INSTRUCTOR’S FOREWORD

That formidable historian and former Professor of Comparative Literature at Stanford, Hayden White, proposed many decades ago that by narrating history we make it real. What happens, though, in the translation from events to narrative? This question, about the space between fact and fiction, science and art, is one that captured Jake’s imagination as it has captured many students’ imagination. Set alight by the Meriwether Lewis and William Clark story as he knew it, he was perplexed and disappointed by his encounter with The Journals of The Lewis and Clark Expedition. In the place of confident adventurers, he found taciturn, scientific, even banal, reporters, often unsure of themselves. Why, he wondered, had representations of Lewis and Clark—at festivals, in biographies, in paintings—strayed so far from the “facts”?

To answer this question, Jake thinks recursively, turning and returning to historical narratives as he thinks and rethinks their rhetoric. Deliberately resisting the temptation to think in hierarchical binaries, this essay lets in the “wildness” of history. Through its form, it embodies the dizzying layers of desire that shape and make American history. In its conclusions, the essay urges us to take note of the rhetorical conjuring within all narratives: the American, the scientific, the most sacred.

—Gabrielle Moyer
This summer, the Lewis and Clark Foundation will host the 23rd Annual Lewis and Clark Festival in Great Falls, Montana. This small city of less than 60,000 marks an important point on the map of American History and the portrait of American psychology. Geographically, however, Great Falls' location is unremarkable. Lying seventy miles northeast of Helena, Montana, the inconspicuous Great Falls is commonly defined by its proximity to other places.

Although today Great Falls seems a quotidian western city among hundreds of others, it was once the site of a harrowing encounter. In the summer of 1805, the Missouri River’s cascading rapids at Great Falls forced the members of the Lewis and Clark expedition to make a grueling portage and simultaneously abandon their hopes of discovering a continuous water route to the Pacific. The agony of this humbling experience is vividly communicated in *The Journals of The Lewis and Clark Expedition*, which were meticulously recorded by Lewis, Clark, and others throughout their cross-country expedition. After confronting wild grizzly bears and enduring an overland march that nearly killed William Clark, on June 14, 1805 Lewis remarked that it seemed as if “all the beasts of the neighbourhood had made a league to destroy me, or that some fortune was disposed to amuse herself at my expense.”¹ Caught in the midst of a difficult struggle, facing the prospect

of agonizing humiliation, and seemingly at a loss for rational explanation, Lewis surrendered his fate to the whims of nature. Resigned to the mercy of wild beasts and fortune, he found himself at the pinnacle of despondence.

Despite marking a low-point for the Lewis and Clark expedition, the portage at Great Falls is recalled triumphantly in America's collective memory. Charles Fritz's painting The Arrival of Captain Meriwether Lewis at The Great Falls (2005), one of the most famous images of the Lewis and Clark expedition, underscores this paradoxical movement, in which a moment of despair is transformed into one of achievement. Fritz depicts Lewis standing proudly on a boulder overlooking the falls. His eyes locked on the horizon, Lewis is an idealized explorer in an idealized scene. The absence of hardship, an overabundance of light, and an intensity of majestic landscapes in Fritz's painting sear a powerful narrative into the mind of any viewer. Seemingly at odds with historical events, this is a picture of pure accomplishment and absolute serenity.

Fritz's deviation from the historical record presents a complex puzzle that calls into question modern understandings of history as well as the ways in which the past is interpreted and represented. Most importantly, it is vital to consider why an artist would portray the Lewis and Clark expedition in a manner that contradicts widely available historical records as well as the journals of the individuals who actually experienced the historical events in question. Professor Jerzy Topolski, a prominent scholar of history and historiography, examines precisely this issue in his article, The Role of Logic and Aesthetics in Constructing Narrative Wholes in Historiography (1999). Topolski contends that “imagination as well as logic […] generates the more or less concretized images constituting the background onto which the historian, ‘playing’ with basic information, imposes some content and portrays some event by means of a narrative,” underscoring the complexity and fluidity of historical interpretation. Although there is only one correct version of history, in the sense that only one course of events could have transpired prior to the present, Topolski stresses the multiplicity of historical narratives that can be drawn from the same set of facts. Thus, although Fritz's painting is somewhat incorrect, because it might
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mischaracterize the past, it may still be possible to understand it as legitimate history. Since no modern historian can actually witness the portage at Great Falls, it seems as if they have no choice but to construct, or to an extent imagine, historical narratives out of the few accessible fragments of information.

Pursuing this line of analysis further, it seems as if multiple contradictory narratives of the Lewis and Clark expedition can reasonably be considered true, because the same pieces of evidence can support a variety of theories. Topolski expands upon this point, explaining that “one evidence source can underwrite many different theories. [...] One and the same source of information may be used to construct various historical accounts of any fragment of the past.”

Understanding history in this way, perhaps Fritz’s depiction does not actually stray from the historical “facts” any more than the writings of an author who imagines the portage at Great Falls as a terrifying and humbling journey. “Facts” about the expedition’s struggles at Great Falls cannot possibly chronicle anything more than a tiny sampling of the countless events that took place during the summer of 1805. Indeed, it is impossible to say for certain that there was not a moment in which Meriwether Lewis stood tall on a boulder, triumphantly overlooking the Great Falls, just as Fritz imagined.

Topolski’s conceptualization of historiography as a rhetoric in flux presents a major obstacle to modern understandings and analyses of the Lewis and Clark expedition. To accept historical records as utterly indeterminate is to undercut historians’ ability to assert with confidence what actually happened in the past. On the other hand, proclaiming one definitively correct version of history makes it nearly impossible to make sense of the varied representations of the past that linger in the modern world.

Despite this historical ambiguity, modern Americans fondly and feverishly celebrate the legacy of the Lewis and Clark expedition as a definitive and profound historical event. Historian Thomas Slaughter, in his book Exploring Lewis and Clark (2003), declares that modern portrayals of the Lewis and Clark expedition, “blending fact, fiction, and myth have buried the explorers under a mountain of celebratory words.” As Topolski would say, injecting an element of myth into an historical event, modern narratives of the Lewis and Clark expedition “concretize” the past. Ambiguity is removed from the story, and the past morphs into a very specific and
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easily knowable tale. Discussing modern accounts of the Lewis and Clark expedition, historians Kris Fresonke and Mark Spence remark that the “most remarkable feature […] is not the volume of material, but its narrow scope.”6 The consistency of Lewis and Clark narratives is stunning, something that Fresonke and Spence liken to “a favorite national children’s bedtime story—which […] Americans insist on hearing over and over.”7

The very particular narrative of the Lewis and Clark expedition espoused by America’s collective memory is sustained through modern attitudes towards Lewis and Clark. The two explorers are not merely respected or honored. They are adored. Writing as the expedition’s bicentennial approached, University of Miami History Professor Andrew Cayton explained that the nation’s excitement about Lewis and Clark amounted to “a fascination that took hold […] and threatens to swamp us all.”8 This zeal of enthusiasm continues to this day. Nearly two thousand Americans will travel to the Lewis and Clark Festival in Great Falls this summer.9 In fact, Lewis and Clark festivals in places like Cut Bank, Montana, Onawa, Iowa, St. Clark, Missouri, and Clarksville, Indiana will overrun the western United States in the summer months, as they do every year.

Although the Lewis and Clark expedition has come to be seen as “an iconic narrative of Americana,” as Cayton describes it, it is unclear what drives the intensity of attention that is paid to the expedition.10 Turning to Lewis and Clark festivals’ own promotional materials offers insights into the appeal of the expedition. For instance, the festival in Great Falls suggests that, if you are lucky, you might be able to “re-live the high energy” of the expedition.11 Cut Bank’s festival actually
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promises to let you “live the experience.” It seems, then, that Americans flock to Lewis and Clark festivals to fill themselves with the vivaciousness of the Lewis and Clark expedition. Hoping to live the experiences of Lewis and Clark, Americans apparently see the expedition as a catalogue of larger-than-life experiences, a set of magnificent phenomena utterly inaccessible during ordinary life.

But what is it about the Lewis and Clark expedition that Americans want to re-live? What are the experiences that they want to re-create? The beauty captured in paintings like Fritz’s suggests that Americans are drawn to the notion of traversing a vast and uncharted wilderness, of encountering and somehow triumphing over the grandeur of nature. However, despite its elegance, this explanation is incomplete. Thousands of nameless fur-trappers, anonymous explorers, unknown traders, and ordinary weekend hikers have ventured into the wild, faced difficult trials, and immersed themselves in the natural world, often times many years before Lewis and Clark ever set foot in the western United States. Yet, as Cayton explains, it is easy to “witness the obscurity of their accomplished predecessors.” Americans don’t fondly re-tell the stories of “Alexander Mackenzie, who crossed the breadth of North America a decade” before Lewis and Clark, nor do they celebrate the accomplishments of James Mackay and John Thomas Evans, who “mapped the Missouri Valley during their 1795-1797 expedition.” More than the appeal of critical encounters with nature, then, must drive adoration of the Lewis and Clark expedition in the nation’s collective memory.

Popular narratives of the Lewis and Clark expedition focus heavily on the majestic storyline of Lewis and Clark, as the ‘first’ people to explore the west. In what is likely the most significant book ever written about Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, Stephen Ambrose embraces this stately narrative with elegance and dramatic force. Few images capture the sentiment of his popular account better than the simple engraving on the spine of Ambrose’s book. In gold block letters, glistening against a backdrop of deep green leather, it reads: Undaunted Courage. Imposing, yet unassuming, the title and its setting conjure feelings of drama and tranquility,
vulnerability and fortitude, uncertainty and strength. From the cover of his book through its final pages, Ambrose presents an account centered on indefatigable bravery and unflinching might.

Ambrose's narrative fits well with and complements the rhetorical grandeur surrounding modern attitudes towards the Lewis and Clark expedition because it embraces spectacle and magnificence. Like festivals that promise to expose visitors to experiences of greatness, Ambrose champions the drama surrounding the iconic adventure. As he describes Lewis preparing to set off on his journey, he begins to build a narrative of conquest and heroism. Declaring that Lewis “was as close to entering a completely unknown territory […] as any explorer ever was,” he goes on to assert that Lewis “was entering a heart of darkness.”17 Here, Ambrose betrays the totalizing nature of his narrative. In this epic storyline, the west is not only unfamiliar and external to the known world but also dangerous and imposing. Ambrose portrays the uncharted western territories as the very epicenters of peril. If the west was a heart of darkness, Lewis and Clark were the deliverers of light.

Ambrose's narrative is also consistent with modern depictions of the Lewis and Clark expedition. In his essay Why Lewis and Clark Matter (2003), Lewis and Clark historian James Ronda agrees, explaining that “textbook history often portrays Lewis and Clark as the vanguard of America's triumphant westward expansion, a movement that brought civilization and progress to a savage wilderness.”18 From Fritz's portrayal of a gloriously victorious Meriwether Lewis to Ambrose's dramatic chronicle of grand legacies, it seems as if the themes of triumph and inevitable progress are inescapable in modern depictions of the Lewis and Clark expedition.

In his essay On the Tourist Trail With Lewis and Clark: Issues of Interpretation and Preservation (2004) Andrew Gulliford deconstructs the dramatic narrative championed by Ambrose and American society. Quoting Ronda, Gulliford explains that Lewis and Clark explored “a crowded wilderness,” full of Native Americans, fur trappers, traders, animals, societies, feuds, alliances, and histories.19 Arguing that “the expedition would have failed miserably without the constant support and guidance of Native Americans,” Gulliford's alternative narrative stresses cooperation

and interdependence, rather than individual persistence and strength. This is a far cry from Ambrose’s image of Lewis and Clark as conquering heroes who bested man and beast and the wild in order to reach the ocean and expand an empire. Gulliford insists instead that “Lewis and Clark moved, not through an unknown wilderness world, but rather through an Indian landscape where even the rocks and trees had names.” Gulliford’s suggestion that such small features were labeled by the time that Lewis and Clark arrived powerfully rejects Ambrose’s claim that their expedition was entering completely unknown territory.

The glaring incongruity between fact and legend suggests that the popular rhetoric of the Lewis and Clark narrative has been somehow fabricated, entrenched, and maintained over time. Despite its prevalence, the roots of America’s dramatic narrative are surprisingly elusive in The Journals of The Lewis and Clark Expedition. In the expedition’s journals, a rhetoric of uncertainty and simplicity abound. Consider Clark’s entry for May 12, 1804. His account of the entire day consists of nothing but the brief statements, “Doctor Catlet set out at 11 o’clock,” “rain all evening,” and “I still arranged the stores.” Clark’s unemotional tone makes it difficult to imagine someone wanting to re-live his experiences. It seems odd as well to want to re-live February 13, 1805, when all Lewis had to say was “the morning cloudy—thermometer 2° below naught—wind from the SE-- visited by the Black-Cat—gave him a battle ax with which he appeared much gratified.”

Even a brief examination of the expedition’s journals demonstrates that the trip’s logs are not about America’s inevitable march to the Pacific or, as Ambrose puts it, the “opening of the American West.” They are instead about monotony, science, measurement, and frustration. The two explorers generally focus on their day-to-day struggles and operations, specific plants and animals, and ordinary events. This story seems significantly less appealing than the heroic tale chronicled by Ambrose and America’s popular psyche. If the majestic narrative presented by Ambrose is true, Lewis and Clark seem to have made every effort to conceal it.
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However, on April 7, 1805, the day of their departure, the dryness of Lewis' journal gives way to something gentler. Surveying the supplies, boats, and men that would journey west with him, Lewis explained that, although their “little fleet” was not “so respectable as those of Columbus or Capt. Cook,” it was still viewed by the explorers “with as much pleasure as those deservedly famed adventurers ever beheld theirs.”25 At this moment of embarkation and suspense, Lewis swelled with pride. Dramatically declaring that his expedition would “penetrate a country […] on which civilized man had never trodden,”26 Lewis’ dramatic rhetoric demonstrates that he has already begun to construct his preferred narrative of his journey. Likening himself to some of history’s most renowned explorers, Lewis envisions himself ranking among the icons of intrepid discovery.

Lewis’ narration cuts to the core of the legacy of his expedition. For Lewis, as for all great explorers, to succeed is to be first. Like Columbus, who painstakingly wove fiction and falsehood into his records to portray himself as the “first” person to see the new world, Lewis goes to great lengths in his journal to secure a spot for himself on the mantle of historical “firsts.”27 Addressing this phenomenon, Slaughter describes the journals “as crafted perspectives consciously framed with a view to their effect on audiences.”28 Deliberately fashioned to communicate and defend the significance of the expedition and the legacy that Lewis and Clark hoped would succeed them, the journals are more than scientific logs. For Lewis and Clark, the journals were an opportunity to concretize a legacy and dictate how they would be remembered. In their journals, Lewis and Clark wrote history.

In writing and shaping how history would remember them, however, Lewis and Clark helped transform their expedition from an historical event into a type of mythical tale. Perhaps understanding the expedition as a legendary story can help make sense of the rhetorical uncertainty that surrounds it. The Lewis and Clark story, as it is generally understood, has become a legend in the truest sense. It is a story that is celebrated for its stylistic and dramatic appeal, a chronicle of events that is captivating and exciting, dangerous and monumental. As Cayton notes, the main reasons people are drawn to the Lewis and Clark expedition are “more literary than
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historical.”29 Historical “facts” about whether or not Lewis and Clark were actually the first people to explore the west or about the expedition’s genuine historical significance take a back seat to the construction of an epic account.

Approaching the Lewis and Clark story as a literary account helps make sense of many contradictory, inaccurate, and hyperbolic characterizations of the past. In popular narratives, and even historical texts, Lewis and Clark are portrayed as classical heroes. They are archetypes of strength, bravery, and fortitude. Ambrose, for example, asserts that Lewis’ “determination was complete” as he prepared to set sail and that “he could not, would not, contemplate failure.”30 This seems impossible, inhuman even. Are we to believe that Lewis, a man who stood at the edge of the known world, was truly incapable of even thinking about failure? Did he really, as Ambrose claims, know that “he would be making history”?31 Ambrose’s willingness to use superlatives and to make bold and unqualified declarations is stunning, but also befitting of the legacy that he seeks to perpetuate. In passages like this, Ambrose’s writing might read like a novel because it is written, perhaps unwittingly, as a dramatic story more than as a genuine chronicle of the past.

In a sense, the Lewis and Clark expedition has always been seen as a story more than it has been seen as an historical event. Thomas Jefferson, the main sponsor of the Lewis and Clark expedition, actually referred to the journals of Lewis and Clark as “literary” as early as 1803.32 The characterization of the Lewis and Clark story as literature is nothing new. However, the Lewis and Clark expedition is not only a story. It is a journey, one of the types of stories that novelist Willa Cather once proclaimed would “go on repeating themselves as fiercely as if they had never happened before.”33 There is something irresistible about this journey, its context, the transformations that took place around it, and the revolutionary people and events that shaped it. Occurring at the threshold of America’s rapid ascension to power and industrialization, this journey to the Pacific is an allegorical tale. Binding the North American continent, Lewis and Clark dramatically bade farewell to the past and gracefully ushered in the future.
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However, even this canonized and concretized legacy is profoundly fluid, constantly changing and ever evolving. The Lewis and Clark expedition has meant many different things to many different people. As John Spencer explains in his essay *We Are Not Dealing Entirely with the Past* (2004), even today, while some historians celebrate the expedition as a seminal moment of progress, a shining beacon of America's bold pursuit of destiny, others deride it as a colonialist enterprise, yet another dark chapter of conquest on America's tireless imperial march.\(^34\) Throughout history, the expedition's legacy has changed dramatically as well. Spencer explains that although the expedition was largely ignored and considered historically and scientifically inconsequential when it first concluded, it gained prominence again in the late nineteenth century, when proponents of America's new industrialist society “invoked Lewis and Clark to justify the new social order, seeing an opportunity to “link the new society to a more fluid, democratic past.”\(^35\) Spencer traces this evolution into the modern day, a time in which he believes that diverging legacies have led to the growth of a new narrative, one in which Lewis and Clark have begun to “symbolize exactly the opposite of what they stood for a hundred years ago: environmentalism […] instead of industrial development, multiculturalism instead of […] imperial conquest.”\(^36\) The dynamic, yet captivating, nature of its legacy suggests that something magnificent lies at the heart of the Lewis and Clark expedition.

However, this dynamism might also suggest something more enigmatic as well. The legacy of the Lewis and Clark expedition has garnered consistent and nearly endless fascination throughout the years, yet its central tenets and ultimate commitments steadfastly resist static definition. It is mystifying that this event, which has always derived its greatest meaning from its historical grandeur, has left a legacy that is simultaneously so uncertain and so vibrant. Despite its critics, its detractors, its opponents, its revisionists, and its champions, the expedition has remained a perennial force in American culture for well over one hundred years. No matter the time, nor the place, the Lewis and Clark narrative has offered a majestic historical backdrop to pressing issues and changing attitudes.\(^37\) The Lewis and Clark story has
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also always been uniquely American, combining growth and destiny, progress and nature, hardship and triumph. It is familiar, since Lewis and Clark travelled across what is now the heartland of America, but it is also foreign, since Lewis and Clark were, in a way, the first and last truly great American explorers.

When they set out on their expedition, Lewis and Clark were in a situation utterly foreign to any American who is alive today. The two men, and the party of explorers that they commanded, did not know where they were going. Admittedly, they knew some things about the west. Many travelers had been there before. However, a map printed by French cartographer Nicolas de Finiels in 1798 betrays the deep extent of their ignorance. Carried by Lewis and Clark during their travels through the Missouri River, Finiels’ simple *Map of Missouri River and Vicinity from Saint Charles, Missouri, to Mandan Villages of North Dakota*, is strikingly sparse and remarkably inaccurate. Not only is it not drawn nearly to scale, the map also amounts to little more than a rough outline of a few converging rivers. It is devoid of topographical features or names of most settlements and many prominent locations. So lacking in reliable information were Lewis and Clark that, at one point, the two men actually thought that they might discover living wooly mammoths, then referred to as “The Ohio Monster,” whose fossils had been uncovered along the Ohio River. Lewis, Clark, and even Thomas Jefferson were enveloped in the frenzy of adventure. Travelling to what seemed to be another world, even encounters with mythical creatures seemed possible.

These great explorers journeyed to a place that neither Lewis, nor Clark, nor anyone that either man had ever met could accurately describe—neither its basic geography, nor its most common inhabitants, nor its history, nor even its weather. Modern Americans have never known what it is like to venture into the wild—to voyage somewhere that has not been mapped out, scanned by satellites, surveyed by engineers, measured by radar, photographed from the air, travelled by humans, conquered. Certainly, we may try to capture a taste of this feeling. We visit national parks, camp out in the wilderness. Even then, when we venture beyond the comfort of the concrete jungles that we inhabit, we remain confined within rigidly defined

spaces and ultimately pre-examined locations. There is nowhere else to go. If we are trapped by the limits of our world, then the world that Lewis and Clark explored was limitless.

When they address this topic, modern narratives of the Lewis and Clark expedition generally focus on how Lewis and Clark made the unknown known. Like Fritz's idealized scene and Ambrose's theatrical rhetoric, they tend to ignore the vulnerability and lack of knowledge of two of history's greatest explorers. Hardly anyone pauses to consider things like Jefferson's hope to find “The Ohio Monster” and what it might reveal about the expedition's more intimate secrets. Lewis and Clark, two national heroes, set off into a land in which they expected to encounter actual monsters. One can only imagine the uncertainties and reservations harbored by these men. Still, these themes are hardly ever confronted in narratives of the Lewis and Clark expedition.

Despite being largely overlooked in modern chronicles of the expedition, it seems as if weakness and vulnerability should be central components of a story about any kind of journey. After all, journeys are captivating not just because they traverse physical spaces, but also because they facilitate travels through personal struggles, contemporary attitudes, and even more complex planes of meaning. Audiences adore stories in which great men are changed by their surroundings and brought to their knees by the vastness of nature, the challenges that they face, and the hardships that they must endure. Readers long for their heroes to proudly brandish their humanity, to shed the impregnable armor of their personas, and show the world that despite their heroism, they are like us. Americans adore the image of the naval officer stealing a kiss as he returns home. The hardened warrior, still in love.

In his essay What Sacagawea Means to Me (2002), Sherman Alexie approaches the legacy of the Lewis and Clark expedition with an eye towards historical contingency and rhetorical indeterminacy. Dissecting the binaries and historical biases that have clouded modern understandings of the expedition, Alexie's writing clashes with popular narratives. Declaring that “in the future, every U.S. citizen will get to be Sacagawea for 15 minutes,” Alexie attempts to create a space in which contemporary readers can come to terms with the multiplicity of historical narratives embodied by the Lewis and Clark expedition. Encouraging readers to re-live the experiences of Sacagawea, Alexie offers an alternative to the festivals that litter the American west,
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which seek only to let visitors re-live the experiences of Lewis and Clark themselves. Still, Alexie’s alternative paradigm does not reject narratives like Ambrose’s in which “the two captains will lead the adventure, fighting rivers, animals, weather and diseases for thousands of miles.”41 Rather, it asks readers to “march right beside them” and imagine themselves as “aboriginal multitaskers” who “will also breast-feed.”42 For Alexie, there is more to the story than conquest and heroism. Building upon historical inquiries like Gulliford’s, Alexie’s narrative challenges modern understandings precisely because it demands ambiguity.

Although external forces and historical contingencies foundationally influenced the course of their expedition, both Lewis and Clark reveal a persistent resistance to this clear vulnerability. In his journals, Lewis chose to explicitly narrate the story of his rise to historical prominence. Clark, on the other hand, exposed splinters of his preferred narrative in the act of creating his journals. In his original notes on August 22, 1804, Clark references “This creek I call Roloje, a name given me last night in my sleep.”43 However, in the edited transcript of the journal that he submitted for publication, he speaks only of “this creek I call Roloje.” There is no mention of the dream.

Clark’s self-editing divulges the manner in which he hoped to be remembered. Like Lewis, Clark seems reluctant to admit to weakness or fallibility. Perhaps it seems childish or unprofessional for a great explorer to name a river based off a dream. However, it also seems poetic. The prophetic William Clark, face to face with the wild, finally succumbs to a whim and abandons pure science. Projecting his dreams and his musings onto the landscape around him, he creates fantasy. Why, though, is this unacceptable for Clark? Perhaps naming a creek for a dream would represent a momentary lapse in judgment, a departure from diligent scientific methodologies.44 Meticulously removing this miscarriage from his journals, Clark demonstrates that he, like Lewis, has already begun to consciously shape the rhetoric that will be his legacy. Still, Clark’s willingness to ultimately name the creek Roloje is pleasing, somehow reassuring. Despite their grand legacies and heroic personas, at least we know that these men dreamed as well.
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