

what grounds has Canada to bestow her sympathies upon the States more than upon the Sioux in this quarrel; and what reason is presented to us for entering into any treaty with the United States that would have for its object the repression of the Sioux?

Wendell Phillips' Arrangement of the United States.

The telegraph has only briefly alluded to Wendell Phillips' letter to General Sherman relative to the American Indian policy. We submit the full text:

Sir,—An American citizen, entitled and bound to enquire whether the officers of the Republic are men or something below humanity, I respectfully claim the right to ask you are the journals correct when they represent you as advising the extermination of the Indians? This charge has been made several times during the last three years. If it be false, I beg you, for the honor of the nation and of the service, to deny it. While you neglect to do so the press issues your supposed example to commend that infamous course and to create a public opinion which shall approve and demand it.

If the charge be true I cannot but remember that you are better acquainted than most Americans with the real relations of our government to the Indians. You were in 1857, the head of an Indian commission, and its report signed by yourself and printed by the government, is one of the most terrific pictures ever drawn of the wrongs the Indian has suffered from this nation. This investigation and your general experience showed you how cruel and unjust has been our treatment of the Indian for the last 100 years. You have seen that we have surrounded him with every demoralizing influence, steeped him in intemperance, incited him to licentiousness by the example of those set over him, and tempted him to every vice. You have yourself placed on the public records the evidence that the government has robbed him of his land, cheated him of his dues, and uniformly broken faith with him. If any of the tribes are to-day huns, thieves, and butchers, they may rightfully claim to have only copied, at humble distance, the example we have set them.

You are not ignorant that the Indian has been outraged and plundered by the frontiersmen without stint or redress, and butchered by our soldiers, under the American flag, with brutal and detestable cruelty—the description of which in plain terms the press would not admit to its columns. You know—no one better—that the worst brutality which purient malice ever falsely charged the Indian with is but weak imitation of what the white man has often inflicted on Indian men, women, and children.

You know that on the plains we have violated every rule of civilized war, massacring women and children with worse than savage brutality. Your career has not shown you an instance were the Indian has lifted his hand against us until provoked to it by misconduct on our part, compared with which any misconduct of his is but dust in the balance.

Your experience will fully indorse what President Harrison, when Governor of Indiana, said to his Legislature in 1857, "that the utmost efforts to induce the Indians to take up arms would be unavailing if one out of the many persons who have committed murder upon their people could be brought to punishment."

You will not in the slightest degree doubt or deny the grave charge which Major Gen-

eral Harney, after fifty years service on the plains, made to a Congressional Committee, "that he had never known an Indian tribe break its word to our Government, and he had never known the Government to keep faith with an Indian tribe." You are too much of a soldier not to confess that had you been placed in the Indian's circumstances you would have been ashamed not to have acted as he has done.

You would accept, as every honest man does, the statement of Major General Pope, in 1855, that the army officer "cannot present a course which give the Indian to war, without thereby, at the demand of every gentleman, his own feelings with the Indians has brought on a difficulty, he is obliged to pursue and force back to the same deplored state and place, Indians whom he knows to have been wronged, and who have only done so justifiably what he would have done himself under like provocation." You must be keenly sensible what a reproach it is to religion and culture that our multiplying millions, with all the resources of civilization and Christianity in their hands, have lived for two hundred years close to this small and capable race and been able to give it only their vice—and that all of good the Indian has is his own; most of his vices he can rightfully charge to the white man.

Except the negro no race will lift up at the judgment seat such accusing hands against this nation as the Indian will. We have subjected him to agents who have systematically cheated him. We have made endless war on him, merely as a pretext to steal his lands. Trampling under foot the rules of modern warfare, we have made war on his women and children. We have cheated him out of one hunting ground by compelling him to accept another, and robbed him of this last by driving him to the bay and then punishing resistance by confiscation. Meanwhile neither pulpit nor press nor political party would listen to his complaint. Neither in Congress nor in any city of the Union could his advocate obtain a hearing. Statesmanship, good sense and justice, even from the chief magistrate, were unavailing when they pleaded for such long time victims of popular hate and pillage as our Indian tribes.

Can it be possible, then, that with such knowledge and such experience, you, sir, the head of the army, and bound to show at least outward respect to civilization, have no counsel to give except extermination—the extermination of these plundered victims of a greedy, unscrupulous and cruel people? Can you advise a professedly Christian people, steeped in guilt, not to reform, but to consummate its wickedness by such hideous barbarism as only the most inhuman tyrants have ever attempted? The worst possibls of infidels, do you affirm that a wise and powerful nation is safe only when it sinks below the level of savage life to clutch a coward's peace by sweeping every man, woman, and child of this insignificant race in blood from our path? Wise men laugh at such timid folly; brave men despise it. They know that fair play is the best teacher and justice always sufficient shield.

If, indeed, this is the counsel you give from your high place, then, for the sake of that Christianity which we profess and that civilization we claim, I wish it understood that one, at least, of your fellow citizens believes that you misrepresent the army, whose best officers have often protested against our heinous injustice to these wards of the nation, and that you disgrace the profession of DuGuescheu, of Bayard, and Sir Philip Sidney, disgrace the post which Washington

once filled and the uniform that Thomas, Greene and Hamilton have worn.

Your fellow citizen,

WENDELL PHILLIPS.

THE REAL CUSTER MASSACRE.

Wendell Phillips writes as follows to the *Boston Transcript*—

Will you please explain why even your columns talk of the "Custer Massacre"? The Sioux war, all confess, is one that our misconduct provoked. During such a war General Custer has fallen in a fair fight simply because the enemy had more soldierly skill and strategy than Custer had. What kind of war is it where if we kill the enemy it is death; if he kills us it is a massacre? When the farmers of Concord and Lexington, in 1775, shot the British invaders of their villages was it a massacre? When the Southerners mowed us down at Bull Run and Ball's Bluff there was no talk of a massacre. When the North paid them in their coin at Gettysburg and Antietam there were no columns with staring capitals "Gettysburg Massacres." I know the privilege of foul words always granted to the weak and whipped; but there is not much self respect in using it. The general use of this abusive term betrays the unfairness of the American press. It shows a consciousness that our treatment of the Indian will not bear to be stated in plain words. We try to hide our own infamy by abusing our victims—according to the Old Bailey rule, "When you have no defence, abuse the plaintiff."

But the word "massacre" is an unfortunate one for the friends of General Custer to connect just now with his name. For there really was, in 1865, a "Custer massacre," when General Custer—a disgrace to his uniform and to the flag he bore—attacked a peaceful Cheyenne village, near Fort Cobb, whose inhabitants were either our prisoners or our guests, dwelling there by our order. At midnight, without the slightest warning, his shouts wake this quiet settlement, and as the terrified sleepers rush from their huts Custer shoots down scores of women half asleep, and of unarmed, peaceful men.

One of these was Mocketayata, whom Chevalier Bayard and Sir Philip Sidney would receive as a brother. This was the real "Custer massacre," which the press then proclaimed a "brilliant victory."

In 1857, Governor, afterwards President, Harrison said:—"The utmost efforts to induce the Indians to take up arms would be unavailing if one only of the many persons who have committed murder upon their people could be brought to punishment."

That this is as true now as in 1857, we have the evidence of Major General Harney and Major General Pope, offered within the last two years.

Yours,

WENDELL PHILLIPS.

Prospects of the Eastern War.

(*Kölnische Zeitung*—Cologne, July 4.)

From present appearances it seems (writes Herr von Wicked, a distinguished military critic) that the war will be confined to Servia, Montenegro, and the insurgents of Bosnia and the Turkish forces on the other side. Unless unforeseen and incalculable incidents should occur, the whole struggle is rather hopeless for both parties; it may last for years, and yet produce no decisive result. The forces which Turkey can now send to her threatened frontiers may at the highest be estimated at from 140,000 to 150,000 men; and Servia, Montenegro, and the other Slavonic States