperated by streams of water. this peculiarly unfortunate because so soon as we cut through the first strata of ice the water rises up and rises as high as the upper surface of the ice and thus creates such a deoth of water as (had) renders it impracticable to cut away the lower strata which appears firmy attached to, and confining the bottom of the vessels.” Moulton III:284-85

April 3, 1805 – Ordway – Fort Mandan
“The articles which was to be Sent back to the States in the Big Barge was packed and boxed up ready to go on board.” Moulton IX:125

Sketches of the Keelboat, from William Clark’s Field Notes. Courtesy of the Beinecke Rare Book Library, Yale University.
The circumstances surrounding the building of the vessel that was used by Captains Meriwether Lewis and William Clark on their exploring expedition in 1803 have been uncertain for years. This boat, generally called a “keelboat,” should more accurately be called a barge, or military galley, after a careful look at its design. The differences between the two types of boats are significant. In his journal during the voyage, Lewis himself, and others who saw it, called his big boat a “barge.”

The drawings of this boat made by Captain William Clark and other references in the journals also establish its type clearly. For many years, the fact that Lewis went down the Ohio River with his barge and other smaller boats was not widely known. There is a well-documented tradition that one or more of the Lewis boats was built in Elizabeth, Pennsylvania, but most historians today conclude that his barge was built in Pittsburgh. Until 2003, the belief was that it had been built at one of the boatyards along the banks of the Monongahela River (i.e., near Pittsburgh). The research outlined in Patricia Lowry’s August 3, 2003, *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* article, “Who Built the Big Boat?” pointed to a new possibility — that the Lewis boat was built at Fort Fayette (i.e., in Pittsburgh). This stockade, erected in 1791 on the banks of the Allegheny River, protected settlers from Indian raids after Fort Pitt had fallen into ruin. It is known that Captain Lewis had his supplies stored at Fort Fayette in preparation for his departure down the Ohio River. A painting of the city of Pittsburgh believed to have been executed in 1804, when studied in detail recently, revealed not only an image of Fort Fayette, but a building on the shoreline that has the features of a boatbuilding structure.
Boats for the West and On the Ohio

The famous Revolutionary War soldier General George Rogers Clark, William Clark’s older brother, used armed galleys in his campaigns against the British and their Indian allies on the western frontier. Before the summer of 1780, with his usual promises to pay the boatbuilders, Clark engaged workmen to construct 100 boats, mostly cheap flatboats, which were to be completed within two months and used to transport provisions on his planned 1780 expedition.  

At that time, Jacob Myers was with Clark in Illinois. On July 21, 1780, Myers sent a bill to the governor of Virginia listing “cost and items used ... to make 7 boats for the state of Virginia, cost of 1,765 pounds currency for calking, nails, boxes for artillery and horses.” Jacob Myers is mentioned again in records of September 29, 1780, and February 20, 1781. During the spring and summer of 1781, General Clark was back in Pennsylvania attempting to raise troops for another expedition. He embarked from Pittsburgh on August 8 with three field pieces and only 400 men. Jacob Myers was still attached to Clark’s army on March 22, 1782, when a bill was sent from Louisville for “entries for items and cash distributed to various officers and persons — references to corn, meat, and other items.” Persons owed included Jacob Myers. Many letters and bills were sent to Virginia governor Benjamin Harrison at that time for canoes, boats, barges, paddles, oars, anchors, nails, calking, calking irons, mallets, augers, hemp, cordage, and other boat-building supplies. Major Isaac Craig had been ordered to Fort Pitt with artillery and military supplies. He reached his station in Pittsburgh on June 25, 1780, and was still directing boatbuilding operations in 1790 when he paid $2.66 and 2/3 cents a foot for most of the keelboats and barges he bought.
Of course, there were other armed barges traveling the Ohio whose designs were nearly identical to the vessel that Lewis and Clark used in 1803. On March 21, 1791, John Pope, traveling from Pittsburgh to New Orleans, encountered a “Keel-bottomed boat with a square sail” bound upriver from New Madrid, making two-and-a-half miles an hour without the aid of oars. When he neared Natchez, Pope found a Spanish fleet consisting of a governor’s barge occupied by Governor of Spanish Louisiana Don Manuel Luis Gayoso de Lemos y Amorin (1747-1799) accompanied by other vessels. This “galley” had twenty-eight men, twenty-four oars, one six-pounder, and eight swivel guns. A drawing of this galley shows a remarkable similarity to the Lewis and Clark big boat, which was built twelve years later.14

**Fort Fayette and Anthony Wayne**

By fall 1791, much of Fort Pitt had been torn down. Major Isaac Craig, quartermaster general at Fort Pitt and then Fort Fayette, wrote to Secretary of War Henry Knox on October 6 that William Turnbull and Peter Marmie were continuing to pull down and sell the materials from the fort. Knox responded on December 16, directing
Craig to build a new fort for the protection of Pittsburgh. Craig decided upon the name of Fort Lafayette. Knox approved, but the name “Fayette” was used thereafter. Fort Fayette was on the south side of the Allegheny River about a quarter of a mile east of Fort Pitt. It sat within about a hundred yards of the bank on beautiful rising ground, straddling present-day Penn Avenue between Ninth and Tenth streets. The structures were enclosed in a square stockade surrounding about an acre. Four bastions contained blockhouses, a brick arsenal, and a barracks with thirty rooms. On May 5, 1792, Captain Thomas Hughes moved his men to the fort. General Anthony Wayne commanded the third army sent against the Indians north of the Ohio, arriving at Pittsburgh on June 14, 1792. Wayne immediately plunged into the business of organizing and training his “army” — just forty recruits, plus the corporal’s command of dragoons that had accompanied Wayne across the state. The number in his force grew rapidly and the “army” was renamed the “Legion of the United States.” General Wayne himself headquartered at the southeast corner of Liberty and West streets, while his troops encamped on Suke’s Run across the Allegheny River.

The quartermaster and his supplies were kept at Fort Fayette. James O’Hara and Major Craig bought flour, meat, forage, and other supplies, and contracted boats for the army’s use. By the time of Wayne’s departure, Major Craig had built forty-two boats, mostly flatboats, for his troops at Pittsburgh. They were larger than those he had purchased for army use the year before. In a letter to General Knox dated November 30, 1792, Craig reported that at an early hour, the artillery, infantry, and rifle corps (except for a small garrison) left Fort Fayette, embarked, and descended the Ohio to “Legionville.” As soon as the troops had embarked, the general went on board his barge under a fifteen-gun salute from a militia artillery corps at Fort Fayette. The salute commemorated the fifteen states in the union and voiced the army’s gratitude for the “politeness and hospitality” that the officers of the Legion had experienced from Pittsburgh’s citizens. Among Wayne’s troops was William Clark, commissioned as a first lieutenant in the fourth sub-legion in Wayne’s western army. Thus Lieutenant Clark would have known well the builders and characteristics of the vessels carrying these troops. By June 1793, Major Craig, the deputy quartermaster general, forwarded 104 flatboats to Wayne’s expedition laden with provisions, horses, and equipment in addition to goods sent by other craft.

The Jacob Myers Packet-Boat Service

It seems likely that Jacob Myers participated in building some of General Wayne’s barges because Craig contracted out work and because, immediately after Wayne’s departure, Myers built the barges used in his own “Packet Service,” the first boat of which was ready to leave Pittsburgh in October 1793. Because the fortunes of boatbuilders undoubtedly waxed and waned as the demand from the military swelled and stopped, Myers might have been in need of a new market. Boat carpentry is a highly skilled occupation, far more complicated than homebuilding. Every frame, plank, and rail is curved, twisted, or sawn at angles, and most have to take on a three-dimensional shape. Fittings are curved, cast, or carved, and even sails are not flat. The boatbuilder serves a long apprenticeship and can be in great demand for intermittent periods. In 1793 Jacob Myers offered his fortnightly service between Pittsburgh and Cincinnati on boats propelled by oars and sails. These were no flatboats; they were intended for continuous service up and down the river. The advertisements, which first appeared in The Pittsburgh Gazette on October 19, 1793, and in Cincinnati’s Sentinel of the Northwest Territory on January 11, 1794, described the first regularly scheduled boat service on the Ohio River between the two cities. One reference mentioned that there were to be four boats of twenty tons each, a size within the range Meriwether Lewis specified in his initial list for the expedition in 1803. The enterprise, however, appears to have been short-lived. Isaac Craig clearly knew of the Myers boat service, and in May 1794 wrote that the idea of passenger packet boats ought to be abandoned. The government mail boats that operated from 1794 to 1798 carried a few passengers, but thereafter no regular service appears to have been available on the upper Ohio until the advent of the steamboat. Presumably the ease and cheapness with which boats could be purchased or passage obtained on the boats of others made packet service unprofitable.

Lewis, the Whiskey Rebellion, and Clark

In 1794, a federal army unit was sent to western Pennsylvania to help put down the Whiskey Rebellion. Meriwether Lewis, who was then twenty years of age, had enlisted in the army as a private and was part of this unit. They
camped on the Monongahela River about fifteen miles above (i.e., south of) Pittsburgh on Andrew McFarlane’s farm at what is now the riverfront town of Elrama, two miles upriver from Elizabeth. McFarlane’s ferry landing was on the west side of the Monongahela River. Lewis may have become familiar with the Elizabeth town boatyards and boatbuilders at that time. At the same time, Fort Fay-
ette was the center of the rapidly changing forces involved in the rebellion and was used for incarcerating some of the prisoners. Lewis could have seen Jacob Myers’ advertise-
tments for his packet-boat service in The Pittsburgh Gazette, and may have seen his boats firsthand in Pittsburgh. The 1795 Pittsburgh map (see page 8) on which the Fort Fay-
ette plan is shown most clearly also shows a “U.S.Wharf” on the shore adjoining the fort. The modern definition of the word “wharf” differs somewhat from the definition at this time, which could simply mean a shore or landing

place. For example, the area known as the “Monongahela Wharf” was a riverbank until well after 1850.

Early in 1796, the same year Clark retired from the army, Georges Henri Victor Collot, a French military officer who had fought on the American side during the Revolution, passed through Pittsburgh, giving us some in-
sight into Fort Fayette and boatbuilding in the city. His mission was secret: he was to assess, for the information of the French government, the strength of the fortifications along the Ohio and Mississippi rivers. He visited Fort Fay-
ette and had a low opinion of it, stating, “On a dark night, four grenadiers, with a dozen faggots of dry wood, might burn the fort and all the garrison, and not let a single in-
dividual escape.” He also remarked about the cost of boats at that time, saying that keelboats and barges were selling further up the Monongahela at $1.50 a foot. He stated that Pittsburgh prices were exorbitant.

Galleys Built in Pittsburgh

Two years later, during a period of trouble with France, two row galleys were built at Pittsburgh under the su-
pervision of Major Craig who was in charge of opera-
tions at Fort Fayette. These galleys were forty-five feet in length and thirteen in beam. They had two masts and were equipped with sails and rigging. There were thirty oars of differing lengths, and the row benches were con-
structed so that they could be folded away. The first galley, the President Adams, was launched on May 19, 1798, with General Wilkinson presiding. Tarleton Bates, Virgin-
ian and friend of Meriwether Lewis, wrote to his broth-
er Frederick Bates six days later, “On Saturday the nine-
teenth, precisely at 2 PM, the first galley was launched at this place. It was said to be a very beautiful launch, she slid a most unusual distance, I believe 126 feet.” The galley departed down the Ohio on June 8, 1798, with General Wilkinson and his suite on board, followed by six large flat-bottomed boats and several smaller craft. Because of low water in the Ohio River, the second galley, the Senator Ross, was not launched until nearly a year later, on March 26, 1799. She carried a twenty-four-pound gun in her bow and some swivel guns on deck. The launching was heralded by a salute fired on board and returned by the guns of Fort Fayette. By April, she had departed for the Missis-
sippi. By then, the anticipated war with France had been averted. As Major Craig had overseen the construction of the President Adams and the Senator Ross, it is plausible
that both vessels were built at the Fort Fayette yards. The firing of a salute from the fort would make sense only if the boats had been launched there. The artillery had a limited effective noise range and there were no means of communication to coordinate such a firing had the galleys been launched further away.

Captain Lewis Needs a Big Boat

In September 1800, Meriwether Lewis returned to the Indian frontier. While in Pittsburgh, he had direct dealings with Major Craig. On December 5, Lewis was promoted to captain and on one of his trips traveled down the Ohio with a twenty-one-foot bateau and a pirogue, thus gaining real experience on the western rivers.

In 1801, Lewis was in Pittsburgh off and on during his military trips where he likely had contact with Major Craig again. Lewis could probably not have avoided seeing Myers and his boats during this period if Myers were still living in or near Pittsburgh. Late in 1801, Lewis received the invitation to become secretary to President Jefferson. In 1802 Jefferson and Lewis started planning the great western expedition, and by spring 1803, President Jefferson and Lewis had completed their planning. On Jefferson’s orders, Lewis traveled to Philadelphia to study navigation, surveying, medicine, and biology with top experts. He also purchased large quantities of military and civilian supplies and trade goods.

In a letter to Jefferson in January 1803, Lewis offered an estimate of the cost of his “means of transportation:” $430. He listed his “Articles Wanted” in detail in his May-June summary. Among those items were his “means of transportation:”

1 Keeled Boat light strong at least 60 feet in length her burthen equal to 8 Tons.
1 Iron Frame of Canoe 40 feet long
1 Large Wooden Canoe
12 Spikes for setting-poles
4 Boat Hooks & Points Complete
2 Chains & Pad-locks for confining the Boat & Canoes &c

No record of the order or contract for the big boat’s construction has been found, and so it is not known who was selected as contractor. What does exist, however, is an example of how Lewis would have implemented such an order. In a lengthy letter to Jefferson on April 20, 1803, concerning his boat and other transactions, he stated, “I have also written to Dr. Dickson, at Nashville, and requested him to contract in my behalf with some confidential boat-builder at that place, to prepare a boat for me as soon as possible, and to purchase a large light wooden canoe: for this purpose I enclosed the Dr. 50. dollars, which sum I did not conceive equal by any means to the purchase of the two vessels, but supposed it sufficient for the purchase of the canoe, and to answer also as a small advance to the boat-builder: a description of these vessels was given. The objects of my mission are stated to him as before mentioned to the several officers.”

Lewis wrote again to Jefferson on May 29, 1803, from Philadelphia: “I have written again to Dr. Dickson at Nashville, (from whom I have not yet heard) on the subject of my boat and canoe.” These two letters are revealing. First, they illustrate how Lewis might have ordered the big boat in Pittsburgh. Further, they show that as late as May 29, 1803, a day or so before he left Philadelphia, he was still trying unsuccessfully to get his big boat built in Nashville, Tennessee! He then was intending to travel downriver from Pittsburgh with all his goods in smaller boats and by overland transport.

Lewis Ships His Supplies to Pittsburgh

At this time, Lieutenant Moses Hooke was in command at Fort Fayette; Lewis had a high regard for his character and competence.

Lewis also noted that Major Craig, who had always been associated with Fort Fayette, was also present in Pittsburgh at that time and could take care of his stores if necessary. While still in Philadelphia, Lewis shipped his goods from
there to the Indian Department, Pittsburgh, which was located at Fort Fayette. The list of charges taken out on Lewis’ account in Philadelphia included:

- Transportation of public stores from Philadelphia to Indian D. Pittsburgh
- 18 small falling axes to be furnished at (ditto) Indian D.
- 1 Boat and her caparison, including spiked poles, boat hooks & toe line to be furnished at Pittsburgh

Lewis also ordered “A strong waggon –wt. From here (Philadelphia) 2700 – to be increased to 3500 or more” and instructed that “the box of mathematical instruments to be sent for Mr. Patterson & well secured with canvas – mark’d ‘This side up’ on the top–& and particular charge given the waggoner respecting it.” These instructions indicate that the equipment purchased in Philadelphia was to go to Pittsburgh by wagon — not to some intermediate location on the Monongahela River such as Elizabeth. Fort Fayette, moreover, would have made more sense as a destination for the items, considering the quantity, value, purpose, and ownership of this shipment of military equipment and trade goods. Lewis would hardly have shipped them to an inn, to the post office, to a boatyard on the Monongahela, or to the dilapidated Fort Pitt. By this time, both Lewis and Clark knew every aspect of the military boats used on previous river campaigns, and would have most likely desired an armed galley — a craft that could mount and fire cannons and go upstream. Although Lewis wrote that he wanted a “keeled boat,” an actual keelboat with full-length cabins would have been the wrong design for a big expedition up the Missouri. Lewis and Clark had to carry a huge load of supplies and trade goods as well as a large crew. Keelboats cannot mount a large sail and they have only a single oar for steering, which would have been too weak for a boat as large as the one Lewis and Clark needed. Barges or galleys have mounted rudders. A keelboat’s roof oars would have been too inefficient and too few for their big crew. Oars would have to be mounted lower down to be functional. The main power for the boat, rowing, would have dominated the whole design of Lewis and Clark’s boat selection, and thus led them to select the very type of boat that they did, which was a barge.

**Lewis Heads to Pittsburgh, 1803**

It is now clear, though, that the order for the big boat could not have reached Hooke and the Pittsburgh boatbuilder before the first week of June 1803! Having finished his business in Philadelphia, Lewis returned to Washington on the first of June. He left for Harpers Ferry on July 5, where he purchased 3,500 pounds of guns and other supplies. These goods were shipped by wagon to Pittsburgh. Lewis, on the move again by July 8, headed north. When he arrived in Pittsburgh on July 15, Lewis wrote to Jefferson at 3 P.M.:

I arrived here at 2 O’clock, and learning that the mail closed at 5 this evening hasten to make this communication, tho’ it can only contain the mere information of my arrival.... I have not yet seen Lieut. Hook nor made the enquiry relative to my boat, on the state of which, the time of my departure from hence must materially depend: the Ohio is quite low, but not so much so as to obstruct my passage altogether.

Lewis had ridden in from the south. If his boat were being built anywhere along the Monongahela River — at any place between Elizabeth and the boatyards at Pittsburgh — Lewis might have ridden near the boatbuilding site upon entering the city. In fact, the post office was located in the southern section of the city throughout those years, near the boatyards on the Monongahela shore. Lewis did not know yet where his boat was being built, nor did he know the identity of the builder. He had to learn both from Lieutenant Hooke, commandant at Fort Fayette and in charge of Lewis’ supplies there. In Lewis’ letter to Jefferson on July 22, he referred to “The person who contracted to build my boat....” Lewis never indicated that he himself had selected or contracted with a particular builder. He did not know which yard to visit and it would have been quite pointless for him to ride around the city looking for Lieutenant Hooke, Major Craig, or the boat that late in the afternoon. Captain Lewis settled somewhere upon his Pittsburgh arrival at 2 p.m. and was writing to Jefferson shortly thereafter. Perhaps he stopped at Jean Marie’s Inn on the southeast edge of town or at William Morrow’s Sign of the Green Tree tavern, where he had stayed previously. Perhaps he stayed with Major Craig at his house at Fort Pitt or with his close friend from Virginia, Tarleton Bates.

In his letter of July 22, Lewis wrote that he had expected his boat to be nearly finished when he reached Pittsburgh but was dismayed to find it in an early state of construction:

Yours of the 11th & 15th Inst. were duly received.... The person who contracted to build my boat engaged to have it in readiness by the 20th inst.; in
this however he has failed; he pleads his having been disappointed in procuring timber, but says he has now supplied himself with the necessary materials, and that she shall be completed by the last of this month; however in this I am by no means sanguine, nor do I believe from the progress he makes that she will be ready before the 5th of August; I visit him every day, and endeavour by every means in my power to hasten the completion of the work....

The Waggon from Harper’s ferry arrived today, bringing everything with which she was charged in good order.

The party of recruits that were ordered from Carlisle to this place with a view to descend the river with me, have arrived with the exception of one, who deserted on the march, his place however can be readily supplied from the recruits at this place enlisted by Lieut. Hook.46

Though Lewis never mentions the builder of the expedition vessel by name, Jacob Myers was in the Pittsburgh area at exactly that time. His name appears in several civil records. Myers was a proven builder of armed barges, but he was getting on in years. Major Craig would have known of boats built by him previously. Lewis said he visited the boat every day, and that he spent most of his time with the workmen. He could not have done this if he stayed in Pittsburgh and the boat was more than fifteen miles away by water or over land in Elizabeth. As late as August 3, 1803, Lewis remarked in a letter to William Clark, then at present-day Louisville, Kentucky:

my boat only detains me, she is not yet compleated tho’ the work-man who contracted to build her promises that she shall be in readiness by the last of the next week. The water is low, this may retard, but shall not totally obstruct my progress being determined to proceed tho’ I should not be able to make greater speed than a boat’s length pr. day.47

On August 9th, Major Craig wrote to Caleb Swan that “Capt. Meriwether Lewis prepares to descend the Ohio and ascend the Mississippi.” Lewis wrote Jefferson another letter recounting in more detail some of his experiences during the last few weeks in Pittsburgh:

It was not until 7 O’Clock on the morning of the 31st Ultimo. that my boat was completed, she was instantly loaded, and at 10. A.M. on the same day I left Pittsburgh, where I had been moste shamefully detained by the unpardonable negligence of my boat-builder. On my arrival at Pittsburgh, my calculation was that the boat would be in readiness by the 5th of August; this term however elapsed and the boat so far from being finished was only partially planked on one side; in this situation I had determined to abandon the boat, and to purchase two or three perogues and descend the river in them, and depend on purchasing a boat as I descended, there being none to be had at Pittsburgh; from this resolution I was dissuaded first by the representations of the best informed merchants of that place who assured me that the chances were much against my being able to procure a boat below; and secondly by the positive assurances given me by the boat-builder that she would be ready on the last of the then ensuing week, (the 13th): however a few days after, according to his usual custom he got drunk, quarreled with his workmen, and several of them left him, nor could they be prevailed on to return: I threatened him with the penalty of his contract, and exacted a promise of greater sobriety in future which, he took care to perform with as little good faith, as he had his previous promises with regard to the boat, continuing to be constantly either drunk or sick. I spent most of my time with the
workmen, alternately persuading and threatening, but nei-
ther threats, persuasion or any other means which I could 
devise were sufficient to procure the completion of the 
work sooner than the 31st of August; by which time the 
water was so low that those who pretended to be ac-
quainted with the navigation of the river declared it im-
practicable to descend it; however in conformity to my 
previous determination I set out,...

In this letter, Lewis said that the boat was “completed” early 
in the morning of the 31st. If the massive and partly perishable 
supplies that had to be loaded on the boat just before leaving 
the dock had had to be loaded onto wagons at Fort Fayette, 
unloaded on docks located on the Monongahela River, and 
kept there exposed with quickly improvised stowage plans, this 
would have meant more delays, damage, and public specula-
tion about the military nature of the expedition. Instead, Lewis 
stated explicitly that he loaded the boat on the very day it was 
completed and had it fully loaded three hours later.

**Lewis Embarks from Pittsburgh**

The boat was finished on the last day of August, and Captain

Lewis described the launching in his journal:

*Left Pittsburgh this day at 11 ock with a party of 11 
hands 7 of which are soldiers, a pilot and three young 
men on trial they having proposed to go with me 
throughout the voyage. Arrived at Bruno's Island 3 
miles below halted a few minutes.*

Because of the three mile distance, the boat could not 
have been built in Elizabeth, which is nearly twenty miles up 
the Monongahela from Brunot’s Island. In the September 
9th letter to Swan, Major Craig stated, “Capt. Meriwether 
Lewis descended the Ohio the 31st on board a very fine 
boat fitted out with all convenience it[s] size would admit.” 
This comment gives us a clear statement, from one who well 
knew the many boats that had been built on the western 
rivers, that the Lewis boat was one of high quality.

Also, Captain Lewis clearly states the distance from his 
embarkation place to his first stop at Brunot’s Island was 
three miles — the exact distance from Fort Fayette to the 
landing near Dr. Felix Brunot’s farm on the island. Lewis 
could not have measured this on a moving river, but rather

*One Misty Moisty Morning: Members of the Lewis & Clark Discovery Expedition of St. Charles ply the western waters. Photograph courtesy of Betty Kluesner.*
he knew this distance because he had been to the island before. The measurement was derived from land surveys.

After many days of travel down the Ohio, the Lewis party reached Wheeling, now in West Virginia. Captain Lewis met Thomas Rodney, who later commented on this interaction in his own journal. Rodney called Lewis’ boat a “barge” several times and made other comments that added to the information about the boat:

Captain Lewis is a stout young man but not so robust as to look able to fully accomplish the object of his mission, nor does he seem to set out in the manner that promises a fulfillment of it. He sits out in a vessel 56 feet long and completely equipped with sails and 18 oars, with as many soldiers and rivermen as are necessary to man her, and a Mr. Clark, son of Genl. Clark as his companion; and his vessel fitted very nice and comfortable accommodations with great stores of baggage and cargo so that she draws 2 ½ feet of water and will be very heavy to go up against the stream of the Mississippi and other rivers. This will be the cause of great delay in assending the rivers so far as this vessel may carry him; but he has what he calls a portable boat, the frame of which is made of iron, to proceed in; yet it seems to me that he had better have adopted the long experience of the Canadians and used bark canoes that are used by them in their northern trade. He has already been delayed a long time in the Ohio waiting for his boat, which cost 400 dollars, and in getting this far, and now is obliged to use three or four Ohio canoes to light him over the riffs or ripples below this place.50

But Lewis knew better than Rodney. A barge was the biggest vessel they could have used and still have gotten up the Missouri River. Rodney might not have understood that a keelboat or just canoes and pirogues would be too small for the military supplies, trade goods, and other supplies that Lewis and Clark had to carry. Also, Lewis and Clark intended to take many more men and supplies out of St. Louis than were on the voyage down the Ohio. After more arduous river travel, Lewis wrote to Clark when he reached Cincinnati on September 28, 1803:

After the most tedious and laborious passage from Pittsburgh I have at length reached this place; it was not until the 31st of August that I was enabled to take my departure from that place owing to the unpardonable negligence and inattention of the boat-builders who, unfortunately for me, were a set of most incorrigible drunkards, and with whom, neither threats, intreaties nor any other mode of treatment which I could devise had any effect; as an instance of their tardiness it may serve to mention that they were twelve days in preparing my poles and oars.51

Lewis referred to his builder in this letter as “a workman” and “the boat-builder” along with a set of “drunkards.” These references seem to rule out the possibility that he contracted with one of the bigger shipbuilding companies. Lewis noted that his boatbuilder was a man of “mature” years. Jacob Myers would have been about seventy and, given his long career, may have known many men in the area who were capable and willing to help with boatbuilding. Lewis does not, however, name Myers in his journal or letters. If a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hooke. In his letters, Lewis stated several times that if a contract for the boat existed it is probable that the arrangements were made by Major Craig and Lieutenant Hoke.
Although Lewis didn’t indicate the boatbuilder, he generously heaped complaints and insults upon him. At least some of the blame for the delay was due to the impossibly tight schedule. Also, the builder may have promised more than he could deliver in order to get the contract. So it is understandable why the boat was still in an early stage of construction on July 15, 1803. Had Lewis been successful in his original plan for having his big boat built on the Tennessee River, it could have been brought up to St. Louis in plenty of time for the Missouri expedition, with none of the struggles over the rapids of the Ohio River.

Judging by the success of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, however, this Pittsburgh boatbuilder was the right man for the job after all. Even a cursory reading of Lewis’ journal of his trip down the Ohio, in which the big boat was subjected to an amazing amount of abuse in being dragged over the rocks at many rapids, indicates that it is a wonder this boat made it as far as Cincinnati. This should also be a tribute to the design of the boat and its builder.

# Boatbuilding After 1803

The building of flatboats, keelboats, and barges continued at Fort Fayette and at other boatyards on all three rivers until well after the War of 1812. As late as 1824, Zadok Cramer stated that barges, keels, and Kentucky Boats were built in great numbers in Pittsburgh.

Pittsburgh directories listed seven or eight boat builders in 1810 through 1814, although Jacob Myers is not listed. If we consider his obvious advanced age and debilitated condition in 1803, it is probable that he had died before 1810.

On May 3, 1872, Peter Shouse, aged 83 years, applied for a pension certificate at Fort Fayette for his war service as a boatbuilder during the War of 1812, along with nine other boatbuilders. Those named were William Sprague, S. McGill, G. Guest, W. Hamilton, Eli Edmondson, R. Moore, William Whiteacre, and Robert Beebe. They had all been enlisted by Hezekiah Johnson, the commander at the fort. The implication was that some of these men had been building boats at the fort location before being enlisted.

William Sprague and Peter Shouse appeared again at Pittsburgh as boatbuilders after the War of 1812, and Fort Fayette remained a center of army supply activity until its abandonment some time in the winter of 1815.

# Conclusions

Captain Meriwether Lewis took his barge all the way from Pittsburgh to Camp River Dubois in 1803. In the spring of 1804, he and Captain William Clark took it all the way to Fort Mandan in the far west, arriving in the fall. By spring 1805, the barge was reloaded and sailed down the Missouri River to St. Louis by some of his crew.

The success of these voyages is a remarkable testimony to Lewis and Clark and their men. But this success is also a testimony to the designers and builders of Lewis’ barge. Working in the heat and humidity on an impossible schedule, these men completed an incredibly durable vessel. They have been too long forgotten, and too often maligned.

The specific location of the building of this barge seems clearly to be Fort Fayette in Pittsburgh, not anywhere on the Monongahela River. The contractors were clearly Lieutenant Moses Hooke and Major Isaac Craig. Fort Fayette was their center of operations; Fort Fayette was where Lewis’ supplies were shipped and stored; and Fort Fayette was the location of the U.S. Wharf at the time. It was the only practical location at which the semi-secret project could be carried out.
When Larry Myers contacted the Heinz History Center in 2007, his communication led to a valuable reevaluation of the evidence that has accumulated about the building of the Lewis and Clark barge some two hundred years ago. Much of this evidence supports the conclusion that Jacob Myers was the principal builder of the Lewis barge.
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For countless generations, human communities have called the Ecola Creek estuary home. Before the resort town of Cannon Beach, Oregon, emerged in the late nineteenth century, a Tillamook tribal village — NeCus’ — sat along this tiny brackish bay where it crosses the sandy beach to the open sea. The Lewis and Clark Expedition journals provided a tantalizing but fragmentary glimpse of this community. Here, we share a wider view of this beachfront village and its significance before, during, and after the Corps of Discovery’s visit in January of 1806.

The journals offer the only detailed, firsthand written description of this Ecola Creek community. Encamped at Fort Clatsop through the winter of 1805-1806, Corps members had been living in close connection and actively trading with the resident Clatsop community and Chief Coboway (a.k.a. Comowool, in the journals). In early January, Native traders brought whale meat and blubber to the fort. According to Lewis’ journal entry, dated January 5, 1806, this blubber was “not unlike the fat of Poark...very palatable and tender.” Low on provisions and eager to break up the redundancy of their winter diet, Captains Meriwether Lewis and William Clark dispatched a party to obtain meat and blubber from villagers living near the beached whale. On January 8th, embarking from the salt makers’ camp near the Clatsop villages of Nakut’at and Neakawksi in modern-day Seaside, members of the Corps crossed Tillamook Head toward NeCus’ village, where the whale was beached.

Clark and twelve other Corps members including...
Sacagawea traveled southward on a well-established tribal trail over the Neaseu'su — an imposing headland, some 1,200 feet high, jutting more than two miles into the turbulent sea. Today it is called “Tillamook Head,” and sits within Ecola State Park. On their descent from the spectacularly scenic summit at “Clark's Point of View,” the party passed an abandoned village full of burial canoes. From there, they proceeded to the bustling village at the mouth of Ecola Creek. Here, at the village we now know as NeCus', the Corps found the whale largely flensed, and residents unwilling to part easily with whale products. Though residents had their own names for this place, Clark dubbed the creek “Ecola,” the term for “whale” in the trade language of Chinuk wawa (Chinook Jargon). Clark's comments on the people and structures of NeCus' village are brief but informative. Clark noted a “village of 5 Cabins on the Creek.” The texts from his journal entry and expedition map (Figure 2) suggest the principal village sat on the south bank of the estuary, with a single house on the north bank.

Clark described houses that were “of the Same form of those of the Clatsops.” From the journals, alongside other ethnographic accounts, we know these houses resembled those common throughout the Tillamook world — with walls of split cedar planks chinked with lichen or moss, a rectangular floor plan, and a gabled roof (Figure 5). The houses had central floors dug into the ground and bench-like platforms used for sitting, sleeping, storage, and other purposes (Figures 1,6). These wide benches spanning each
A Village on the Ecola Shore

wall, roughly two feet above the floor, were likely lined with cedar planks. Mats woven from locally available cattails, rushes, and other plants were used as floor coverings and interior partitions. Clean sand, spread on the floor, was replaced frequently to keep floors clean. Firepits in the center of each room were surrounded by rock or split boards laid on their sides. In the dark of winter, torches of Sitka spruce or Douglas fir pitch provided additional illumination. Aligned to the waterfront, these longhouses served several functions: as living spaces, storage areas, meeting halls, and ceremonial venues. A longhouse could house twenty or more inhabitants, implying a village of perhaps a hundred or more at the time of Clark's visit.

The “No-Cost Tribe of the Kil a mox Nation”

Something of the character and composition of NeCus’ can be inferred from the thin archaeological, ethnographic, and historical record. As Clark observed, the village at Ecola Creek sat within the traditional territory of the “Kil a mox Nation.” The villagers were indeed associated with the Nehalem (or northern) Tillamook, being Salish-speaking peoples who differed in language if not necessarily culture from the Clatsop and other Chinookan kin to the north.

While the NeCus’ village buzzed during Clark’s brief visit with non-resident tribal visitors gathered to harvest the beached whale, this gathering of multiple tribes speaking multiple languages was a common sight at the mouth of Ecola Creek. For NeCus’ village was a place where tribes met and shared food, trade goods, songs, and stories as people traveled north and south along the coast. The Tillamook and other tribal communities along Oregon’s coast passed through NeCus’ while traveling to and from the vast Chinookan villages such as Niak’ilaki (or Tlatcep, both meaning “pounded salmon place” — the origin of the name “Clatsop”) at the Columbia River’s mouth. Preeminent salmon fishing and trade centers, these Columbia River villages were prominent hubs of multtribal social, economic, and ceremonial life.

As a stopover point for travelers rounding Tillamook Head on these journeys, NeCus’ village was especially important. Tribal members of the last century mention this place as “an easy landing place...a stopping-over place at which the Tillamook Ind[ian]s in canoes headed for the Col[umbia] Riv[er] in April.” This continued in the decades following the Corps’ visit: tribal elder Joe Scovell (1922-2014), for example, reported that his great-grandfather Chief Illga often stopped at NeCus’ when traveling between his village on Tillamook Bay and the fur trading post at Astoria to trade in the first half of the nineteenth century. Stopovers at this place were critical: paddling around Tillamook Head was long and arduous, requiring perhaps ten miles of paddling through exposed and rocky surf, so that many paddlers took a deserved rest at NeCus’ village before or after their trek. Canoe crews often found a break in the surf beside Haystack Rock — usually on the north face in the winter and the south in the summer, reflecting prevailing seasonal winds and currents. When the surf was too rough for safe canoe travel (likely the case during Clark’s visit), people instead traveled over the steep Tillamook Head trail.

Archaeological and ethnographic evidence tells us that NeCus’ village sat at a center for resource procurement — a place where salmon-bearing streams, forests rich in elk and berries, and offshore rocks abounding in shellfish and other marine foods all converged in one place. But what

Figure 3. Silverweed or Argentina anserina. Named places reported in ethnographic archives provide clues to life in NeCus’ village before Lewis and Clark. The placename Neshyetskawen or Nes’yetska’away, “place with yetska roots,” refers to the edible roots of the silverweed “that grow in the tideland” adjacent to the village at Ecola Creek. A staple of the Nehalem-Tillamook people and others along the Northwest Coast, Ecola Creek was the only place to find silverweed roots in quantity between Seaside and Nehalem Bay. Photograph by Douglas Deur.
of the whale, the object of the Corps’ visit? Available accounts suggest that whale was a prized but relatively rare component of the traditional Tillamook diet. Men did hunt whales by canoe at sea — a process that apparently involved mortally wounding an animal at locations where prevailing currents would carry it to shore. Clark reported that, by the time his party arrived at NeCus’, the resident Tillamook and visitors from other villages had already harvested most of the beached whale’s meat and blubber, presenting Clark with a largely skeletonized animal and little hope of restocking their dwindling food stores. His January 8, 1806, journal entry reads, “the Whale was already pillaged of every valuable part.” Clark estimated the whale to be roughly 105 feet long, suggesting it was a blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*) — less common than other species in the Tillamook hunting tradition perhaps, but the only whale to reach
such proportions on this coast. At NeCus’ village, the party found the community busily rendering the blubber — a scene not entirely uncommon here into the nineteenth century. In 1853, settler Warren Vaughan reported seeing a large number of tribal members near NeCus’ butchering a different “captured” whale, rendering the blubber in their canoes — placing hot rocks in water and ladling rendered oil from the water’s surface. Likewise, Louie Fuller, a Tillamook man living at Siletz in the 1940s, reported: “My father told me what I never got to see, that [Tillamooks] put water in a small canoe and then put whale meat & hot rocks & in just a little while the whale meat would be boiled & ready to eat.”

Clark’s term for the creek at NeCus’, “Ecola Creek,” was immediately forgotten in common local use, the name “Elk Creek” persisting instead. Still, the moniker “Ecola” returned with the Sesquicentennial Lewis and Clark commemorative events of 1955-1956. Through the twentieth century, the term was reapplied to the creek and associated landmarks, as well as the Oregon state park just north of Cannon Beach.

Lessons from the Name of NeCus’

Based on his interpretation of Native pronunciation, Clark recorded the name No-cost or Ne-cost for NeCus’ village. Regrettably, the term has not been found elsewhere and the name’s meaning remains ambiguous. Based on a review of available Nehalem-Tillamook linguistic information, the closest match appears to be “NeCus’” — “place of the low tide” or “place of the receding tide.” Popularized in the last decade, this spelling has become the official name of the Cannon Beach city park at the former village site, and appears in National Park Service media relating to the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail.

Even if the exact term remains unclear, this name seems a remarkable fit: the site is linked in important ways to historical events involving low or rapidly outgoing tides. In summer, the Ecola Creek estuary water levels become “perched” for months at a time as sand bars form at its mouth, aided by gentle surf and sediment-rich currents that flow southward from the Columbia River. In fall, the level of the water plunges abruptly — often within a few hours — as early-season storms bring high surf and runoff. This pattern
is idiosyncratic and would have been strikingly apparent to NeCus’ residents. While the association is speculative, it is consistent with other naming traditions in the region.

Yet another, even more compelling possible explanation for the name revolves around oral traditions of tsunamis at NeCus’. One of only a few recoverable, ancient stories of the village describes a tide that abruptly receded as prelude to a massive tsunami wave. One version was reported by tribal elder Alexander Duncan as part of a 1930s Works Projects Administration Federal Writers Project oral history study conducted by Cecile Adams. While most of Adams’ notes are lost, her younger half-brother Paul See recalled frequently rereading Duncan’s account, which describes a precontact tsunami at NeCus’ with remarkable geological accuracy:

Alexander Duncan…. He told my sister this story…. His story goes that there were a number of villages there on the beach just south of Tillamook Head. And one day, the great Sahalie Tyee [Creator] took the ocean away. And so, all the young women of the villages were sent down to gather as many of the mussels as they could get. And while they were down there, Sahalie brought the ocean back and they were all drowned. It was a terrible disaster for the Natives, and so the story goes, the mothers sit on the beach for weeks afterwards, crying for their lost daughters.18

There are hints that the destruction was brought about by the hubristic squabbling of arrogant chiefs, whom the Creator turns into rocks that appear like huge inverted “baskets” in the sea — around Chapman Point just north of NeCus’ — before rapidly pulling back the tide and unleashing the tsunami. Apparently in reference to this story, twentieth-century elders such as Clara Pearson recalled the

Figure 6. Another interior of a Chinookan longhouse, as recorded by Paul Kane in 1846 – apparently of similar scale and design to the houses reported at NeCus’. Two tiers of platforms used for beds, sitting, and storage areas encircle a partially excavated floor with a central fire. Woven mats of cattail, rushes, cedar bark, and other plant materials serve as room partitions, tethered to poles, or as padding on sitting and bed areas. Courtesy of Wikimedia Commons.
enduring placename “Dabon’atch” or “the baskets” in reference to these rocks. In light of the apparent weight and prominence of this story cycle, it is conceivable that the village where the event occurred retained the name “NeCus” or “place of the receding tide.”

Other named places provide clues to the nature of life at this village before the time of Lewis and Clark. A few placenames were reported in ethnographic archives for different areas close to the village. They include Nesbyetskawen or Nes’yetska’away, “place with yetska roots,” a reference to the edible roots of the silverweed Argentina anserina (Figure 3) “that grow in the tideland” adjacent to the village at Ecola Creek. This plant was a staple of the Nehalem-Tillamook people and others along the Northwest Coast. Elder Louie Fuller reported of this plant that “it is yellow when cooked. They boil it and if they have lots, they heat rocks and earth-oven bake it.” With its broad, salt-tolerant meadows abounding in Pacific silverweed, Ecola Creek was the only place to find such roots in quantity between Seaside and Nehalem Bay. Indeed, this placename had a Clatsop equivalent. During an 1899 Oregon Historical Society research expedition to the coast, directed in part by Clatsop attorney (and Chief Coboway grandson) Silas Smith, the expedition recorded Clatsop terms for “a place near Elk [i.e., Ecola] Creek where an edible plant, the Eckutlipati, was found” called “Ne-akb-li-paltli” — suggesting that the plant’s significance at this place was widely appreciated.

NeCus’ Village Residents after Lewis and Clark

In the history of NeCus’ village, the visit of the Corps of Discovery portended the riveting changes ahead. Residing so close to the mouth of the Columbia, with its steady traffic in European and American ships from 1792 onward, the Tillamook and Clatsop people suffered frequent epidemics of smallpox, malaria, and other shipborne diseases that reached a crescendo by the early 1830s, reducing tribal populations to perhaps ten percent of what Lewis and Clark had beheld. Soon, early Euro-American settlement in Astoria and Clatsop Plains, and federal refusal to ratify the “Tansy Point Treaties” of 1851, forced most survivors to relocate to Northwest reservations and other tribal communities. Together, these impacts reduced the Native American population of the northern Oregon coast to a minute fraction of its pre-contact totals, only some four decades after Clark and his party visited NeCus’.

Detailed information regarding NeCus’ village and its residents during this period is thin. While the village was Tillamook, Clatsops appear to have been intermarried with the community across recoverable time. During the time of epidemics and colonization, displaced Clatsops seem to have grouped here with growing frequency. From the period following Lewis and Clark’s visit, we know only a few names of NeCus’ residents, and all of them are of combined Tillamook and Clatsop ancestry. One was Kóshtawah, later christened Maggie Adams — born at NeCus’ village around the time of the Corps’ visit, and daughter of a Clatsop father and Tillamook mother (Figure 7). Adams was also a niece to Chief Tostom, the chief who succeeded Coboway (Lewis and Clark’s omnipresent Clatsop host). The exact date of her birth is disputed; published estimates date Maggie Adams’ birth to around 1800, though it is likely she was born shortly after the Corps of Discovery visited her village. She seems to have lived at NeCus’ during her younger years only, as her life was dramatically and abruptly disrupted by inter-ethnic conflicts on the Northwestern frontier. One descendant recalls,

During a conflict between the Shoshones and the white settlers, Maggie’s parents had been killed and she was taken to a convent near Yamhill. Her people searched for her and when they found her, convinced those in charge to return her to them.... Maggie had received some education at the convent and [later, when she returned] she created quite a stir because she wore clothing and cooked like white men.

After leaving the convent, Maggie moved to Tostom’s village at the Columbia River mouth, soon meeting and marrying the presiding Tillamook chief from Tillamook.
Bay, Chief Illga. With growing pressures to abandon both Clatsop and Tillamook villages, the couple removed to Tillamook Bay, eventually settling at the small tribal community at Hobsonville. Like his fellow Tillamook leader Chief Kilchis, Illga was noted for his compassion toward early white settlers who arrived at the coast with inadequate provisions. In 1875, a Grand Ronde missionary visiting the community, Adrian Joseph Coquet, baptized the couple as “Maggie” and “Adam.” And together, they became a highly respected nucleus of the last tribal community that remained on Nehalem-Tillamook lands, even as many tribal members removed to reservation communities at Grand Ronde, Siletz, and Quinault, or to non-reservation communities in distant locations. According to elder Clara Pearson’s accounts in the 1930s, the couple were widely seen as “high class … happy … good and righteous [and] kind to everybody.” In the Hobsonville settlement, Maggie and Illga raised three daughters who, with their own children, became the core of the last enduring Tillamook village on the coast, disbanded only around World War II. Most of what is written about Nehalem-Tillamook culture is derived from interviews conducted with residents of this remarkably resilient tribal community.

Though Maggie, her immediate family, and others left NeCus’ when Maggie was young, the village limped along for a few decades more. By the mid-nineteenth century, it was clearly dilapidated, reflecting the dramatic population declines across the region. By this time, only intermittent and seasonal occupation occurred at NeCus’. Non-Native travelers’ accounts offered thin hints of tribal occupation. Settler Warren Vaughan visited the mouth of Ecola Creek and stayed at the remnants of NeCus’ in 1852, describing his taking refuge from the rain in “a rude hut shelter that probably some Indians had made.” Eleven years later, Clatsop County settler Preston Gillette suggested that a single family lived in what is today Cannon Beach — a Native family by the name of Gervais (often spelled “Jarvey”), apparently residing in what remained of NeCus’ village.

The Gervais family held chiefly significance in both the Clatsop and Nehalem-Tillamook worlds. Edward Gervais (ca. 1836-1909) was the son of a French-Canadian Astor Company employee, Joseph Gervais, and Chief Coboway’s daughter, Yiamust. Like many children of mixed families during the fur trade, he spent part of his youth in the French Prairie community near modern-day Gervais, named in his father’s honor. He returned to the coast to marry Nish-Slush or “Nancy” — daughter of Chief Esahtin from Nehalem Bay; and for many years, the couple lived in Cannon Beach intermittently, hunting, fishing, gathering, and sustaining connections with this place of enduring tribal significance.

Though the couple eventually moved to Nehalem Bay, they also stayed seasonally in the emerging tourist town of Seaside, joining other tribal members in the enclave called “Indian Place.” At times, hoteliers hired them to tell tribal stories to Seaside tourists — especially at the opulent Seaside House hotel, founded by rail magnate William Holladay. Often in popular accounts, Nancy was identified as the “last Nehalem Indian,” though her descendants continued to live in the region and identify as Native people.

Following the Gervais family’s departure, the NeCus’ site fell into ruin and was reoccupied for non-Native uses. Yet for Native families, NeCus’ village remained an important landmark, despite the dispersal of its resident Native people. Descendants of village residents continued to visit, work, and sometimes live in the larger community of Cannon Beach even as the village site was overrun by new, non-Native development. When, in 1892, hotelier Henry Logan built the first wagon road to Cannon Beach, he hired two tribal members, reportedly “Indian Louie” and “Klutche,” to blaze the trail. Alexander Duncan, source of the tsunami narrative, was later hired to improve the passageway and became the first official “roadmaster” of this route. Moreover, key Cannon Beach settlers had Clatsop tribal ties: Jacob E. Brallier (1862-1954) and his brother Frank Brallier (1866-1949), for example, were homesteaders who had claims on the southern end of Cannon Beach. The eventual subdivisions of their land helped kick start the burgeoning tourist town of Cannon Beach. Both were stepsons of Charlotte Smith, a granddaughter of Clatsop Chief Coboway, who married Jacob and Frank’s father after their mother’s death. The two brothers were raised in close proximity to Coboway’s daughter, Celiast, spoke Clatsop in their home, and though lacking direct Clatsop ancestry, recounted many stories in the Clatsop language. Members of this family still reside and run retail shops in the Cannon Beach area.

In recent times, tribal people with ties to Cannon Beach have continued to visit and sometimes participate in social, educational, and ceremonial events in the area. They also took part in the 1955-1956 Lewis and Clark Sesquicentennial and 2005-2006 Bicentennial commemorations in the community. Since those events, the descendants of NeCus’ residents have reconnected with this important place in
We proceeded on many ways. While the tribal history of Cannon Beach has yet to be fully written, it is clear that tribal members — including a small number of descendants who have direct ties to the NeCus’ village — continue to recognize this as a place of importance.

When members of the Corps of Discovery visited NeCus’ village in January of 1806, they recorded details of village life that remain largely absent in other historical sources. They witnessed a village abuzz with Native American resource harvests, social gatherings, and visitors from communities north and south along the coast — a scene likely repeated for unknown generations before the Corps’ arrival, which continued for a few generations to follow. Based on many lines of evidence — including the memories of tribal elders and the larger corpus of tribal oral tradition, we can augment William Clark’s observations and assumptions about Native life in the village considerably. Many lives, many personal narratives, were linked to NeCus’. Clearly, several residents were associated with Coboway and other figures known to readers of the journals. But the available record remains tantalizingly vague, reflecting the dramatic changes on the northern Oregon coast in the years after Clark’s account and the suddenly catastrophic turn in Native lives. Brought to the brink of collapse by introduced diseases and displacement, the NeCus’ population plummeted by the mid-nineteenth century. Neither Clark nor his Native American hosts at NeCus’ village could have anticipated the abrupt changes that would displace this village and bring another, very different kind of settlement to the banks of Ecola Creek. Yet despite the transformation, certain things remain: the site of NeCus’ village, a smattering of archival accounts, and the oral traditions and enduring attachments of tribal members — revisiting and revering this special place into the present day.
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On a very hot and dry day in July of 1998, a few miles outside of Helena, Montana, I (David) was busy helping in the construction of a lifelong dream, a log cabin in western Montana. Although I was born and raised in southern California, my mother had been born and raised in Helena where my grandparents had emigrated from Europe. From my early childhood I spent periodic summer weeks with my mother’s family, camping, fishing, and panning for gold. In 1996 my wife Marti gave me a copy of Undaunted Courage by Stephen Ambrose as a birthday gift. That provided the added dimension of the Lewis and Clark story to my love of Montana. In the spring of 1998, I wrote a letter to Stephen Ambrose, inviting him up to our cabin site for a “cup of campfire coffee and a talk about Lewis and Clark.”

To my great good fortune and surprise, Steve returned my letter and said he would love to see our place as he and his wife Moira were building their own cabin in western Montana. On that hot day in 1998, Steve and Moira drove into our dirt driveway, parked, and Steve emerged from his car wearing a Lewis and Clark tee shirt. After showing them around the building site I posed a provocative question to Steve regarding something I heard him say during one of the World War II television documentaries in which he had provided historical commentary. While we sat under the Ponderosa pines I teasingly goaded him a bit that his negative opinion of General Bernard Montgomery’s military performance during the Battle of Normandy in 1944 was in stark contrast to the glowing evaluation Monty had received on the same program from the noted English historian John Keegan. With some playfulness I asked, “What’s the deal with that?” Steve stared right at me and said matter-of-factly, “John has to look at himself every morning in the mirror, and John is just wrong!” I burst out laughing. Steve’s honest answer was a breath of fresh air.

The analysis of historical events involves not only the study of various documents but also their interpretation. The journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition provide a case in point. People may argue whether Lewis often explored by himself because he preferred his solitude or because he wanted the glory of being the first European American to report new discoveries, or perhaps both. Historical events by their nature may be viewed from multiple angles with various possible interpretations. Intelligent people may develop differing opinions on multiple issues of the expedition. In recent years, the philosophical approach of postmodernism, which in a nutshell rejects concepts of rationality, objectivity, and universal truth, has provided some scholars the opportunity to create interpretations that appear to stray from a common-sense understanding of historical and literary events. Although postmodernism may provide some very novel explanations of both historical events and the human condition, this philosophy does not fit well when applied to scientific and medical topics. If you have appendicitis, you need surgery to address the problem even if you sincerely believe that you do not. Various diseases, their pathology and appropriate treatment, are not good candidates for a postmodern historical interpretation. The facts of medicine remain the same regardless of how anyone feels about them.

In spite of this caveat there have been numerous historians
and authors who have approached issues within the Lewis and Clark story in this manner and, as a result, have grievously erred in their conclusions. Even a superficial consideration of Lewis’ end of life issues would indicate that many are either medical or psychological in nature. This fact does not automatically make these authors’ opinions wrong, but it would seem to require that they provide some authoritative evidence to support their interpretations. These same rules of interpretation would also apply to any physician or psychologist who cares to wade into this controversial topic. Conclusions about Lewis’ fate must stand or fall on established medical and psychological knowledge and a logical and informed view of the historical record. But there may be a vast difference between historians who make medical judgments based on their knowledge and physicians who make the same medical judgments based on their training and expertise. A historian has an added burden of proof when providing medical or psychological opinions. Dismissing authoritative medical answers from medical experts becomes a denial of reality.

There are many books and publications that attempt to interpret the factors that led to Lewis’ death with varying degrees of accuracy. The entire story has been so compromised to the point that historian David Nicandri recently proposed a “cease-fire” on the topic. He further stated, “At this point, it should only be reopened if we discover new sources.” We enthusiastically echo Nicandri’s wishes and desire that the medical issues involved see an end to interpretation and become subject to the sciences and clinical medicine on which they are based. Nevertheless, our analysis of Lewis’ death, based on our training and experience as a physician and a psychologist, moved us to forestall the cease-fire with our medical-psychological analysis of the known facts. That produced our new book, ‘So Hard to Die: A Physician and a Psychologist Explore Meriwether Lewis’s Death.’

Historian John Guice Ph.D. made the dramatic claim that his essay in the book By His Own Hand? The Mysterious Death of Meriwether Lewis should serve as the “authoritative treatment of Lewis’ death for the foreseeable future.” Guice provided an analysis of numerous medical and psychological issues but, as he was neither a physician nor a mental health professional, his claim that his opinions should be accepted from his position of authority as a historian might seem a bit grandiose. His conclusions must be regarded as questionable since he could not provide authoritative medical or psychological evidence for his views. Guice was a well-known “anti-suicide” advocate; equally well known is his assertion that all of the suicide supporters’ claims are based on “flimsy circumstantial evidence” that can be “readily countered.” We conclude is almost entirely without merit.

We address a number of issues discussed in previous Lewis literature:

1. Lewis’ alcohol use/abuse. Is there any evidence that Lewis had a drinking problem? Are the theorists who deny his alcohol abuse believable?
2. The source of Lucy Meriwether Lewis Marks’ denial of Lewis’ reported suicide. Does her denial support the murder theory?
3. The possible role of malaria, syphilis, and mercury poisoning as contributors to Lewis’ death. Did malaria really make him shoot himself? Did Lewis have either tertiary or neurosyphilis and did this make him insane? Could the mercury he ingested in Rush’s pills have caused insanity?
4. Lewis’ survivability for two hours after his two reported gunshots wounds.
5. Lewis’s personality style, both his characteristic behaviors and their ramifications, as evidenced in the journals and other historical documents. Many authors have attacked the suicide theory based on their own interpretations of Lewis’ personality. Was Lewis neurotic? Did he suffer from manic-depression/bipolar disorder? Post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)?
6. Observations of Lewis’ life and striking similarities that he shared with some other historical figures whose problematic medical and psychological issues are well documented.

David Peck D.O.

Advantages of a Forensic Examination

Despite all the theories that surround Lewis’ death and the repeated requests of more than two hundred members of the Lewis family, a forensic evaluation of Lewis’ body has never been performed. Some are of the opinion that such an examination would answer all our remaining questions, but that may not tell us the whole story. Glenn Wagner D.O., a forensic pathologist and retired chief medical examiner for San Diego (CA) County, has performed over fourteen thousand postmortem examinations during the fifty plus years of his career. Dr. Wagner also served as an expert in forensic pathology for the U.S. government both in this country and internationally in relation to war-crimes investigations.
He notes that America has spent a great deal of time and money to repatriate the remains of her war heroes and to answer questions surrounding their deaths. Although the results of any future forensic examination of Lewis’ reported remains are unpredictable, as Wagner astutely notes, “The dead have a story to tell.” Wagner reported that “in studying the death of any individual, the questions that need to be answered are: Who? What? When? Where? How? By whom? and Why? The question of why may be the most difficult to answer.” According to Wagner, “the condition of Lewis’ body after being buried for over 230 years would be dependent largely on the presence of any water in the surrounding ground, whether any casket had held up over time, the acidity of the ground, and amount of plant activity in the area. We may find dust. We may find a skeleton or partial or complete mummification or a relatively intact body. I think there is a really good chance that his remains will not only be skeletal but with connective soft tissue.”

The Coroner’s Jury of 1996 and the Truth about Dr. Guice’s Blue-Ribbon Piece of Evidence for Murder

One of the key issues to be addressed in a forensic examination of Lewis’ remains would be evidence of any gunshot wound(s). This is of chief importance as the determination of the various parameters of bullet wounds adds significant information as to whether they were self-inflicted, survivable, or not. Some of these issues were partially explored during a coroner’s jury hearing in Hohenwald, Tennessee, in June 1996. This event was spearheaded by the late James E. Starrs, professor emeritus of law and a forensic scientist, in the hope of securing authorization from the National Park Service to perform an exhumation and forensic examination of the physical remains of Meriwether Lewis.

In his testimony at the inquest, Guice said that reports of Lewis’ suicide were not possible and cited as his chief evidence the conclusions drawn by Eldon Chuinard M.D., founder of the Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation’s journal We Proceeded On. Dr. Chuinard, in articles in WPO in the early 1990s, stated that a self-inflicted wound to the chest or abdomen that exited out the lower back, as was said to be the wound suffered by Lewis on October 11, 1809, was not survivable for the two hours reported by Mrs. Grinder. Chuinard said that such a scenario was “unbelievable.”

One of Chuinard’s objections to Lewis’ reported suicide was his belief that Lewis would have bled to death more quickly than in the two-hour time frame. I consulted with four expert physicians in relevant specialties regarding this issue. Dr. Wagner disagreed with Chuinard’s assessment. Depending on the condition of Lewis’ remains, Wagner noted that a forensic examination “not only could predict the trajectory of the bullet, but the organs hit, where they are hit, and the amount of bleeding over time.” He said that “some folks felt that a two-hour survival time would suggest that it was not a suicide. I’d have to disagree with that position. What the bullet hits will determine how quickly one bleeds. Loss of thirty percent [of blood volume] will put you into shock. Loss of forty percent will likely kill you if you are not treated medically.”

Dale Carrison D.O. is professor and chairman emeritus of emergency medicine at the University of Nevada School of Medicine. Both he and Wagner noted that people can die from gunshot wounds as the result of exsanguination: they “bleed out,” losing so much blood that the resulting drop in blood pressure cannot support life. Carrison corroborated Wagner’s position that which organ is hit, where it is hit, and the velocity and shape of the bullet will influence how quickly internal bleeding will occur. In addition to these eminently qualified physicians, I also consulted with two board-certified general/vascular surgeons, Anthony Leo M.D. and Dale Mortenson M.D. They have eighty-plus years of surgical experience between them including the surgical treatment of gunshot wounds. They both agreed with all the conclusions of Drs. Wagner and Carrison.

We should note that Jerry Francisco M.D., a forensic pathologist who also testified at the 1996 coroner’s jury, reported the same conclusion as my four experts. Interestingly, no follow-up questions were asked regarding his opinion despite the important implications of his testimony. This was no surprise given Francisco’s confirmation of the survivability of the described wounds and the challenge of his authoritative (and expert) testimony to Guice’s “evidence” against suicide.

I emphatically note that the issue of Lewis’ survivability for two hours is not an issue for historical interpretation. Only one physician whose perceived authority derived from his career as an orthopedic surgeon denied that Lewis could have survived for two hours. Dr. Chuinard stated that such wounds were not survivable for two hours as opposed to five physicians, expert in the evaluation and treatment of gunshot wounds, who stated that such wounds could be survivable for two hours. This issue is not simply a disagreement among equally qualified sources.
To illustrate this issue, there are positions in medicine that may be legitimately argued. For example, what is the “best” antibiotic to use for a strep throat? Some physicians could choose Penicillin VK, others amoxicillin or erythromycin. All of these antibiotics would cure a strep throat but physicians may have their favorites based on their clinical experience. But the issue of Lewis’ gunshot wounds and his survivability is quite a different scenario. If five expert physicians agree that Lewis could have survived for two hours, then Guice’s self-proclaimed authoritative evidence against suicide is not acceptable, Dr. Chuinard’s opinion notwithstanding.

Marti Peck Ph.D. - Lewis and Mental Health

In ‘So Hard to Die’ we investigate the culture in which Lewis lived, the religious beliefs of his mother Lucy, his membership in Freemasonry, the influence of Enlightenment and southern-cultural thinking on his personality style, his positive and negative character traits, and other cultural influences on the story of his life and death. Many of these issues influenced Lewis’ mental health. Biographer Richard Dillon had no background in mental health yet he said of Lewis, “Sensitive he was; neurotic he was not.”11 Vardis Fisher attacked the suicide theory with several convoluted arguments as highlighted in a recent broadcast of Clay Jenkinson’s The Thomas Jefferson Hour with Idaho State Historian HannaLore Hein, who holds the same position Fisher once held with the Idaho State Historical Society.12

In ‘So Hard to Die’ I conduct a fictitious (but historically accurate) psychological interview with Lewis based on his writings, historical documents relating to the era, and reports and observations of his friends — among them Clark, Jefferson, Mahlon Dickerson, William Carr, and Gilbert Russell. Lewis’ “responses” to my interview reflect medical precepts of 1809 as presented by Dr. Benjamin Rush. How Lewis’ mental health during his lifetime may have influenced his death has never been extensively addressed by a mental health professional. Gary Moulton in The Lewis and Clark Expedition Day by Day noted the evaluation of Lewis’ personality by “armchair psychoanalysts.” I have endeavored to elucidate Lewis’ personality from my reading of the historical record and my thirty-plus years of clinical experience. My desire is to clarify comments from other authors as to whether or not Lewis was “neurotic” or a “psychotic suicidist” or suffered from clinical depression. These terms have been inadequately defined and explained in the Lewis and Clark literature. Although these subjects require more subjective interpretation than the medical analyses by Dr. Peck, the principles of human behavior and the causes of mental illness have not changed since Lewis’ time. Although numerous mental illnesses have been extensively studied and their accompanying behaviors exhaustively catalogued, many Lewis biographers were not familiar with this material. Individuals certainly became depressed during Lewis’ time and they attempted to mitigate their unpleasant feelings often in very harmful ways, as many still do today. People also have innate behavioral tendencies which their cultures may greatly amplify, as was the case with Lewis.

As is true of everyone, Lewis had personality strengths and weaknesses. The early American culture in which he lived emphasized the importance of personal honor and the need to protect and defend it. Lewis confirmed this with his testimony at his court martial by noting that without his honor, his life was not worth living.13 Lewis’ behaviors during his life were an ongoing demonstration of his reactions to anyone he thought was attacking his honor. His angry response to a perceived insult from Lieutenant Joseph Elliott, which led to his court martial in 1795, reportedly
included shed tears. Lewis reacted similarly and repeatedly during the Corps of Discovery’s return journey in 1806, including such episodes as the burning of supplies in order to keep them out of Native American hands and threatening death to thieves and an impertinent Native American who threw a puppy in his lap. Lewis also threatened death to the Native American “dog-nappers” if they refused to relinquish Seaman. The supreme example of his anger may have been the act of leaving a Jefferson peace medal around the neck of the dead Blackfeet man “so that they might be informed who we were.” His anger during the spring of 1806, rather than being unique to that time and evidence of PTSD, was present throughout his lifetime. His sense of his honor did not always work in his favor, particularly when he encountered people like Frederick Bates and William Eustis who grossly insulted his most deeply held sense of himself as an honorable and honest man. These individuals were not Native Americans encountered in a faraway place but powerful bureaucrats of the federal government and members of the Jefferson-Madison establishment.

Humans still suffer from numerous illnesses both mental and physical, just as they did during Lewis’ time, and react to threats to their lives and security with the same negative psychological responses as they have throughout history, with often vain and injurious attempts to mitigate them. Similarly, Lewis’ behaviors support a personality analysis based on existing criteria found in both the Psychodynamic Diagnostic Manual (2nd ed.) and the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM 5).

A Brief Analysis of Existing Death Theories

In analyzing Lewis biographies that support an “anti-suicide” approach, we note that much of the historical record that supports the conclusion of suicide is ignored, minimized, or explained with a baseless medical or psychological response. Patricia Stroud, in her recent biography Bitterroot: The Life and Death of Meriwether Lewis, minimizes any effect that alcohol may have had on Lewis’ psyche. Starrs and Gale wrote that “Lewis had absolutely no history of alcohol abuse,” citing as their supportive evidence that his enemy Frederick Bates “never once said that Lewis had any kind of drinking or drug problem.” Considering the rampant alcohol abuse prevalent in nearly every stratum of American society at that time, one could conclude that Bates himself may very well have been an alcohol abuser, or that Lewis’ drinking, however serious, did not seem out of the norm to Bates. Drunkenness was so common in the early nineteenth century that it was not even recognized by many as a problem, and if there is not a perceived problem, there would have been nothing for Bates to report. Guice admitted the possibility of Lewis’ alcohol abuse in his testimony at the coroner’s jury in 1996 when he said, “We know from letters to his buddies, we know he’d been drinking a little bit.” Others have tried to minimize or deny any alcohol abuse by Lewis, noting that many men during that time also drank a lot, suggesting that widespread alcohol abuse somehow made it a harmless pastime. Vardis Fisher and other authors completely ignore Captain Gilbert Russell’s critically important report of the medical treatment he rendered to the suffering Lewis at Fort Pickering in the fall of 1809, treatment necessitated by Lewis’ admission of his imprudent use of liquor. Others claim the report was forged because it appears to have been written by someone other than Russell.

During the 1996 coroner’s jury hearing, Thomas Streed, a
criminal psychologist, criticized the medical treatment Russell provided to the deranged Lewis, implying that Russell’s report lacked credibility and therefore the entire view that Lewis had an alcohol problem was weak.\(^\text{18}\) As we indicate in ‘So Hard to Die,’ Strued, in his inaccurate assessment, joins those who ignore, denigrate, or misrepresent a lengthy list of valid medical and psychological opinions. The totality of these errors invalidates Guice’s conclusions that he claimed “readily counter” the suicide theory. These and many other assertions of previous authors are, as Steve Ambrose told us years ago about another issue, “just wrong.”

**Evidence for Emotional Depression**

As with other issues in the historical record, anti-suicide supporters must account for the existence of reports of Lewis’ emotional depression. In his letter to his brother Jonathan concerning Lewis’ emotional state in 1809, Clark gives an indication of Lewis’ severe depression. He wrote, “I fear O! I fear the weight of his mind has over come him, what will be the Consequence?”\(^\text{19}\) Stroud deals with this problem with the murder theory by stating in *Bitterroot* that the original letter does not exist and is only known through a typewritten copy.\(^\text{20}\) Her implication is that the Clark letter might be a fake and its contents cannot be trusted. However, according to James J. Holmberg, curator of special collections at the The Filson Historical Society in Louisville, Kentucky, the original Clark letter *does exist* in the archives of the Filson.\(^\text{21}\) A photograph of a portion of the original letter appears in Holmberg’s book *Dear Brother: Letters of William Clark to Jonathan Clark*.

In closing, we note that the story of Lewis and Clark has added a great sense of enjoyment and meaning to our lives. They are heroes of ours. But heroes are also human. They are complicated and, as is true of all of us, they have positive and negative aspects to their personalities. We all have feet of clay. ‘So Hard to Die’ expresses our desire to supply some much-needed authoritative truth to the existing literature concerning the final days of Meriwether Lewis and not simply add another novel historical interpretation. As Clark and Jefferson both noted, Lewis was an extremely honest man. Mahlon Dickerson recorded that he was a loyal and true friend. Jefferson’s description of Lewis as a man of “courage undaunted” is as eloquent and true as his precepts in the Declaration of Independence. Although the story of the end of his life is tragic, Meriwether Lewis had vast talents and accomplished much for our country. Lewis’ position in the American pantheon of heroes is secure and his accomplishments and positive contributions should be remembered by all of us who love this story. Illuminating the truth regarding his death need not detract from his life’s accomplishments.

---

**Dr. David Peck is a retired physician and longtime member of the LCTHF. He is the author of Or Perish in the Attempt: The Hardship and Medicine of the Lewis and Clark Expedition (2002) which was produced into a Montana PBS documentary that can be viewed online by searching for Or Perish-PBS.**

**Dr. Marti Peck is a clinical psychologist and certified adult psychoanalyst in private practice for thirty years. The Pecks reside in San Diego, California.**

---

**Notes**

3. Guice, ed., *By His Own Hand?,* xiv.
5. Wagner, video interview.
7. Wagner, video interview.
17. John Guice, as recorded in the transcript of the coroner’s jury hearing in Starrs and Gale, *The Death of Meriwether Lewis*, 56.
18. Thomas Strued, as recorded in the transcript of the coroner’s jury hearing in Starrs and Gale, *The Death of Meriwether Lewis*, 96.
21. James J. Holmberg, email to authors, October 1, 2020.
Review

Blood and Treasure: Daniel Boone and the Fight for America’s First Frontier

By Bob Drury and Tom Clavin

Reviewed by R. Douglas Hurt

Daniel Boone commands name recognition even among those who know only a little about the settlement of the trans-Appalachian West and American history, particularly the settlement of Kentucky and the Indian-white conflict that ultimately led to the white acquisition of the region. Boone’s life as a hunter, settlement founder and organizer, and Indian fighter is legendary, the written record mostly true. As a man of indefatigable restlessness, courage, and perseverance, he remains in the public mind and lexicon as someone who single-handedly blazed a trail through the Cumberland Gap that enabled the settlement of Kentucky – albeit after considerable violence, death, and suffering by both whites and Indians.

Given that the general public is familiar with the outline of historical knowledge about Boone and that the story of his life and times has been long and well told, one is moved to ask why another book about his life is necessary. The answer must be that it is not necessary, unless there is a demand for a retelling of the story, professional writers Bob Drury and Tom Clavin have given us a fast-paced, engaging volume about Daniel Boone from the settlement of his family in Pennsylvania and migration to the Yadkin River Valley in present-day North Carolina in 1752 until the end of the American Revolution which secured the trans-Appalachian West for the new confederation of the United States. The book is organized in four parts: The Frontier; The Explorers; The Settlers; and The Conquest. The chapters provide brief coverage of the subject matter. Along the way Drury and Clavin touch on the Proclamation of 1763, which they incorrectly note handed over the trans-Appalachian country to the Indians, as well as the Cherokee Wars, Pontiac’s rebellion, Dunmore’s War, and a litany of Indian-white violence that the authors bring to life with skill and excitement. They take into account differing Indian and white points of view, and correctly contend that the white settlers took Indian lands without shame and by their perceived right to claim and occupy the land peacefully if possible but by force if necessary, a rationale that they turned to quickly.

Drury and Clavin provide a good refresher on some of the main aspects of western expansion. Interwoven into their story are the efforts of George Rogers Clark to drive the British out and the western tribes to submission and secure the opening of the Ohio and Illinois Country for white settlement. There are brief encounters with the major personages and events of the day, among them Pontiac, Henry Hamilton, Corn Stalk, Logan, Simon Girty, William Crawford, Simon Kenton, Blackfish, and the Gnadenhutten or Moravian Massacre and the Battle of the Blue Licks. Readers learn about Boone’s kidnapping and flight from his Shawnee captors, the violent death of two sons, service in the Virginia legislature, failures as a businessman and land speculator, and other aspects of his life experiences and events. Particularly poignant and understated are the lives of his wife Rebecca and the other women who traveled west with their families, not necessarily willingly, and who settled at hard-scrabble “stations” that later developed into small towns.

This book is a good read. It should also serve as a challenge and rebuke to present-day academic historians who do not have the skill to write popular history. When taken at the authors’ intent, the book will provide an enjoyable experience for anyone who is not concerned about dialog quoted without references and the propensity of the authors to use purple prose. For their research, the authors relied primarily and necessarily on the Lyman Draper Manuscript Collection at the
Wisconsin Historical Society, the work of John Filson (1747-1788), and the George Rogers Clark Papers at the Missouri Historical Society with supporting supplemental evidence by William Nester, professor of government and politics at St. John’s University, and John Mack Faragher, emeritus professor of history and American studies at Yale University, which they acknowledge.

While some readers may wonder about the accuracy of the dialog, others may not be troubled by passages such as, “a rain of falling arrows that darkened the dawn sky” (77); “bone marrow that sent buffalo hunters into slavering paroxysms” (115); and “the bruised sky hid the sun and stars” (282), among many other colorful passages. Popular as opposed to academic historians avail themselves of greater freedom to use the written word and make imaginative judgments, and we probably are the better for it because such tactics help readers engage with their work.

This book remains, however, a triumphal story of conquest and inevitability. Its brief coverage of the life of Daniel Boone and his times, at least until the Peace of Paris (1783) when the book essentially ends, is dramatically written. The authors provide a short epilogue noting Boone’s life after the peace treaty, including his move to Missouri to live with his youngest son Nathan who had worked with William Clark in the fur trade and surveying Indian lands. Daniel Boone was not only a long hunter and settler who claimed land in Kentucky by right of occupancy and sometimes law, but also a man recognized for his leadership in the settlement process and military affairs, that is, fighting Indians who wanted to expel the intruders from their lands. It is the story of the fight to seize and keep Indian lands until the federal government had the military power and the nation the demography to overpower the Native nations in the trans-Appalachian west. Daniel Boone was in myth and reality, as Drury and Clavin attest, “a genuine pioneer and adventurer” (353).

Ray Douglas Hurt is an American agricultural historian with an emphasis on the Great Plains, the Civil War, Native Americans, technology, and the American South, West, and Midwest, as well as the Green Revolution. He is a Professor of History at Purdue University and the author of The Ohio Frontier: Crucible of the Old Northwest, 1720-1830, The Great Plains during World War II, and The Big Empty: The Great Plains in the Twentieth Century, among others.
“Left Pittsburgh this day at 11 o’clock with a party of 11 hands 7 of which are soldiers, a pilot and three young men on trial they having proposed to go with me throughout the voyage.”

Meriwether Lewis, August 31, 1803


Meeting Location:

Senator John Heinz History Center
1212 Smallman Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Lodging Location:

Drury Plaza Hotel
Pittsburgh Downtown
745 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
1-800-325-0720
Group No. 2450752
www.druryhotels.com

Make your own room reservation by June 7, 2022, to receive the discounted rate of $150/night plus tax. The number of rooms is limited. Breakfast and evening “kickback” food events are included with your room.
54th Annual LCTHF Meeting Registration Form

Please print neatly and clearly

Name(s): ________________________________________
Name(s) on Name Tag(s): __________________________
Mailing Address: __________________________________
City: ____________________________________________
Phones: home: ___________ cell: ___________ work: ________
E-mail: ____________________________________________

Note: You'll receive registration confirmation by e-mail. If you do not have an e-mail address, it will be mailed to you.

Emergency contact name: ___________________________ Relation: ________________
Emergency contact cell/telephone: ______________________

Please check all that apply:
- Descendant of Corps of Discovery [Corps member’s name]: __________________________
- First time attendee
- New member
- Regional membership(s): ____________________________________________
- Special requests/needs, circle those that apply: ________________________________

Please specify, such as vegetarian, limited mobility, hearing impaired, etc.

ENTIRE MEETING REGISTRATION FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th># of People</th>
<th>Equals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member fee if registered by end of June 6, 2022:</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member fee if registered after June 6, 2022:</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-membership registration fee:</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: If you join LCTHF at registration before June 7, 2022, you are eligible for $400 member fee.

Contact LCTHF office at 406-454-1234 for details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price</th>
<th># of People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$30</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Pre-meeting sign-up only, tour time 2:30-4:00 pm, limited spaces available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price</th>
<th># of Shirts</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$22</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENTIRE MEETING ATTENDEES
SUBTOTAL: $______

This will be a great opportunity to meet with friends in person again! Meeting will NOT be available via Zoom. Please see the Foundation website just prior to the meeting to see if any Covid protocols exist.

p. 2
### EVENT FEES FOR GUESTS OF REGISTERED MEETING ATTENDEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th># of People</th>
<th>Equals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday August 7 Afternoon Molly’s Trolleys motor tour of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>= $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Pre-meeting signup only. No walk-up sales.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday August 7 Evening Rooftop Reception “Under the Stars”</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>= $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday August 10 Evening River Cruise and Banquet</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>= $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Add subtotals from this page and from p. 2 to arrive at grand total.*

### FULL MEETING ATTENDEES

**GRAND TOTAL** $ 

### REGISTRATION FEES FOR SINGLE DAY MEETING ATTENDEES ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th># of People</th>
<th>Equals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday August 7 Afternoon Molly’s Trolleys motor tour of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>= $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Pre-meeting signup only. No walk-up sales.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday August 7 Evening Rooftop Reception “Under the Stars”</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>= $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday August 8 Full Day’s Events</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>= $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday August 9 Full Day’s Events</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>= $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday August 10 Full Day’s Events</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>= $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SINGLE DAY ATTENDEES**

**TOTAL** $ 

---

**Online registration is available at:** [lewisandclark.org](http://lewisandclark.org)

If you prefer, you may mail your completed registration form with check or credit card information to:

Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation  P.O. Box 3434  Great Falls, MT 59403

You may also call the office at 406-454-1234 to pay by phone with a credit card. No cash please.

Payment information and options:
- Check - payable to Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation, LCTHF 2022 meeting
- Credit Card - Visa
- Credit Card - Mastercard
- Credit Card - Discover

Card Number: ____________ CCV Number: ____________
Expiration date: ____________ Name on card: ____________

If statement address is different than mailing address on p. 2, please indicate statement address below:

Address: __________________________
City: __________________________ State: ______ Zip: ________

---

**Silent Auction:**

If you plan on donating any items, please check here: ________

For details, contact either:
- Della Von Setten at dellavonsetten@gmail.com or Sarah Casey at director@lewisandclark.org
- or call 406-454-1234.
WE GRATEFULLY ACKNOWLEDGE AND THANK OUR PARTNERS WHOSE CONTRIBUTIONS HAVE MADE THIS MEETING POSSIBLE

Beaver County Historical Research and Landmarks Foundation

National Park Service - Friendship Hill National Historic Site

National Park Service - Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail

Senator John Heinz History Center

PRELIMINARY PROGRAM

August 6, 2022: Saturday
Board Meeting at the Drury Plaza Hotel.

August 7, 2022: Sunday
Meeting registration at the Drury Plaza Hotel.
Pre-meeting event: Molly’s Trolleys afternoon tour of Pittsburgh (2:30 – 4:00 pm).
Sunday evening reception on the rooftop “Under the Stars” at the Drury Plaza Hotel.

August 8, 2022: Monday
Day begins with the business meeting and programs about the French and Indian War, Albert Gallatin, and the Senator John Heinz History Center. Bidding on auction items will open in the evening and the day will conclude with an evening of Pittsburgh trivia at the Drury Plaza Hotel.

August 9, 2022: Tuesday
Day begins at the Senator John Heinz History Center with a panel discussion about building Lewis’ iceboat, followed by a presentation by Jefferson scholar Bill Barker, the awards luncheon at the Senator John Heinz History Center, the importance of canal water transportation in Pittsburgh, the Whiskey Rebellion, and Pittsburgh in 1803. We will screen the film classic Almost Heroes in the evening at the hotel. The announcement of auction winners will conclude the evening.

August 10, 2022: Wednesday
The superintendent of the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail will bring us up-to-date, Jim Holmberg will present the Moulton Lecture, an invitation to the 55th Annual Meeting will be presented, and an enchanted evening dinner cruise aboard the Gateway Clipper with a view of Lewis’ journey by water in the area will conclude the evening and begin the 54th Annual Meeting to a close.

August 7-10, 2022: Sunday-Wednesday
Wellness Program: Morning walks will be conducted. Excellent walkways are available. Earn double points for your team!

Thank you for joining us! We look forward to your arrival.

If arriving by air, taxis and shuttles are available at the Pittsburgh Airport (20 to 30 minutes to hotel, depending upon traffic). Car rental service is available at the airport. Parking is expensive and in short supply in downtown Pittsburgh. Valet parking only is available at the Drury Plaza Hotel (with entry/exit privileges) at a cost of $32/night. Hotel courtesy vans to and from the airport are not offered.
President’s Message

Dear LCTHF Member,

The Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation accomplished much in this past year. I would like to highlight some of our many achievements. Our mobile map exhibit, Reimagining America: The Maps of Lewis and Clark, was displayed at several sites to good crowds. It is already booked well into 2022 at locations in five different states.

Our canoe trip through the unspoiled Missouri Breaks area in Montana was fully subscribed and there is great interest in this coming summer trip from July 11-15, 2022.

Several chapters hosted online programs that were attended by our members virtually from all over the country. The wealth of talented scholars and presenters we were privileged to see in this manner was one of the pleasant surprises to come out of the pandemic. We will augment future in-person meetings with remote technology when appropriate.

Our 2021 Annual Meeting took place via Zoom and featured presentations by our fourth Moulton Lecturer, Dr. John Logan Allen, and our Board Member and Dutch oven cooking expert Luann Waters. However, our next Annual Meeting from August 7-10, 2022, is planned to be in-person in Pittsburgh, PA, without a Zoom component, so please make plans to attend in the flesh.

Our William P. Sherman Library and Archives is now included in the interlibrary loan system and on Goodreads. We instituted a regular Calendar of Events to be distributed to members and partner institutions featuring all the Lewis and Clark activities set to occur in the near future nationwide.

We established a broader presence on social media. We started a new, more closely curated Facebook page that can be found at @lewisandclarkthf. We opened up on Twitter and Instagram and created a YouTube channel with video. Our social media sites are growing in followers and hits and will feature more and more content as time goes along. Please follow and participate in them.

We updated our academic website, Discovering Lewis and Clark. Our new blog, Lewis and Clark News, will also keep you up to date. Links to these may be found on our foundation website lewisandclark.org.

We held a photo contest that received many outstanding submissions, the best of which we incorporated into a 2022 calendar. Our curriculum guide is being updated with the latest scholarship and attention to cultural sensitivity. It should be completed in the coming year. We established the Lewis and Clark Ambassador Program, which will enable interested members to assist the public to get the most out of their personal journey of discovering Lewis and Clark whether informationally or along the trail.

We are transitioning to a new membership system that will encompass both national and the various chapters grouped into regions around the country. We feel this will be beneficial for prospective and existing members over time.

These improvements did not occur by happenstance. We are fortunate to have dedicated staff, devoted volunteers, and enough financial resources to pull it off. Your generosity has been critical to the success of the Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation for over fifty years now.

With your help, we look forward to further progress in 2022. Thank you for being an LCTHF member and for your contributions past, present, and future as we work in concert to be Keepers of the Story and Stewards of the Trail.

Proceeding on together,

Lou Ritten
President
Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation  
2020-2021 Board of Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Lou Ritten</td>
<td>La Grange Park, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Jim Sayce</td>
<td>Seaview, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Yvonne Kean</td>
<td>Olathe, KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Rob Barg</td>
<td>La Grange Park, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Past President</td>
<td>Philippa Newfield</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directors at Large

| Bill Bronson       | Great Falls, MT |
| Lee Ebeling        | Great Falls, MT |
| Karen Goering      | St. Louis, MO   |
| Gary Kimsey        | Bellevue, CO    |
| Barb Kubik         | Vancouver, WA   |
| Wayne Madry        | Statesville, NC |
| Collette Sorgel    | Three Lakes, WI |
| Luann Waters       | Wynnewood, OK   |
| Jerry Wilson       | Versailles, IN  |

Staff

| Sarah Cawley       | Executive Director |
| Chris Maillet      | Membership and Administrative Assistant |
| Svenja Turman      |                        |
| Della Van Setten   | Library and Archives Technician |
| Tori Shaw Clemmons | AmeriCorps VISTA Member |

Trail Stewardship Grants 2020-2021

Organization  
Bitterroot Heritage CIVIC Group  
Discovery Expedition of St. Charles  
Friends of Kaw Point Park  
Illini Chapter of LCTHF  
Oregon Chapter LCTHF*  
Park County*  
Sgt. Floyd Tri-State Chapter LCTHF

Project Name
Sacajawea’s Rest Park  
Lewis and Clark Film Series  
Historic Native Plants at Kaw Point  
2021 Trail Tourism  
Oregon Interpretive Panel Update  
Clark’s Trail Through Park County  
Floyd River Campsite Rock

*Partial or full funding from NPS Sign Coop Grant

Education and Scholarship Grant 2020-2021

Organization
Charles Redd Center for Western Studies, Brigham Young University  
Washington Chapter LCTHF

Project Name
Reuben Lewis Research  
Lewis Cootee Re-creation for Lewis & Clark Living History Programs

2020-2021 Active LCTHF Committees and their Members

Awards: Collette Sorgel-Chair, Philippa Newfield, Jerry Wilson

Bicentennial Trail Stewardship/Advocacy: Rob Heacock-Chair, Dick Fichtler, Karen Goering, Shannon Kelly, Jim Rosenberger, Bob Russell, Jerry Wilson

Diversity: Wayne Madry-Chair, Ron Craig, Amanda DeBonis, Barb Kubik, Jason Levister

Eastern Legacy: Paige Cruz-Chair, Mike and Lorraine Loesch, Philippa Newfield and Phillip Gordon, Janice and Jerry Wilson, Phyllis Yeager ex-officio

Editorial Advisory: Clay Jenkinson-Editor, Philippa Newfield-Chair, Jay Buckley, Arend Flick, Mark Jordan, Barb Kubik, Gary Moulton, Jerry Wilson

Education and Scholarship: Barb Kubik-Chair, Amanda DeBonis, Brad Tennant, Janice and Jerry Wilson

Financial Affairs: Rob Barg-Chair, Karen Goering, Mike Loesch, Yvonne Kean-ex-officio

Governance: Jerry Wilson-Chair. Bill Bronson, Keith Bystrom, Lee Ebeling, Rob Heacock, Steve Lee

Investment: Rob Barg-Chair, Steve Lee, Nelson Weller, Philippa Newfield

Library: Beverly Lewis-Chair, Lynn Davis, Barb Kubik, Jeremy Skinner, Kathryn Hamilton Wang, Della Lemons Van Setten-Library Technician, Kris Townsend-ex officio

Membership and Outreach Committee: Gary Kimsey-Chair, Shannon Kelly, Collette Sorgel, Philippa Newfield, Jerry Wilson

Moulton Lecture: Philippa Newfield-Chair, Jim Knox, Steve Lee

Special Projects: Phil and Sandy Barney, Keith Bystrom, Carolyn Gilman, Ken Jutzi, Gary Kimsey, Dan Sturdevant, Kris Townsend, and many others

The Orderly Report: Philippa Newfield and Arend Flick, co-editors

Volunteers: To our countless volunteers both at the National level and with our Chapters, we are grateful for all you do! We logged over 33,833 hours of service in the past year.

Wellness Challenge: Janice and Jerry Wilson

February 2022 – We Proceeded On
Focus on Education – Sarah Cawley
Sarah Cawley is the Executive Director of the Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation. She is originally from Dingmans Ferry, PA, a small rural town in northeastern Pennsylvania right along the Delaware River. In January of 2021, her third grade teacher reached out and asked her to teach a virtual Lewis and Clark lesson to his students. Sarah put together a lesson, and ended up teaching 19 different classes in Dingman Delaware Elementary School, providing quality Lewis and Clark information and education to students 2,000 miles away.

If you think your local elementary school would be interested in virtual classes about Lewis and Clark, reach out to Sarah at director@lewisandclark.org. Lessons are $30/class, and that includes a Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail maps sent directly to the school.

If you are an educator, and looking for ways to bring Lewis and Clark to your classroom, check out the LCTHF website! We have made the Curriculum Guide available online, to assist teachers in bringing history to life.

Focus on a LCTHF Partner – Conservation Legacy
Conservation Legacy is a new partner, introducing LCTHF to the AmeriCorps program! With them, LCTHF was able to bring Tori Shaw Clemmons onto our team to help create new programs and develop new ideas on how to incorporate various demographics into our work. Tori has established a large social media presence, while also creating a virtual L&C Trivia program. She is also working with the USFS in Great Falls to develop a braille trail along with a sensory garden using educational tools such as raised braille, text recordings, sign language, and more.

LCTHF Awards
Awarded at the 53rd Annual Meeting
Appreciation Award – Sarah Cawley

Meritorious Achievement Awards
Gary Kinsey for initiating a variety of outreach programs utilizing social media and other outreach tactics. Alexandria Seals with the Lewis & Clark Exploratory Center for the rapid and effective conversion of the 52nd Annual Meeting from in-person to online as necessitated by the Covid pandemic.

Chapter Awards for their imaginative utilization of online technology to remain in contact with members during the Covid pandemic.

California
Idaho
Portage Route
Oregon
Meriwether Lewis
MO-KS Riverbend
Washington
Homefront

Focus on a Young Scholar – Shannon Kelly
Shannon is the lead interpreter at the North Dakota Lewis & Clark Interpretive Center and Fort Mandan State Historical Site. She is originally from Post Falls, ID, and fell in love with the Lewis and Clark story when she was young. As a historian, the expedition was always fascinating to her, especially regarding Meriwether Lewis.

Shannon’s current research is on the life and career of Frederick Bates in relation to Lewis and Clark beyond just his rivalry with Meriwether Lewis after the expedition. She is also hoping to embark on a historiographical revisiting of Lewis’s first biography, Charles Morrow Wilson’s 1934 Meriwether Lewis of Lewis and Clark and explore how one incredibly erroneous book planted the seeds for so many myths about the man.
53rd Annual Meeting

The 53rd Annual Meeting was once again held via Zoom on September 12, 2021. As all were able to join together and see each other virtually once again, we were reminded of the friendships and excitement that we have missed for the last two years. Dr. John Logan Allen joined us as our Moulton Lecture speaker this year, and LCTHF Board Member Luann Waters educated us on the uses of a cast iron Dutch oven. Although the meeting was short, we all had the opportunity to talk amongst ourselves and learn about some new things.

54th Annual Meeting – Down the Ohio: The Journey Begins 1803

You are invited to the Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation’s 54th Annual Meeting to be held in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, from August 7-10, 2022. Special area partners are the Beaver County Historical Research & Landmarks Foundation and the Senator John Heinz History Center. Accommodations will be at the Drury Plaza Hotel Pittsburgh Downtown. Typical Drury amenities include the complimentary breakfast, evening reception, lounge/bar and pool/gym, etc. The Downtown Drury is a former Federal Reserve Bank building where many of the former bank rooms have been incorporated into the hotel design. The small meeting rooms that were used to store paper money and coinage still have their vaults. Parking at the Drury is by pay/valet, but your vehicle will be safe in the former bonds and securities storage room. The Drury is within easy walking distance of the Heinz History Center, the Allegheny River, and many other Pittsburgh sites.

The meeting agenda will include our required business meeting, as well as an awards ceremony and opportunities to meet old and new Lewis and Clark friends. The presenter list is set with an emphasis on Lewis and Clark and 1803 Pittsburgh. The Moulton Lecturer is our good friend from The Filson Historical Society, Jim Holmberg. Other activities include an optional trolley tour of Pittsburgh (extra charge), an evening “Under the Stars,” tours of the Heinz History Center, movie and trivia nights, and a grand finale: a dinner cruise Down the Ohio.

Come early and stay late. There is so much to do and see in this section of the Lewis and Clark Trail!
Heritage
American Philosophical Society
Ashcraft, Lee & Ann
Atkinson, Donald
Brafield, Craig
Brunn, Joe & Fran
Calvert, Christopher K.
Condon, John & Frances
Cortes, Paige W.
Duncan, Dayton & Dianne
Fick, Harold A.
Fischer, Eric
Fisher, Joe
Foit, Beverly & Dan
Frits, Charles
Gaitley, Barbara J.
Gogan, Doris
Goldsmith, Howard
Gramentine, James & Sarah
Guard, Robert F.
Hall-Reppen, Deb & Rich
Jackson, Helen
Jengo, John W.
Johnson, Mark
Kインド, Cathi
Klaver, Stephen & Mona
Lewis & Clark College Library
Lewis & Clark National Park
Assoc.
Lewis and Clark Foundation
Liesveld, Kenny
Mahon, Linda
Marriott Library University of Utah
Meade, Jim & Phyllis D.
Medvec, Stephen & Alexandra
Midgett Jr., Palmer
Mihelish, Bruce & Pam
Morin, William & Lolly
Norman Jr., William
Pierre/FT. Pierre Historic Preservation Commission
Riddle, Mary
Riphagen, Kees
Rissieuw, Hugh
Rivinus, Randolph P. & Susan L.
Robleto, Robert & Elizabeth
Sargent, James & Alice
Scribner, Kent
Stephen Ambrose Tours
Stoxen Library – Dickinson State University
Swackhamer, Barry
Travelers Rest Connection
University of Idaho Library
University of Wyoming Library
Vermillion, Louis
Wendt, Lois & Lonis
Whitley, Kenneth
York, Wayne J.

Explorer
Aungst, David & Audrey
Cross, Larry
Ebeling, Lee
Flannes, Martin A.
Gray, Nora & Randy
Hamilton, Susan
Kimsey, Gary
Merritt III, John I.
Nagy-Trujillo, Claudia
Rodenburg, John & Linda
Stearns, Hal & Sheila
Van Berkum, Trevor

Jefferson
Bagley, Craig
Bodenstedt, Joseph & Patricia
Brooks, Austin
Burgham Foundation
Downs, Cheryl & Joe
Eide, Richard
Findlay, Andrew & Yong Hui
Giuth, Alan
Jordan, Mark
Kraft, Dana
Milne, Catherine
Palmer, Theodore W.
Schulgen, David
Skold, Mary
Wallenborn, Ken & Lucy
Wright, John
Young, John

Discovery
Barney, Philip L.
Curlin, Jackson
Epstein, Larry & Callie
Hammerness, Virginia
Hurd, Richard & Wanda
Kean, Yvonne J.
Laverty, Michael

Steward
Allen, John Logan
Amiet, Don
Anderson, Jerome L.
Asker, Kevin
Babcock, Edward
Nakel, Barlett
Beattie, Donald
Betty Ford Adventureland Camp
Branom, Hank & Sara MacGilvra
Bronson, William O.

Bronson, Carol
Brooks, Dick
Buckley, Jay
Buckley, Brian & Susan
Chandler Sr., Geln
Cirincione, Dominick
Clark, Wade
Clery, John & Rita
Gray, Bud
Da Rosa, Allison & Jim Miller
Davis, Lynn & Doug
Davis, Kenneth
Diamandis, Sharon
Downs, Phil & Charlene
Dukes, Deborah
Dunn, Robert
Dwyer, Bonnie
Eggers, Fred
Falvo, Ed
Fichter, Dick & Katherine
Forrest, Stephen
Foss, Jeffery
Frick, Pattie
Garnett, Betty
Gaten, Florence
Goering, Karen & Lawrence
Gordon, Phillip
Gorski, Margaret
Gucciardo, L. Suzanne
Hagstrom, Lorna Jean
Hainesworth, Lorna
Hall, Gary & Pat
Hammond, Mary
Hansell, William
Headley, Helene
Herman, Douglas & Sarah
Hole, Donald
Hunt, Patricia
Jackson, John R.
Jenkins, Clay
Johnson, Matthew L.
Jutz, Ken
Knox, James
Kubik, Barbara & Rennie
Laycock, Ron
Lee, Steven G.
Lewis, Beverly
Ludwig, Gary K.
Martin, Janell
Mattson, John
McCammon, George E. & Lillian A.
McClure, Larry & Eleanor
McLemzie, Mark & Alicia
Miller, M.
Miller, Gerald

Mitchell, Jean M.
Mitchell, Davy J.
Mohler, Jimmy
Mordy, James & Marjory
Mueller, Jeff
Nelzen, Cindy
Newfield, Philippa
Nici, James
Nottingham, Jack & Betty
Obdram, Family of Anthony
Osborne, Joseph
Pakula, Lawrence
Papp, Stann
Patterson, Paul
Peterson, Cherry
Polak, Dorothy
Raney, Wendy
Reinhold, Deloris
Ritten, Louis N.
Rogers, Brian C.
Rosenberger, James & Mary
Scoll, Ed
Schulze, Mark
Seaberg, Karen
Seaberg, Ladd
Simmons, Jerry & Gail
Slosberg, Gloria
Smith, Robert
Smith, Mark S.
Sorgel, David & Collette
Sturdevant, Dan
Townsend, Kris
Tregon, William
Truppi, George
Rubbs, John
Ward, Robert E.
Welch, Patrick
Yager, Phyllis & Ray

Captain
Bauer, Della M.
Boswell, Bryant
Holton, Eddie
Lingo, David & Patty
National Park Service (LCNHT)

President
Baria, Eleanor
Payne, Margaret Anne
Strodtman, Mike
Weller, Nelson

Thank you for your continued support!

*We apologize for any misspellings or incorrect information*
**Statement of Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9/30/2021</th>
<th>9/30/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues and other support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions, gifts, and donations</td>
<td>$56,797.00</td>
<td>$38,664.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise sales and publications</td>
<td>$14,157.00</td>
<td>$2,252.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>$54,577.00</td>
<td>$66,932.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment return</td>
<td>$772,701.00</td>
<td>$155,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>$26,789.00</td>
<td>$9,522.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous income</td>
<td>$12,941.00</td>
<td>$15,372.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues and other support</strong></td>
<td>$937,962.00</td>
<td>$288,492.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9/30/2021</th>
<th>9/30/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$4,269.00</td>
<td>$12,666.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail/Field programs</td>
<td>$63,049.00</td>
<td>$44,163.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise/Publications</td>
<td>$42,850.00</td>
<td>$41,628.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total program services</strong></td>
<td>$110,168.00</td>
<td>$98,457.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and general</td>
<td>$169,064.00</td>
<td>$134,687.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total supporting services</strong></td>
<td>$169,064.00</td>
<td>$134,687.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses</strong></td>
<td>$279,232.00</td>
<td>$233,144.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Decrease/Increase in net assets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9/30/2021</th>
<th>9/30/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$658,730.00</td>
<td>$55,348.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statement of Financial Position**

**Assets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9/30/2021</th>
<th>9/30/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$71,202.00</td>
<td>$148,211.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>$3,703,718.00</td>
<td>$2,991,127.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other current assets</td>
<td>$8,609.00</td>
<td>$13,040.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital assets, net</td>
<td>$13,563.00</td>
<td>$885.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library books and collections</td>
<td>$188,870.00</td>
<td>$187,906.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>$3,985,962.00</td>
<td>$3,341,169.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Liabilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9/30/2021</th>
<th>9/30/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued expenses</td>
<td>$29,549.00</td>
<td>$26,787.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue and memberships</td>
<td>$77,492.00</td>
<td>$94,191.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td>$107,041.00</td>
<td>$120,978.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net assets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9/30/2021</th>
<th>9/30/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without donor restrictions</td>
<td>$427,253.00</td>
<td>$424,015.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With donor restrictions</td>
<td>$3,451,668.00</td>
<td>$2,796,176.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total net assets</strong></td>
<td>$3,878,921.00</td>
<td>$3,220,191.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total liabilities and net asset**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9/30/2021</th>
<th>9/30/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,985,962.00</td>
<td>$3,341,169.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LCTHF FY 2020-2021 Annual Report was provided by LCTHF
Like many American families, ours had to focus on getting to the end of the month and “holding down the fort,” our family home in Fresno, California, built by my grandfather George Ross Shannon and my father Walter Dresser. My parents knew little about their grandparents, let alone distant ancestors. Still, my mother claimed proudly that we were descended from another George Shannon who went west with Lewis and Clark.

In reaching back through our family history, I am always counting ancestors on my thumb. My mother was Deborah Shannon Dresser. Her father (my grandfather) was George Ross Shannon, California Central Valley farmer and contractor. His father was Wilson Shannon, horse trader and saloon owner, according to my mother. Wilson's father was William Shannon, a legislator and rancher in Texas and also a soldier on the side of the Confederacy (ouch!) during the Civil War. William's father was George Shannon who went west with Lewis and Clark in 1803. At eighteen, George Shannon was the youngest member of the Lewis and Clark Expedition. After the expedition's return and Meriwether Lewis' untimely death, Shannon was sent to Philadelphia by William Clark to assist Nicholas Biddle in preparing the expedition's journals for publication.

My mother also said that we had a distant cousin, Fanny Boone, who married into that pioneer family. As fans of television actor Fess Parker who portrayed both Davy Crockett and Daniel Boone, we were probably more excited about the Boone connection.

In adulthood, I became the family historian and found much material about George Shannon, my third great-grandfather, a lot of it inspiring and some of it – the fact that he owned slaves – disturbing. Yes, I was part of that history too. George's own father – another George – was an abandoned child brought from Ireland. When he achieved his majority, he settled in Western Pennsylvania, became a homesteader, and was there during the Whiskey Rebellion (1791-1794). Sadly, he froze to death while out hunting not far from his cabin in the same year that his son was traveling with Lewis and Clark. Hunting mishaps seem to run in the family.

I was thrilled when I discovered that George Shannon the explorer was also a writer. Two essays, possibly college papers, are preserved with William Clark's papers. Private Shannon's work with Biddle preparing the expedition's journals for publication deserves more scholarly attention than it has received. Young Shannon was William Clark's protege and, with Clark's guidance, he attended college and got started in law.

Although the trajectory of George's adult life was bumpy – he had to fight his own government to secure his veteran's benefits – the figures of George Shannon and his extended family are notably iconic. His first-born son, William, was a rancher in Texas who served in that state's legislature. George's uncle Wilson was the controversial interim governor of Kansas during the violent episode known as Bleeding Kansas (1854-1859). Later, George and his uncle came to California for the Gold Rush and appeared to have done well for themselves.

The Shannon name is derived from a Celtic word for “the bard who serves a chieftain.” Story-telling, risk-taking, and adventuring are traits I recognize in myself. Along with other characters in my family tree, George inspires me to explore how history, place, and events turned these Scots-Irish immigrants into Americans. Further, they make me explore what it means to “be” American, how it is no simple transformation. George's ambition and survival skills, as a frontier scout and later as a country lawyer, are part of a much larger story that connects me to key historical moments and makes me proud to be part of this ongoing experiment called America.

Jannie M. Dresser, originally from Fresno, California, is a San Francisco Bay Area poet, writer, and teacher. She has published one book of poetry, Workers' Compensation: Poems of Labor & the Working Life, and is slogging away on a family history tentatively titled Backward Ho: A White Girl Unravels Her Pilgrim and Pioneer Past.