Sitting Bell

A. McG. BEEDE ATTORNEY-AT-LAW FORT YATES, N. D.

Sunday, June 29, 1930

(D-11)

Professor W.S. Campbell:

By good luck I got, for \$5, a couple dass ago, a good second hand copy of "Sitting Bull-Custer". Have been trying to get such copies at \$10 each for a year. There is frequent call for a copy, and, in some cases, willingness to pay as high as \$25. I let.

1 105 Dr. P.G.Cole (A.Schraeder & Son, INC.) 470 Vanderbilt \$ Avenue, \$ Brooklin have my own special copy, with drawings in it on the flyleaves by No-Two-Horns, son of Red Hail (Wasu Luta) ontime a lieutenant of Sitting Bull, and in this copy a part (about two pages) lifted out by the publisher, least with this part in, it might possibly be denied the privilege of mailing. Times have changed since then. You see it is, substantially, the old play as the Sioux themselves used to play it, until playing it was forbidden. The added parts are all such words and phrases and sentience, in substance, as the characters represented as speaking are reported to have used, on various occasions. I "snapped it up" and preserved it—and formulated it to some extent.

On page twenty-nine occurs the following:

"Fool-Mink
(Dancing and singing)
The soldiers dressed in blue are going where campfires in the west are glowing You'll find them tenting full of glee, All"happy hooligans" like me.
You'll hear their spirit bugles blowing By western rivers softly flowing.
You'll find them tenting full of glee, All "happy hooligans" like me."

The margin, on this copy, I have written as follows:

The phrase "happy hooligans" has been criticised. It accurately expresses the Indian thought. Indians believed that when soldiers slayn break loose from the rigid repressive discipline they are under, they become hilarius lawless "roudies", at first, cursing and swearing, and merrily insulting the Flag, the Army & the Government.

I was unable to find-out the origin of this idea.

Indians believed that "strict discipline" continuously was harmful.

(See my "Toward the Sun",pg.109)
Spirits frequently spoke to persons, advising them, but spirits very rarely "materialized" visibly, and what a spirit said was rarely heard by more than one person, i.e. the person addressed."
This is what I have just written in the margin.

In time of special need, and at other times, one rather expected whispered counsel from the spirit of a maternal grandmother or maternal uncle, as well as from some others. It was so much "matter of course" that it was nothing special. No Indians I have known had spiritualist mediums, or considered this sort of common thought as a "religion" in any sense whatever. In the few cases where spirits "materialize" it was never, so far as I know, connected with anything of serious impost, was always connected with something trivial, humorous jocular-though Indians were timid at spirits that "meterialized." So we might "Spiritualists" that it carried no meaning. The they were so fully