

bearing) the initials of Mr. S. was written by him it proves not only the fact that he had intended to use the columns of the Spectator for the purpose of propagating his sectarian principles; but that he was fully aware that the constitution of the Association would not permit it. But not only so, he informs me himself that he had made "a like request" of the Spectator and had been refused; and after stating this to me, he then requires the inexcusable condition that I should obtain, what had been denied to him. Now if the gentleman was sincere in this proposition, he must have entertained a most contemptible opinion of the conductors of the Spectator; for he must have supposed that they were governed by no sort of principle, but by mere whim and caprice, and were totally insensible to the great and solemn duties an editor of a public paper owes to the community. The press is a mighty engine, and whenever a conductor of a public print practices to ignoble and dishonest purposes, and ceases to set a worthy example to society, it is a base betrayal of the trust reposed in him. If the editor of the Spectator had refused a "like request" to Mr. Spalding, upon principle, and had <sup>put in words</sup> granted the same to me, he would have blasted his reputation as an honorable editor in this community. And this is just what he expected and required the editor to do, or else he would not address me at all.

With the fact that the constitution of the Printing Association would not permit the propagation of sectarian principles through the Spectator distinctly in his eye, Mr. S. proposed that he should discuss "the principles of the Christian religion as found in the Bible".

4  
for fear that or could not be enough to exclude the  
conspiration he also proposed to discuss "the  
principles of the American Board for Foreign Mis-  
sions" a purely sectarian establishment, and  
under the control of a sect. What sort of con-  
nection these things could have with the simple  
inquiry whether these men were or were not guilty  
of murder, perhaps no man of an honest heart,  
and a logical mind, can possibly imagine.  
Suppose these men had been upon their trial  
before an honest and impartial jury, who were  
solemnly sworn to try the case according to  
law and evidence; and Mr. J. had been called  
to testify as a witness, and sworn to state "the  
truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth"  
and he then had went on to accuse the defend-  
ants with being "traders in human souls", enemies  
to "freedom of thought", "murderers of Christ and  
cannibals", what would an upright Judge  
have said to him? He would have stamped the  
gentleman at the threshold and said to him "You  
will please sir to state only the facts of this case.  
The religious <sup>opinions</sup> of these men have nothing to do  
with the fact of their guilt or innocence. The  
Constitution of our Country, and the eternal prin-  
ciples of justice allow every man to worship  
Almighty God, ~~as to him~~ in any mode he may  
think right, and it is not the right of this  
Court, or of this government, or of any gov-  
ernment or power on earth to deprive these  
men of that privilege. This Court does not  
sit here to try men for the errors of their reli-  
gion. There is a Higher Power, that will do that.  
If these men are guilty they ought to be punish-  
ed, without any, the least regard to their religion,  
whether they be Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Quakers or Sea

thus, and they are entitled to a fair and impartial trial that the fact may be ascertained whether they are, or are not guilty. We have no use for any discussion here that can only prejudice the jury, and thus make this Court the instrument of vengeance and not of justice, as it should be. I am well & therefore confine myself to a simple statement of facts, leaving out the calumnious opinions of these men, as well as your own."

But Mr. Spalding had no taste for this logical and impartial mode of investigation. There was no room here for prejudice and fanaticism to operate. The neat, clear facts give all that we wanted in this mode. He knew well, if he went into the columns of the Spectator, that he would be confined to facts relevant to the point - that the discussion would be confined to a "history of the massacre", and not be permitted to travel out into the unlimited field of sectarian cantonment. He knew that the discussion would be between himself and myself, and that he would <sup>not</sup> be aided in making "quixotic" charges of murder against others by anonymous subscribers, who shrink back with conscious shame from before the public gaze, behind inflammatory fictitious signatures. All these things the gentleman knew; and he determined not to go there. For this purpose he interposed conditions that he knew would keep the correspondence out of the Spectator.

I cannot but think Mr. Editor, that Mr. S. knew at the time he wrote his letter to me April 11, 1848, that the Oregon American would soon be in operation published; and that he determined not to have the discussion appear in the

6.  
Spectator, for the reasons I have mentioned. If I  
am not mistaken Mr. S. had control of the prin-  
ting material, and that previous to his letter to me,  
you, Mr. Editor, had made arrangements with  
him for the type and press, and other <sup>things</sup> ~~materials~~  
necessary for the publication of a paper. If I  
am mistaken, I will thank the Editor of the  
American to come to me.

When I received the letter of Mr. Spalding, in which he made a proposition so  
entirely strange, and unheard of, I scarcely  
knew what he could intend - whether he was  
determined to escape responsibility, or whether  
he had some other "subtle influence" in view  
I could not so well determine. I was well  
satisfied that the editor of the Spectator  
could not grant the privilege asked, but I  
determined that Mr. S. should have a fair op-  
portunity a second time, to ask the privilege  
of abridging his sectarian doctrines upon the  
readers of the Spectator, and I therefore exhib-  
ited my letter to him, and his in reply to me to the  
Editor of that print and read them to him. In  
my letter to Mr. S. I had only proposed a discus-  
sion of simple facts, and I <sup>proposed</sup> ~~proposed~~ that both  
parties keep copies, so that either could pub-  
lish in his discretion, and thus be secure that  
the whole should go before the community.  
With the contents of both letters before him, the  
Editor of that print refused the publica-  
tion of what was proposed to be a dis-  
cussion of other matters besides a mere  
"history of the massacre" as he was in duty  
bound to do.

I still thought that I might be able to  
induce Mr. S. to do us justice in a case so

7

plain and simple, and therefore addressed him a second letter under date of April 28, 1848, in which I endeavored, in the mildest terms, to show him the impropriety and inutility of so wild a course of discussion as he proposed; and in which I made a most urgent appeal to his candor, to give us his statement; but no appeal to his sense of justice and propriety, could make him change his determination to lug every thing into the discussion that would prejudice the persons about to be tried before the bar of public opinion, for murder. I heard no more from Mr. S. until I saw an extract from my letter in the first No. of the American, which simply contained enough to show that the privilege asked had been refused. This was followed in the second No. with his first production, or first part of his "history," as he is pleased to call it, (though a bad misnomer,) in which he says "The Spectator was refused us, as will be seen from an extract of Mr. Bennett's letter in the last No. of your paper. He was given in the extract for this refusal, are that the Constitution of the Oregon Printing Association cannot admit into the columns of the Spectator, a history of the Waiilatpu Massacre."

Now in the gentleman had <sup>admitted</sup> ~~expressed~~ his that portion of my letter to him, and all his letter to me, which went to show what was asked of the Spectator, what our correspondence was to be about. In his most singular letter to me he expressed his willingness to give the statement; but afterward says "in giving these statements in writing he would prefer to take the course he had taken in his giving them verbally is to lay down the principles of the Christian religion

8  
as found in the Bible, as also the principles of the  
American Board for Foreign Missions." My re-  
marks upon that part of his letter to me, he care-  
fully omitted. I had not stated in my letter to  
him that the Editor had refused to publish a  
"history" of the massacre. I only stated he had  
refused "the privilege asked," and what was that?  
If the reader will turn to the published correspond-  
ence between Mr. S. and myself in the third No. of  
the American, he will see. The refusal was to pub-  
lish a correspondence, ~~about~~ which Mr. Spal-  
ding proposed should embrace two distinct  
things, in no wise relating to each other.

1. A history of the massacre.
2. A discussion of "the principles of the Chris-  
tian religion as found in the Bible."
3. A discussion of the principles of the Amer-  
ican Board for Foreign Missions.

These two distinct things were proposed to  
be included in the ~~necessary~~ discussion by  
the gentleman in his letter to me; and when the  
Editor refused to publish a correspondence  
embracing these matters, Mr. Spalding then  
accused him of refusing to "publish" a his-  
tory of the Wailapsu massacre.

After having thus misrepresented the matter  
and made a false impression upon the minds  
of his readers, the gentleman bursts forth in a  
strain of unmitigated indignation and ex-  
claims "A voice as of successive peals of thun-  
der, will be heard, not many months hence, prob-  
ly all the Eastern mountains from every  
corner of the Protestant world, 'Where were  
forged those chains which are bound around  
the Oregon Press?'"

Now did not the gentleman know the dif-

I  
prince Lutwam a more "history" of the massacre such  
as I had demanded of him to give, and a per-  
fect conglomeration of history, <sup>and</sup> sectarianism,  
~~and prejudices~~ which he proposed to give, and  
had given?

The gentleman in his letter to me had refused  
to make a statement in writing, unless the use of  
the Spectator could be attained, in which to pub-  
lish all our correspondence; and he was very  
certain to propose a discussion of <sup>charges</sup> ~~that~~  
he knew would prevent the publication of the  
discussion; and in the first part of his "histo-  
ry", he says "the reasonableness of this condi-  
tion will be seen at first sight." What ideas  
of justice, <sup>your words</sup> ~~and~~ that gentleman may entertain,  
I cannot tell. Were he, or any other man, un-  
der the sacred garb of a preacher of the gos-  
pel, on the Sabbath day, from the sacred  
desk, to put forth slanders against me, in  
which crimes <sup>should be</sup> ~~was~~ imputed to me from which  
humanity would impulsively recoil, and after  
I should be loaded with infamy until my  
reputation, dearer to me than life, should be  
prostrate on the earth, trailed in the dust,  
torn, tattered and reduced to utter ruin, and  
after he had gazed on in silence and reulta-  
tion at the ruin he himself had made, and  
I should then call upon him to give me  
a fair and candid statement of the grievous  
charges he had brought against me, and to be  
witness in support of them, and he should  
refuse to do so except upon an impossible  
or unreasonable condition, which is equal  
to a flat and positive refusal. I should hard-  
ly know what to say to the mansteans absurd-  
ity and injustice of such a refusal. There are

Some things so utterly unjust, that it requires no argument to prove them so. If a man makes charges against another, whether slanderous or true, I assume it as a self-evident principle, that he is bound by all the rules of pure and holy justice, to inform the injured party what charges he makes against him, and upon what evidence. If he puts himself to the "trouble" to make the charges, he ought to put himself to the trouble to answer them. It may be a very trivial <sup>thing</sup> ~~matter~~, to some to blast the reputations of others; but to the sufferers it is no idle matter.

The Reverend gentleman, in the plenitude of his zeal and charity, has charged certain Catholics, and through them the Catholic Church, with one of the most unnatural, useless, and dismal murders ~~ever~~ <sup>to be</sup> ~~known~~ <sup>found</sup> in the dark and shuddering annals of human crime. He has charged them in substance with "not having the fear of God before their eyes, but being moved ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> seduced by the instigation of the Devil," <sup>that</sup> they with "malice aforethought" urged on a band of infuriated savages, with their murderous tomahawks and deadly rifles, to butcher and slaughter a body of innocent missionaries and immigrants. If the accused are guilty of that heinous crime imputed to them by this gentleman, they exhibited a barbarity and cruelty unparalleled, and for a purpose, and <sup>from</sup> a motive, so inadequate, so unreasonable, and so nauseous, that we must ever remain in utter astonishment that sensible, civilized men, should have committed a deed, unprecedented in brutality, and yet so contemptible in the motive that produced it.

But the gentleman has not only charged them



men with full murder (and God knows that was enough!) but he has sought to overwhelm them with accumulated infamy and reproach; until all men shall think they do but God service, when they shall pursue them with unmitigated vengeance, and ineffable ruin. In the sacred, just, and free constitution and laws of my country, I find the great principles - that no man shall be convicted of a crime until he has had an impartial trial before an impartial jury; and that nothing shall come before that jury but facts, relevant and pertinent to the matter, not resting upon mere hearsay and idle report, and not calculated to produce prejudice and in the jury. If the people of a county are prejudiced against the individual, so to do is the law of his rights that it grants him a change of venue to another county, where the cause does not exist. Every jurymen is asked if he has formed an opinion or expressed an opinion; and if he says yes, as it can be proved by other testimony, he is invariably rejected. The law is the accumulated wisdom of ages; and well does it know the overwhelming influence of prejudice on the human mind.

But these just and noble principles are not to be found in the sweet spirit of charitable Christianity, in the opinion of Mr. Spalding, if we judge his opinions by his acts. There is no such sickly tenderness in that mild system; no such squeamishness. It will do very well in the law of the land, but it is not required in that more perfect system. There was a time when Christianity had cause to suffer from unexamined prejudice - when the prejudiced Jews "stapped

their ears and ran upon" the martyr Stephen "with  
 an accaid" and now it would seem, from the  
 quillman's acts, that Christianity must revenge  
 itself upon a thus, by turning against them the  
 same prejudices that oppressed it in the begin-  
 ning. Perhaps so, this is right.

I have known many quivians charges made  
 against men; but I have never, I believe, known  
 a man charged with murder, and then with any  
 thing else, by the same man. To charge a man  
 with this great crime against Nature and Na-  
 ture's God, most usually satisfies even the  
 most vindictive appetite for vengeance, <sup>even</sup> those  
 men who have been <sup>are</sup> accustomed to jud <sup>and</sup> gatten,  
 feast and gloat upon the ruined reputations  
 of their victims, <sup>do</sup> did not usually charge them  
 with a complication of crimes, until the poor  
 victims are <sup>are</sup> utterly confused with the language-  
 means and cammingled heaps of <sup>evil</sup> crimes <sup>plac-</sup>  
 ed upon them. It is in the power of ingeni-  
 ous malice, whitted by prejudice, to make so  
 many, and so gross charges against a man,  
 until the individual <sup>is</sup> <sup>implicated</sup> <sup>is</sup> utterly astonished  
 and confused with such a strange medley  
 of accusations.

You see, Mr. Spalding has not only chan-  
 ged the Catholics with murder, but he has chan-  
 ged them with "forging the chains that bind the  
 Oregon Peiss," with being "traders in human souls"  
 with "giving the world the dark ages," with "ea-  
 ting out the vitals of Spain, Italy, the South-  
 American Republics, and Mexico" - with now  
 "labouring incessantly in every active state, but espe-  
 cially in our beloved United States, to forge the  
 chains and weave the winding sheets for the no-  
 blest richest inheritance of man Freedom of

13

Thought, with being with the "murders of Christ and  
Cannibals, or base decesses" and what else thou-  
du will see by inspecting <sup>reputably</sup> ~~his~~ "murders". And so  
predetermined is Mr. Spalding to sustain his charges,  
and to convert his gallow Christians of murder, that  
like a mad dog, with his jaws distended, and  
his eyes gleaming vengeance, he snaps at every  
thing that comes in his way, friends as far. Because  
the Printing Association adopted a rule to exclude  
sectarian productions, although a majority, an  
overwhelming majority, are Protestants, he accuses  
them with having been "enticed by these subtle  
influences which" &c. and this was "unfortunate for  
the interests of Oregon." It was most "unfortunate"  
indeed that there were no men of such suspicious  
keen wit, as the renowned gentlemen, in Oregon  
City! How very unfortunate that he was a-  
mong the Indians, a glauca compelled to "waste  
its sweetness on the desert air", and that here in  
this benighted region of Oregon, where his talents  
could have been appreciated, and he could have  
done so much more good here, than he did a-  
mong the Indians. The silly members of the asso-  
ciation reasoned in this way - that our community  
was small, without protection, that union was  
necessary among us, and that as there was but  
one paper, to permit it to become the vehicle  
of sectarian doctrines, or of party parties, it  
would not contain one half the matter offered,  
and this would lead to its ruin. The paper was  
published once in two weeks, and could not con-  
tain one tenth part of the matter that would  
have been offered. Several intelligences would  
have been excluded, and nothing gained in the pa-  
per but sectarian squabbles.

But it was necessary to make an incendi-

any outcry against the impudent Catholics, and even to accuse them, with this most "subtle influence" of saying "Chains for the Organ Press"; and as the Association was composed of so great a majority of Protestants, as gentlemen of no religion, to make good the charge, it was necessary to represent them as a pack of soft simplicitans, easily gulled by "subtle influences," so very airy that they could not be seen, felt, heard, or dreamed of, until it was utterly too late. "Subtle influences"! Mr. Editor I have often observed that as the last refuge of discomfited slander, when the slanderer could put his tongue upon no act, when he could prove no tangible thing done, as the last shift, the very last retreat he would say that the person accused, had done this thing by "subtle influences," a phrase in which you may charge a man with any and every thing; and when called upon to prove the facts, it can be said he is too sly, too subtle for me to catch him. An innocent man, would certainly be too subtle. If men are so excessively sly, like airy spirits, so that they can do every thing, and yet speak to no one, never expose themselves, dissolve into thin air, evaporate, vanish, and flit from place to place, without leaving a trace behind, how does it happen that these gloomy and suspicious persons find out the only ones that find out these things? I cannot but think <sup>that</sup> a small spice of prejudice, with an occasional bit of malice, makes this class of men wiser than others.

And all these accumulated, and still accumulating charges are made against these men, for the pure, holy, and just purpose, that they shall have before this community, a

perfectly impartial trial - that there may be no prejudice excited against them, - no innuendo, - no bad blood and that as they are charged with such a complicated batch of crimes, if they do succeed in clearing ~~the~~ acquitting themselves of the charges, they must inevitably come off the cleanest men on earth.

But how shall these men, doomed as they are, defend themselves against this stupendous mass of prejudice and obloquy? Ah! the waves of the raging sea, one charge succeeds another. It is not enough to accuse them of murder; but it is necessary to accuse them of all sorts of inhumanities, that peradventure, if the ~~learned~~ <sup>purveyor</sup> gentleman should fail, after all his prejudiced efforts, to convict them of murder, he may at least have the poor consolation of convicting them of "Cannibalism", or ~~of some other religious error~~.

In the Court of Judge Lynch, whatever justice is obtained there is administered with all promptness. It does not require either much time, or much evidence. Most usually the case is determined out of doors, in the absence of the accused. But even in that Court there is some show of justice at least. The defendant is usually heard; and some testimony is usually required for decency's sake; and although Madam Ruman, with

16.

he ten thousand lying tongues is admitted as a  
competent witness, yet the lying jade will sometimes  
by mere accident, tell the truth, and justice. But it is  
not so in the court of his Honor, Judge Preju-  
dice. No testimony is there required. It is only necessa-  
ry that the victim be suspected of being sus-  
pected, and that the charge be made. If the charge  
be of a trifling matter, his Honor can not trouble  
himself about it - he lets it pass. But the more man-  
strous, unreasonable, confused, and impracticable,  
and unnatural the crime charged, the more certain  
is the conviction. His Honor only asks the prosecu-  
tor what he has to say; and the moment the de-  
fendant denies the charge, his Honor springs with  
electric rapidity from his gory seat, his hair  
arises, like the hair of furious, his countenance  
~~glowing~~ <sup>glaring</sup> with implacable hatred, and his eyes  
glaring with fiery indignation, and he screams  
out with <sup>"a"</sup> ~~the~~ voice as of successive peals of  
thunder - "away with him! away with him!  
Crucify him! Crucify him!"

Now I say it fearless of contradiction,  
that the voracious gulletman, from the beginning, has  
sought to <sup>create</sup> prejudice in the minds of those who  
were to try these men - that he has availed himself  
of every means in his power to turn the religious  
prejudices of the community against them - that  
he has addressed his arguments to

17

ignorance and prejudice - and that for this purpose he has mantrously misrepresented the Catholic Faith, and if he has not done more to create ~~of~~ prejudice against them, it was for want of sense. Now are we to defend ourselves under such circumstances? Is there any security for innocence at all?

It is most fortunate that kind Providence has so constituted man, that the greedy monster called <sup>always</sup> prejudice <sub>and</sub> <sup>always</sup> <sub>and</sub> dares the matter. He is no friend to half way measures - to doing business by peace meal - and in his fanatical and infuriated anxiety to avow his victims at one fell swoop, he dares too much - the sinister motive traps out - and the whole design stands exposed to the observation of the community.

Now Mr. Spalding in his bitter religious persecution of the Catholics is behind the liberal and unlighted <sup>spirit of the</sup> age in which he lives, and especially that of his own country. He has been so long among Indians, excluded from intercourse with the civilized world, and only accustomed to read bitter sectarian publications, against us;

18. that he is ignorant of what passes in the big  
magisterial world, outside the narrow circle in which  
he has moved. In the United States and in Europe, gener-  
ally the most liberal and charitable state of feel-  
ing exists between our Protestant brethren and  
ourselves. The parties are true crying by charitable  
and generous appeals to man's reason and judg-  
ment, to decide their religious differences. It is  
well known that the present Pope is at the head  
of the liberal party movement in Europe. Before  
the Revolution in France took place, the Pope  
had called a meeting of a number of theologians  
and asked their opinions, whether he could  
give his subjects a liberal constitution without  
any ~~infringe~~ detriment to his spiritual author-  
ity, and they unanimously replied that he could.  
I take from <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>late</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>issues</sup> of the *Salvatorian*, a Protestant paper  
published at the Sandwich Island the follow-  
ing articles.

"The festival of the landing of the Pilgrims was  
celebrated on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of December. An address  
was delivered, and afterwards a famous dinner  
eaten - such as the Pilgrims themselves never taste-  
ed. All manner of grandeur were present; a-  
mong the rest Bishop Huggins of the Romish  
Church. I am sorry now truly, that he should



join in a Puritan festival, and use to make of  
a speech, in reply to a toast in honor of Pope Pius  
IX.

A public meeting was held in New York Nov. 19th  
to express sympathy with Pope Pius IX in his suc-  
cessful stand against Austrian despo-  
tism. The Mayor occupied the chair. An address  
was prepared to His Holiness, the meeting was ad-  
dressed by P. S. Butler and others and the follow-  
ing resolution was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That "peace hath her victories no less re-  
nowned than war" and that the noble attitude  
of Pius IX., throwing the vast influence of the Pon-  
tificate into the scale of well-attempted freedom,  
standing as the advocate of peaceful progress, the  
promoter at once of social melioration, in-  
dustrial development and pacifical reform, unmov-  
ed by the parade of hostile armies having on  
his banners, hopeful for man and trusting in God,  
is the grandest spectacle of our day, full of  
incorruptment and promise to Europe, more grate-  
ful to us, and more glorious to himself, than tri-  
umphs on a hundred fields of battle."

Now will not Mr. Spalding see, that he has  
missed the figure. No doubt with some bitter secta-  
rian press in the States, the state of feeling has not  
changed, but among the availing mass of  
our fellow citizens, the most liberal and enlightened  
state of feeling exists. This is not the age of reli-

grow bitterness and persecution. All factors know  
 that the genuine and true interest of every man is  
 to know the truth and that to know the truth, is to  
 put aside prejudice and examine impartially.  
 The man who addresses his arguments to ignor-  
 ance and prejudice, will ruin his own cause  
 and I venture the assertion, that the Reverend gentle-  
 man will find that out, in the end. So he con-

John A. Burnett.