

are classified by anthropologists as belonging to the white race. In any case in my book (where whites are opposed to Indians) Frabk must fall under the head of whites-for practical purposes. This is explained in my book.

I have seen a lot of buffalo hide lodges in old photographs, and have handled five of them myself, in the Field Museum, the American Museum of Natural History, and abroad. None that I know showed traces of smoke-tanning. One- a Cheyenne lodge- was certainly not smoked, for it had never been used except for state occasions, and never had a fire in it. The photographs show the new lodges invariably white, unless painted. The same was true of the Cheyenne lodge in the Field Museum. When a new lodge was put up, it was sometimes the custom to close the smoke-hole and build a mudge inside (as described by Grinnell in his article on Blackfoot Lodges, I believe) but this was done, as I remember, for good luck, and not to cure the skins. But, granting that all lodges were smoked like hams, they were white when new, for they were painted with white clay.

It is true that Indians did not often ride mules, but they were eager to get them for packing purposes. Sitting Bull captured a number from white men and other Indians at different times, and some he gave to his favorite sister. He would not have done this had she not valued ~~the~~ mules. As to cottonwood bark forage, it is certainly true that Indians could not have fed all their stock on such forage; that is why they lost so many head. As to the mild winters of Montana, I would like to quote Viljalmur Steffansson, the Arctic explorer, who ~~stated~~ stated in my hearing that he had never found any weather in the Arctic equal to the cold of his boyhood winters in Montana. Plenty of horses froze standing, and in some winters even buffalo. One winter, as the Historical Society of North Dakota reports, the horns of cattle burst with the cold. ~~Horses paw~~ Horses paw through snow for grass, of course; buffalo, however, shoved it away with their noses; old hunters tell how the crust used to be marked with blood where buffalo had been rooting.

I had no intention of suggesting that the Sioux (only half of whom had guns) were the equal of Sergeant York or Yellowstone Kelly as marksmen. All I say is that they were better horsemen and shots than the soldiers. ~~The~~ ~~most~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~marks~~ ~~men~~ ~~and~~ ~~soldiers~~ ~~and~~ ~~marks~~ ~~men~~ A host of officers have made public statement to this effect; if Mr. Wells cares to read a dandy book by P.E. Byrne "Soldiers of the Plains", he will find all these statements gathered together for his information. Considering the kind of guns and ammunition the Sioux owned, they were remarkable shots, and better horsemen. In Finerty's Warpath and Bivouac (another dandy volume) Mr. Wells will find the statement of Major Walsh, of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, declaring that Sitting Bull's Sioux were far superior in both respects to the best cavalry regiments of England. Walsh knew the British Army well. There were many rookies in the Army on the Plains, owing to the huge number of desertions in those days, men who had had very little training. The Sioux were all veterans, who had been fighting and riding all their lives. And when Custer wanted to fight his men, he had to dismount them; they couldn't hit anything from the saddle, whereas the Sioux made a living by shooting buffalo from the saddle.

As to the number of rounds fired when Sitting Bull was killed. The four thousand(?) rounds expended by the Police were not all fired in hand-to-hand fighting ~~in the dark~~. Most of it was fired from cover after the two parties separated. And the first part of that fight was in the dark, and unexpected. At that, either the money spent on lead by Uncle Sam's Army is largely wasted, or that was mighty good shooting. In warfare a soldier could not begin to carry the lead that is required to kill him. Yet we have as good soldiers as anybody. Better, when it comes to rifle-fire.

the

Before one brands Indians as cowards, one must know why he decided to fight or run away. The motives of white men and Indians are entirely different. Only one white officer I know of fought like the Sioux chief- T.E. Lawrence (See Revolt in the Desert). He usually went into battle with the understanding that there were to be "no casualties." He--and Sitting Bull-- were not hard-boiled enough to send a pal to his death for the sake of a "victory."