

# VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM: |  
BY ORSON S. MURRAY.

"I AM SET FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL."

[PAYABLE WITHIN FOUR MONTHS.]

BRANDON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1842.

VOL. XIV. NO. 31



## POETRY.

For the Telegraph.

"TAKE ME HOME."  
The following lines were suggested by reading the above title, by Dr. Reynell Coates.  
Oh! take me home! my oft-riven heart  
With the changing world's dazzle and art:  
I love it once, but its visions are fled;  
My hours have perished; its hopes are all dead:  
My soul's I've worn, and I've basked in its  
glow—  
I wander alone, by its sunniest streams.  
Take me! Oh! take me home!  
The home of my childhood—the home of my youth,  
Whose voices were music, whose vows were all  
truth—  
I have dreamed of it oft in the far Indian isle,  
When I slept in its shades, where the sweet flowers  
smile;  
I thought that the voices of birds in the air,  
And soft words from home, gently calling me  
there.  
Take me! Oh! take me home.  
Oh! I have loved thee, and must love thee  
still;  
The last tears will start, and my bosom will swell,  
The songs I once loved again fall on my ear,  
My tears return me the friends I'm so dear.  
They are gone! they are gone! and the bright flow-  
ers wave,  
The lone willows sigh o'er their green, grassy  
graves.  
Take me! Oh! take me home.  
I'll wander again where with loved ones I  
stayed,  
The tall, waving oaks, on the fair flow'ry glade;  
I'll visit their graves where the moon beams  
pale,  
I'll see, on the mild evening gale  
The spirits float by me, and oh! 'twill be blest,  
To see my last sigh o'er their place of rest.  
Take me! Oh! take me home!"

world, I have no doubt, but a gun overcharged is not as apt to hit the mark, (4) and when we get on too much steam, we are more apt to burst the boiler. (5)

I conclude where you admit and publish a sentiment in your paper, without comment, you endorse it as your own. If it is not so, you can inform me, for which I will be grateful. (6) If I understand there are some of your views (if you endorse them,) that go to put down all human government, and the ordinances of the gospel too. I will name one or two particulars. The production of old Mrs. Fox of Hardwick, in her lengthy article. She had been a Baptist, and then Congregationalist, but now had renounced all ordinances. (7) Again H. C. Wright, in remarking on his E. Bethel meeting, says, he should not dare to give wine to a reformed drunkard at communion, fearing that by tasting he might return to his former course. This looks to me like straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. It looks as though the balance-wheel was out of order, or the whole machine needed inspecting. (8)

We may not defend ourselves or our families against the murderer, but let him run until he has killed all he wishes to. (9) I heard of a man in Norwich a few months since, that killed his wife, and said if he could kill four more he would be satisfied. (10) Shall he have the opportunity? Perhaps the next might want to kill six. But we must risk consequences and obey God. But we must not go so far as to admit one that God has reformed and renewed by his grace and brought into the church, to obey the express command of Christ, for fear of consequences. The commission of the Savior was, "go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost—teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I command you." And at the institution of the Supper he says—"this do in remembrance of me." Now shall we set them aside, and adopt a system of disorganization? (11) I am aware that there are defects in our government, and let us try to regulate them. (12) I am aware that human laws were made for the lawless and disobedient, and while there are such I wish not to be found in the ranks of those Peter and Jude speak of, despisers of government. I wish you to understand me, brother Murray. I am not a friend to war; and do believe that a small part of the expenses and time that has been employed in promoting war might have bro't about a universal peace. And I humbly hope that some move will be made for a congress of nations to affect this thing, and free trade and human rights be universally regarded, and swords be beat to plowshares, &c. (13)

I am not satisfied with the move for a new Baptist paper, unless there has been more labor with you than I am aware of. And if you can believe me, I have written in love and friendship. And I request you to consider the subject in the light of God's truth, and see if some of the arrows are not beyond you. (14) I don't think it strange at all that after fighting with beasts at Ephesus, your nerves though strong might be a little unstrung. But I trust when the needle comes to settle, it will be north and south again. (15) I am aware that it requires the wisdom of an apostle to keep a straight course, and never lean to error nor decline from truth. Satan has a great many agents, and they are all ready to act their part. At Phillippi a damsel possessed with a spirit of divination, could follow up the apostles and say, "these men are the servants of the most high God, that show unto us the way of salvation." It appears she would have the people understand that the apostles' religion and hers were all one; and she certainly told some truth, and under that guise would have the people believe her witchcraft. But the apostle would not endorse her sentiment, but rebuked the foul spirit, as every faithful servant of Christ should do, when any one attempts to set at naught the commands and ordinances of the gospel.

And now brother Murray, I am far from making a man an offender for a word; and if I know my own heart I desire to justify thee. I wish you to review the subject, and give me a direct answer, whether you

would wish to set aside all human government, while there are murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, &c. in our world; and whether the ordinances of the gospel shall be set aside, and we neglect to reprove and rebuke those that dare to do it.

ELIHU BRONSON.  
Hardwick, April 6, 1842.

P. S. Brother Murray: I am not in the habit of writing; but I tho't brotherly love, manly dealing, and fair play, required that I should give you some of my views. Make what use of this you think proper, and believe me your friend and well wisher.  
E. B.

### NOTES BY THE EDITOR.

(1) It is true that my physical temperament is sanguinary, and that I am fond of muscular exercise. But there are some other things equally true. There are some so delicately constituted—but more so delicately educated—that good, wholesome treatment will throw them into paroxysms and hysterics. I am not now accusing or acquitting brother Bronson. I am making a general remark, to be applied where it is applicable. If I have any time used a beetle where a feather would have done better, others have often used a feather to do a work which can only be done by a beetle. The difference between us then, in these matters, is this:—By such means as I have used, whether they have always been the best or not, I have accomplished something, while they have done nothing. A beetle will brush a fly from a man's nose, effectually—but a feather will never drive an iron wedge into a stubborn oak, or a drill into a flinty rock.

But brother Bronson will allow me to say that I think him not a little mistaken, as to the occasion of the complaints against my use of English. The saying of father Marshall—if I am right as to the very eccentric author of the very strange (to say the least of it) address to the Deity—has been made quite too much of. With all due regard to brother Bronson's head and heart, and feeling averse to assuming anything vainly, I must still be indulged in saying that I think there is sometimes quite as much want of discernment and discrimination on the part of those who look on and see work performed, as there is on the part of those who use the instruments in performing it. I ask what it is that I have been doing, generally, when I have been complained of for severity of language? Have I been engaged about some frivolous work, like brushing a fly from a man's nose, or a spider from his coat? Far otherwise. It has been while I have been engaged in conflict with the overgrown giants and matchless monsters of Intemperance, Slavery, War, Female Oppression, Indian Oppression, Colonization, Licentiousness, Clerical Corruption, &c. &c., that I have been assailed for using too heavy weapons. I believe in adapting language to occasions and purposes. Let those who choose constantly to employ themselves in saying small things, and smooth things, and pretty things, do it, if they must and will. As often as I find occasion thus to employ myself, I shall allow myself to be thus employed. But at present I think the state of the world demands that the greater proportion of my time and energies should be otherwise used. Let those whose nerves and muscles are better adapted to being occupied with flies and butterflies, employ themselves at such business, if they can thus best benefit themselves and mankind. There are enough who will thus employ themselves, at any rate, without my help. I would not despise the day of small things—nor neglect to do small work—nor do it with inappropriate instruments or taste. But I would have the large work done also—and would have such instruments used as will do it. While I would use a feather to brush a fly from a man's nose, I would use Hercules' club in an encounter with the Nemean lion, or the Lernaean hydra. The true state of the case I suppose to be this:—I have employed myself so small a share of the time about things that require the use of the feather, and so large a part of the time about things that require the use of the club or the beetle, that many have from this fallen into the error that I use heavy instruments for doing light work. If careful observation in future does not show it to be so—if it does not appear that when I am found using heavy weapons I am dealing with great and dangerous and deadly foes to human

interests, let me be corrected, and I will receive it patiently and thankfully.

(2) I perceive that brother Bronson has the good sense to use the beetle where it is needed, after all.

(3) The family with which I understand H. C. Wright and others thus to identify themselves, is the human family—the great common brotherhood. This family relation has been generally too lightly esteemed. There has been too much cutting off, and dividing off, and building up separate and conflicting interests. There has been too little of recognizing every being who has an erect countenance, with God's image enstamped upon it, as our brother and fellow. The doctrine that "God hath made of one blood all nations of men," is not as well understood as it ought to be, nor is its worth as well appreciated. If our brother sin, still he is our brother, and should be treated with kindness and affection, and at the same time with faithfulness.

A field opens before me here, that I can not refrain from entering. Those who are first to complain of the harsh treatment dealt out by reformers, are themselves generally the first and last to be guilty of the harshest and most cruel of all the treatment which human beings exercise towards their fellow beings. Its harshness and cruelty take their character from the condition of the victims of them. The severity which reformers use, and which is complained of as a beating and clubbing process, is applied to those who assure to be patterns and leaders in religion and morals, and those who take it upon themselves as much as possible to give direction to human affairs. These are of the same classes with the "Scribes," "Pharisees," and "Lawyers," whom the Savior treated in the same way. They, of all, deserve the severest treatment—because they enjoy the greatest advantages and abuse the greatest privileges. They not only know their Masters will and do it not—but they lead others astray by bad precepts and examples. These are they who complain of the severe treatment they receive from reformers, while they themselves are guilty of ten-fold severity and cruelty, in acts of an entire different character, and altogether unwarrantable, towards those who come under their scourge. The classes who are subjected to their ill treatment are the poor, the ignorant, the unfortunate, the out-cast, the down trodden, the vicious, and the criminal. Now to know whether the severity used by reformers towards those with whom they deal, or the severity of those who complain of reformers, towards the victims of their inhumanity, is the more or the less justifiable, it is proper to compare the course of each with the course pursued by Jesus Christ.

(4) How comes it about that there is so much fluttering and agonizing, if the mark has not been hit pretty effectually? (5) Boiler or no boiler, it strikes me that the ship is under good headway yet. (6) I would not be understood as endorsing all that is allowed a place in the Telegraph, under the signatures of others, without comments of my own. I know of no newspaper publisher who allows himself so to be understood. (7) I hold myself responsible for extending the liberality to allow those who manifest a sincere love for truth and holiness, to speak their own sentiments—whether they be of one denomination or another, or of no denomination. In the case here mentioned by brother Bronson, I was not afraid of being injured myself by the sentiments uttered—or rather of the facts stated—nor that the readers of the Telegraph would be injured. A simple statement was made in the form of a narrative. I do not recollect that any argument was produced, on the point alluded to by brother Bronson. And if there had been, brother Bronson knows the Telegraph is open for him, or any other one to reply if they choose. I suppose brother Bronson will not allow that he fears discussion. And I hope he is not so exclusive and illiberal as not to allow others an opportunity of expressing their sentiments, if they vary somewhat from his own. Truth has nothing to fear, but every thing to hope, from discussion.

(8) Brother Bronson should know that this is a sentiment not peculiar to Henry C. Wright. It is advocated by Edward C. Delavan, and I believe by numerous others.

(9) This is spoken just as though Non-

Resistance gave men permission to kill their fellow beings—or as though it had a tendency to induce manslaughter—when in fact it is the only effectual remedy for manslaughter ever offered to the world!

(10) Where did he learn the lesson, and imbibe the spirit which led him to perpetrate the horrible deed? Did he learn it of Non-Resistants, who teach that human life is inviolable in all possible circumstances, and who practice accordingly? Did he not rather learn it of those who advocate killing under certain circumstances?

(11) The question might here be raised whether any "express command of Christ" is disobeyed by refusing to use fermented wine. I do not understand Henry C. Wright to be opposed to the observance of the commemoration of the Lord's supper, or to have laid it aside for himself. He told me he had not. I have not entered into the discussion of the question as to the nature of the wine used by our Savior, thinking it to be of less importance than some other questions which are agitating, and which I think ought to agitate the religious world. My own conviction is, that a large proportion of the vile compound called wine, used in this country, has not a particle of the juice of the grape in it, and for myself I totally abjure its use under all circumstances.

(12) The greatest defect Non-Resistants complain of in human governments is, that they are founded on the man-slaying power. This principle they would "regulate" out of existence, believing it to be anti-Christian and inhuman.

(13) All the opposition that has been brought against war, or that will be, short of Non-Resistance, will be as ineffectual for its removal, as Colonization has been and will be for the removal of slavery. The congress of nations talked of, while governments continue based on the man-slaying principle, will be a splendid humbug. As much might be expected from a congress of slaveholders, for the suppression of the slave-trade, with a view to the abolishment of slavery, as from nations, whose governments are built on war principles, for the suppression of war. The only remedy for slavery is, the "foolishness of preaching"—such preaching as will convince of the sinfulness of holding property in man, under any possible circumstances. The only remedy for mankilling is the "foolishness of preaching"—such preaching as will convince of the sinfulness of killing men, under any possible circumstances.

(14) So far am I from being offended with brother Bronson, or distrustful of the kindness of his intentions and motives, I love him the better for his faithfulness. I call it faithfulness, because there is manifest sincerity and obedience to conscience on his part. His view is the correct one, as to what was due me before the starting of a new paper. Let me be convicted of error before my readers. The Telegraph has always been open. The truth is, the getters-up of the new paper in opposition to the Telegraph are afraid to undertake to show the errors of the Telegraph, lest their own errors get exposed. So they go about getting up an organ to serve "their interests," right or wrong.

(15) Don't you know, brother Bronson, that deranged persons are hard to be convinced of their derangement? Settled or unsettled, strung or unstrung, let me have your arguments. Do not require me to go in the popular track, merely because it is a popular track. So far as I depart from it, show me that I am wrong, and that the popular track is right. I have endeavored to "stand in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein; and [I have] found rest for [my] soul." The conviction is irresistible with me that the popular guides and teachers have in many things forsaken the "old paths," and the "good way," and that they who run after them in these things will find it to their hurt.

(16) I would have the man-killing power, and every other unchristian usurpation taken out of "human government." That is all. As for the "ordinances of the gospel," I would not have the least departure from what is binding on Christ's followers in regard to them. I consider that there is room for an honest difference of opinion touching them. This is not to be construed as leaning to, or from, any one sect. I think all existing sects have

attached undue comparative importance to their own peculiarities, while they have neglected things more important. There has been too much tithing "mint and anise and cummin," to the omission of "the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith."

P. S. Brother Bronson has acted the manly and Christian part. I respect and love him for it. He asks me to "review the subject." I have already done it often, and will do it again. Will he do the same thing? Let us search the scriptures, my Brother, and see whether these things be so. Let us search our own hearts, too, and see whether they are open to all truth—see whether there is not danger of letting pride of opinion and love of party choke out our love to Christ and to souls. There can be no difficulty between me and any who act the upright part brother Bronson has in this communication. All the difficulty there is, has come from another course of procedure. There are those who, instead of meeting me face to face, like honest men, with a view to convince me, or be convinced, have gone off and raised a "mad-dog" cry against me. What does this argue, but that they shun the light, lest their deeds be reprov'd, and their own errors be exposed? I repeat the charge, and will always hold myself bound to sustain it, that the new paper is got up to prevent too much light, and too much reformation! Whether the people can be so blinded as to be made to believe that it is for their interests to sustain such a thing remains to be seen. Those who will submit to such treatment should shut their mouths against Romanism.

For the Telegraph.  
To whom it may concern—Mistakes Rectified, and Anxieties Alleviated—Baptists in Vermont Diminished 316 in 6 years! 173 in 3 years!

Brother Murray:—Will you be so good as to publish the following table? It may be a relief to the minds of some who sigh over the desolation of Zion. The first two items are from Benedict's History of the Baptists, published in 1812. The rest is taken as it is inserted in the Minutes of the Convention for 9 years past—farther back than that I can not go.

Years	Churches	Ministers	Baptized	Dis. by let.	Abol. let.	Excluded.	Died.	Total	
1790	34	43						1600	
1812	74	49						4807	
1833	123	76						10090	
1834	114		416	201	384	130	87	10167	
1835	133	91	208	248	506	109	108	10447	
1836	135	85	16	724	243	375	86	101582	
1837	136	98	8423	281	439	116	122	10108	
1838	127	75	13	743	246	342	87	94	10209
1839	121	85	25	713	256	362	97	142	10912
1840	135	98	26	864	366	376	97	11101	
1841	138	99	360					11209	

Here stands the statistics of the Baptist denomination in Vermont, for 9 years, as they stand in the Minutes of the Convention. There are many things about it that it is difficult to explain. And altho' there appears to be some irregularities in it, yet it will be perceived that on the whole there has been a regular increase. In 1833 there were 123 churches, 76 ministers, 10090 communicants. In 1841 there were 138 churches, 99 ministers, 11209 communicants. But there are forty churches that have become extinct!! that argues a diminution!!! but, will the reader just cast his eye at the above table? There he will discover that in 1833 there were 123 churches and 10090 communicants. The next year, 114 churches, and 10167 communicants. Again, in 1837 there were 136 churches, and 10108 communicants. In 1839 there were 121 churches, and 10912 communicants. See the difference—15 churches less, and 801 more communicants. But what has become of those 9 churches in the first case, and those 15 in the second? Why, stopt travel! lost their visibility!!! So here you see 24 churches that have lost their visibility in 9 years. Yet the whole number of churches have increased 15, and the number of communicants have increased 1119. So we see that if a church concludes to disband, that is no argument that the members on the whole diminish. Again, the Vermont Association in 1804, numbered 1039. From that, to the time it divided in 1833, there had been 7 churches dismissed to join other Associations—11 had disbanded; and it then numbered 2336 communicants. Thus, in 29 years, it had disposed of 18 churches, and gained 1299 communicants. From this we may see that it is no great cause of alarm that churches disband. Yet we would wish to have them all prosper and thrive, and grow in numbers and graces. I might say much more by way of shewing that there have been many churches that have disbanded, or run down; and go on, and name them, to the amount of 40 in this State; but I conclude it will be needless.

## VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

BRANDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 16, 1842.

For the Vermont Telegraph.

FROM BROTHER BRONSON.

Dear Brother Murray:

I have for some time past had desire to write to you; but have stated on the account of my ignorance. But hoping you may have wisdom to cull from my broken remarks something to learn the state of my views, I proceed.

I have been a reader of the Telegraph since its first publication. When you issued your Prospectus, I was pleased with it. You proposed combat sin in high places, and low places, and all places. I think you have redeemed your pledge. But I am aware that a wise general may be in the choice of his battle ground and mode of attack; and although many conquer he will be liable to loss. I recollect hearing a very many years ago, of an old minister after attending a council where one had been censured, in his prayer he observed—"Lord thou knowest that brother (calling the accused by name,) will take a beetle and brush a fly from a brother's nose, and a feather would do much better." I have thought you was a little too uniform in using the beetle, though you many times lay the stress on to very good advantage. (1)

It is not my intention to name many particulars. A few will give you views. In the case of Brown, missionary, peppering the hams of the Africans, I think you laid the smack on right. And in the case of the protracted meeting and Anti-Slavery lecture at Grafton, I think there was no need even of the feather. I am aware that there is a state of things when the mind and soul are wholly absorbed with a view of one lost condition, that to introduce any other subject, however nearly connected, might be injurious.

With regard to slavery, and your views upon it, and those of H. C. Wright, I have no difficulty with you. I think it as corrupt an institution as there is on earth. But I have thought that after denouncing slavery as a system of theft, robbery, and murder, which I think are the proper names (2) for it, it is a stretch of charity for H. C. W. to say any other person regarding truth and righteousness, in honesty, to call his brethren. It looks like introducing themselves into a bad family.

With regard to your wish to affect the reformation of the church and the