

of the battle, which was uncontradicted. My late publication addressed to you through the *Wisconsin Tribune*, corresponded nearly word for word with my former publication. The late Mr. Matthew G. Fitch, some ten or twelve years since, also published an account of the same battle in the Mineral Point paper, in which he differs in no essential particulars from me. On data such as this, I think there is more reliance to be placed for the truth of history, than on the memory of Mr. Parkinson, which is clearly at fault in the very first fact he states, and much more so in others.

CHARLES BRACKEN.

Walnut Grove, Dec. 30, 1852.

---

FAYETTE, Feb. 5th, 1853.

To Gen. W. R. Smith, State Historian:

SIR:—I regret exceedingly that you should be annoyed with so many communications upon the subject of the battle of the Pekatonica, and particularly when those communications disagree so much as mine and those of Lieutenant Charles Bracken. Mr. Bracken in his last communication, seems to have departed entirely from his request, contained in a note appended to his account of the battle of the Pekatonica, in which he requests any of the survivors to correct any mistakes which he may have made; admitting that, after a lapse of twenty years, he might have made some. But when those mistakes are pointed out, and corrected, he claims, not only to possess a superiority of memory over me, but also that his account was written from data that could, or should be relied upon, more than my memory.

Now, had Mr. Bracken claimed in the start, to have written his account of that affair from such data as he refers to in his last communication, perhaps I should not have presumed to set up my memory in opposition thereto. But, as Mr. Bracken made no such claim, and evidently carried the idea that he had written