

Killing Indians.

In an article in our issue of the 12th inst., we mentioned the circumstance of the killing of some Indians on Eel River, among whom were a squaw and child. We condemned the shooting and animadverted in pretty strong terms on a certain class of men in this county, known as "squaw men." Three of the party charged with the killing of these Indians are now waiting their trial on an indictment for murder, which prevents us from following this particular subject any farther, or from expressing any opinion, or making any remarks calculated to effect public sentiment in regard to the guilt or innocence of the men. We would not at all refer to this matter, pending the legal investigation of the subject, had there not been a studied effort on the part of certain "squaw men," to create an erroneous and false impression in regard to the general tenor of the article in question. The parties feeling themselves aggrieved by our blast at "white diggers," have endeavored to create an opinion that the article of which we write was intended as a general tirade against all men who have in any manner, or under any circumstances, been engaged in killing Indians. We cannot understand how any man of common reason, after having read the article could draw any such conclusions. It had no reference, whatever, to killing Indians, any farther than this particular case was concerned, neither was it intended to effect, or touch, any class of men other than the one to whom we particularly referred. With reference to them, we entertain the same opinion now as then.

It is well known to all acquainted with our views concerning Indians that we are in favor of killing them when they have committed any depredations. Past experience, has clearly demonstrated the fact that U. S. troops

It is well known to all acquainted with our views concerning Indians that we are in favor of *killing them* when they have committed any depredations. Past experience, has clearly demonstrated the fact that U. S. troops and Indian Agents are of no avail in keeping Indians under subjection, and suppressing difficulties. They are sent into our country for the purpose of keeping the savages in peaceful bounds, and defending our frontier from their depredations. The intention is laudable on the part of our Government, and we have every respect for those whose duty it is to afford us protection; but we have seen enough of Indian troubles in this section to convince us that neither troops nor agents can catch guilty Indians, and they dare not punish others.

Our mode of warfare with Indians is, to pay them off in their own coin. If they murder a white man without cause, kill ten Indians for it. Let them understand that we will be governed by the same mode of revenge as themselves, and depredations will then cease.

On the other hand, Indians should have reciprocal protection by the whites. We do not grant that any man is entitled to the privilege of misusing or abusing Indians, or their squaws. Thereby difficulties are created and the lives of other men endangered. The lowest, *trilling*, vagabond in the country may cause trouble with the Indians, and then if everybody does not turn out to kill off a lot of them, the hue and cry is raised that people think more of Indians than whites. Indians are human beings if they are savages. They form a portion of the great human family, and before the rapid march of civilization cast its turbid shadows among them, lived in peace and harmony. Nature has so constituted them as to respect and venerate the homes of their fathers, and cherish their domestic institutions; and crimes which are severely punished among themselves when committed by one of their own tribe, should not be allowed to go unpunished when committed by white men.

We have written this article to set ourself right before this community, many of whom have had occasion to engage in hunting Indians, and whom we do not wish to see drawn in with the class spoken of two weeks since.

