


2-

to an up-and-at-'em style of fighting, and he had to do the best he could with what he had to do with. Usually, his system was to advance a mounted skirmish-line in front and throw the weight of his charge against a flank or against some section of the line that looked weak. It was the only arrangement that could possibly have worked, but he was up against an impossible set of conditions. Cavalry, no matter how good it is, can not lick unbroken infantry in position.

For my statement that the Plains Indians always attacked mounted and always got beaten off, I have principally first-hand information. One of my near relatives was an emigrant-train pilot across the Plains through the '60s and early '70s. He said so, orally and in writing, a good many times, and he developed from it a rather interesting theory about Indian psychology with which I forbear to burden this document. Also, the reminiscences of soldiers who weren't writing to induce the War Department to ship out a better class of troops, but simply telling what they'd seen, are in some instances at least to the same effect. One is Captain E. V. Sumner, who wrote about Indian campaigns in several magazines of the early '70s, and so far as I know would have had no reason to represent his profession as any easier than it was.

I've read Mr. Grinnell's excellent studies of the Cheyennes. Yours I'm sorry to say I haven't, but I surely and uncontroversially will as soon as I get where they're available. And many thanks.

Sincerely,


H. L. Davis