

"The invasion of New York State," cannot be considered tenable; we must, therefore, look further for the cause of this "unnatural alliance with savages."\* Mr. Thomson† declares that it was done "by way of intimidating the British and the Indians, as by the Americans incorporating into their armies, the same kind of force, the habitual stratagems of the savages would be counteracted, and their insidious hostilities defeated," and yet, oddly enough, adds, "in the hope, too, of preventing a recurrence of previous barbarities." Smith,‡ by way of proving this, we suppose, cites the following remarkable instance:—

"Of the influence of a cultivated people," writes Dr. Smith, "whose manners and religion the savages respect, to induce them to resign their inhuman treatment of their prisoners, Major Chappin gave an instructive example immediately after uniting his force with the warriors of the Six Nations. A corps, composed of volunteer militia and of these Indians, had completely put to rout a party of the enemy in the vicinity of Fort George. In a council held before the conflict (for all things must be done among them by common consent), the Indians, by his advice, agreed amongst themselves, besides the obligation of their general treaty, which they recognized, that no one should scalp or tomahawk prisoners, or employ towards them any species of savage inhumanity. Accordingly, after the battle, sixteen wounded captives were committed solely to their management, when, governed by a sacred regard to their covenant, and the benevolent advice of their commander, they exhibited as great magnanimity towards their fallen enemy, as they had shown bravery against their foes in battle."

We can easily understand James's astonishment that any American writer should have been found to promulgate the fact that sixteen British captives, writhing under the anguish of their yet bleeding wounds, were, by the orders of an American officer, "committed solely to the management" of a party of hostile Indians, to determine, by way of experiment, whether those *ruthless savages*,‡

that *faithless and perfidious race* would listen to the *advice* of their white and civilised brethren; and to ascertain whether *the influence of a cultivated people* would impose any restraints upon the known habits of Indian warfare. The artful advice to an infuriated mob who had just secured their victim, "Do not nail his ears to the pump," fades in comparison with this example of American feeling for their prisoners. After the battle of the Miami, when the British guard (see chapter nine) in charge of the American prisoners, were overpowered, and some of them killed and wounded in defence of the helpless captives committed to their charge, when forty Americans fell victims to the fury of the Indians, the whole Union resounded with the most exaggerated accounts of British perfidy and cruelty.\* This outcry, too, was raised only on the unconfirmed statements of the American press, yet here have we found one of these same historians gravely chronicling an experiment, as to whether the Indians would act the part of good Samaritans, or scalp and otherwise torture their victims. Torture to the feelings of the captives, it must, under all circumstances, have been; a wanton sporting with the fears of his prisoners on the part of the American officer. James expresses himself very strongly on this subject. "Happily, amidst all that has been invented by the hirelings of the American Government, to rouse the passions of the people and gain over to their side the good wishes of other nations, no British officer stands charged with a crime half so heinous as that recorded to have been committed by the American Major Chappin." It is clear from this passage that James, at any rate, does not attribute the American alliance with the Indians to the desire to render less horrible or cruel the warfare of the red men.

Another reason has been assigned, and we will investigate its probability. We will begin

Lieutenant Eldridge's massacre.

\* In our account of the slaughter of Col. Dudley and his party, we adopted Major Richardson's version of the matter (although bearing more hardly on the British), in preference to James's, in which the affair is thus described—"Colonel Dudley and his detachment were drawn into an ambuscade by a body of Indians, stationed in the woods. Here fell the Colonel and the greater part of his men."‡

\* History of the War

† Sketches of the War.

‡ History of the United States.

§ We carefully employ none but the terms taught us by American writers.