

In order to force the settlement by the Indians of claims set up by the United States, an expedition against them was organised under the command of General St. Clair, in the spring of 1791. On the 4th of November following, St. Clair's force sustained a disastrous defeat, in which according to Alexander McKee, Indian Superintendent, St. Clair's troops lost all their artillery, baggage, ammunition, &c., &c., &c., and 1,200 men killed, but subsequent information received by McKee showed the latter loss to have amounted to 1,500 (Q. 58-1, p. 222). The loss of the Indians was only 20 or 21 killed and 40 wounded (p. 224). The charge by writers in the United States that Brant led the attack, is disproved by McKee's account, in which he states that Du Quania and a party of 10 men were the only Six Nation Indians who came to the assistance of their friends. (Q. 58-1 p. 224). Brant's account of the battle, and of the preliminary attack confirms this, as he writes as a looker on, not as a leader. Neither says distinctly that he did not lead, but the fact that the force consisted exclusively, or nearly so, of Western Indians, is of itself almost sufficient proof that Brant was not the leader, independent of McKee's statement that Du Quania and ten men were the only contingent from the Six Nations, to one of which Brant belonged. Thayendenaga, or Joseph Brant, is stated by his biographer, Mr. William L. Stone, to have been one of the advisers of Little Turtle, commanding the Indians who defeated St. Clair, (Life of Brant Vol. II, p. 312), which is not impossible, although only given on the authority of one of Brant's descendants, but the statements on page 313, of the same volume, that 150 Mohawk warriors were engaged in this battle, is distinctly contradicted by McKee, who gives the number from the Six Nations as above, that is ten, or with their leader, eleven in all. The correctness of McKee's report is further confirmed by Mr. Stone when he says that "the Government of the United States was sadly at fault as to the numbers and tribes of the Indians who fought this battle." The repetition of errors once committed is one of the evils of writing history without exercising the most ordinary care. A recent history, published in New York in 1885, attributes to Brant the attack on Wyoming, a statement made by Campbell in his "Gertrude of Wyoming," for which he was obliged to apologize as being unfounded, so that it was not an error in history which had passed unchallenged. Gordon's account, "History of the United States," London, 1778, is the one usually relied on, and it was from it, apparently, that Campbell drew his inspiration. In this account Brant (Brandt he is called), is described as a half blooded Indian, of desperate courage, ferocious and cruel beyond example (Vol. III p. 185). The force under Butler and Brant is stated to have consisted of 1,600 men "near a fourth Indians, the others so disguised and painted as not to be distinguished from the Indians," &c., (p. 187). Butler's own account in the report he made to his commanding officer Lieut. Col. Bolton, gives the total force as 500 men including Indians, under the command of their own chief, Suingerachton, Joseph Brant not being there. Suingerachton was a Seneca chief, reported by Lt. Colonel Mason Bolton as having unlimited command over the Six Nations. (B 100, p. 17). In contradiction to the reports which pass for history, Butler's words may be quoted. After stating the damage that had been done to the settlements, the capture of the forts, &c., he says, that "What gives me the sincerest satisfaction is that I can with great truth assure you that in the destruction of this settlement not a single person has been hurt of the inhabitants but such as were in arms, to those indeed the Indians gave no quarter." The full account is among the Archives in series B, vol. 100,