

sermons says no class of men have opposed and retarded the cause so much as clergymen. Don't then let people look to them as leaders in every good work.

To be continued.

VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

Brandon, Wednesday, Sept. 27, 1843.

The next paper, which will close the volume, will probably be mailed some days later in the week than the usual time, on account of the extra labor in getting out a larger edition than usual, as well as on some other accounts unnecessary to mention.

MY EDITORIAL BROTHEREN.

It has been my design to notice several things pending between them and me, before the close of the volume. But the matter has hitherto been deferred by what I have deemed more important to be attended to first. And I shall now probably fail of finding time and space for them. I will mention several of them here, by name, that they may not think they have been overlooked, and that they may not attribute my course towards them to any other than the real causes. My anxiety to correct the misdoings of other editors and writers towards myself, has been continually abating, for a long time past. I am happy in having discussion, where I can find fairness, fidelity and honesty. But those who have nothing to do but to defend what they are committed to, on the principle that the end justifies the means, can not be too soon or too severely let alone.

The Vermont (Congregational) Chronicle, had a paragraph, some weeks since, which was promptly copied into the Vermont (Baptist) Observer. The emanation was worthy of the source and befiting the receptacle.

The Perfectionist, (organ of John H. Noyes Perfectionism) has pretty constantly for some time, been doing such things as might be expected from a book-worshipper. It has garbled my articles, and accused the Telegraph before its readers, without giving them any fair opportunity to know the truth or falsity of its charges. It pretends to have convicted me of an error in regard to the treatment of the female Midianites by the Israelites, and then tells its readers that I have not been manly or just enough to make the correction. I deny the conviction, and reaffirm the entire accuracy of my position in the case. Those who are willing to do it, are invited to compare my remarks in the Telegraph with those parts of the book to which they allude, and thus satisfy themselves.

The Universalist Watchman has its sect to serve. Its Editor is fidgety at being transcended by others in liberality. He has his limits, as much as any other sectarian. He attacks the Telegraph from time to time, and then refuses it a showing for itself before his readers. Notwithstanding his great want of justice and fairness on this score, it has been my intention to copy at length more of his productions, to show what a man of his professions will allow himself to be driven to. But the space to be spared is not now left. His first attack that I noticed was upon my article in which I labored to show that Rewards and Punishments are bribery and corruption. It was manifest from the outset, and has been all the way through, that what he had to do in the case was to keep up appearances with the other sects. His work, in this respect, is of a piece with the Universalist Revivals recently started in Massachusetts, and the Universalist prayer meetings, conference meetings, sabbath schools, baptisms, and so on, in Vermont and elsewhere. It is all a heartless sham, to show-off by the side of the other rotten religions. Universalists have no confidence in any of this superficial stuff. In relation to rewards and punishments, Eli Ballou agrees with me. He holds on upon a use of words which is an abuse of language, to escape the odium of infidelity from the orthodox. He has himself confessed that the difference in the matter between him and me, all consists in the different use of a word. He clings pertinaciously to one half of the subject, determined not to have the other brought before his readers. In fact he has refused to have my views in my own language, come before them at all. But, what is still more cowardly and unbecoming one of his pretensions, he refuses to give his own opinions to his readers for himself, on one half of the subject. I spoke of Rewards and Punishments. He pretended to take me up on rewards and punishments, as they pertain to the future or ideal world. I said nothing about any distinction between one

world and another—nothing about rewards and punishments in one world more than another. I spoke of Rewards and Punishments. He, in pretending to oppose me—singular as it may seem from a Universalist—went into support of future rewards and punishments. And I know not but he designed to embrace what he would call God's punishments in the present world. He was so vague, indirect, and indefinite, that it was exceedingly difficult to know what he did design to embrace. It was manifest he did not know for himself what he did want to embrace or include. What he did not want to meddle with, was more clear and certain. He did not want to come in contact with existing popular institutions. In my article against rewards and punishments, it was not my design or desire to get into controversy with any one, nor to avoid it. My object was to expose what I deemed to be a great and mischievous error in the world. Seeing the course of the Watchman and the cunning of its Editor, in his fearfulness to offend with wholesome truth faithfully spoken, I put him four questions, to draw him out, and constrain him to define his position before his readers, or refuse to do it. I had discarded rewards and punishments. He had pretended to meet me and support them. I had put fire and brimstone, cannons, bomb-shells, bastiles, guillotines, bludgeons and swords all down in one family. He, in pretending to meet me, had carefully avoided committing himself before his readers, in regard to punishments inflicted by men. He had spoken of punishment as effect following cause. If he had allowed his readers to see my articles, so that they could judge for themselves, I should have been better satisfied, and been willing to let the matter rest with fewer words. But he would not do it. It would not answer his purpose. To let his readers see my articles would be as if the priesthood should allow the people to know and judge for themselves. It is the business of the priesthood to keep knowledge from the people. And he, as a priest, was bound, of course, not to let his readers know what he was talking about. I am not now speaking of Eli Ballou as a man. I am speaking of Eli Ballou as an editor and a priest. Seeing his position, and his determination to keep his readers from knowing what his position was, I resolved to draw or drive him out before them, and so propounded him the following questions:— 1. Does he hold all to be wrong in Rewards and Punishments, in the universe, beyond what comes in the nature of the case necessarily from the violation of natural law, as effect following cause? 2. Does he believe that the Bible teachings on this subject generally sustain such a view? 3. Does he believe that human governments proceed on any such view, or are any such thing? 4. Would he have any other human government than what would be consistent with such views and principles? The former two of these questions he made some evasive remarks upon. But gave no answer to them. No one could know his position in regard to them. Whether he wished to have it known, it is not for me to say. I more think, however—and this is the more charitable view—that he is wanting in courage to think on the subject far enough to form an opinion for himself, and more wanting in courage to express an opinion if he had formed one. I am led to this view from his treatment of the latter two of these questions, the 3d and the 4th. He says of them:—"We shall not answer Mr. Murray's 3d and 4th questions, because, we do not wish, at present, to have any controversy with him on the right or expediency of human governments. We have not sufficiently progressed in our investigation of that subject to have any fixed or settled opinions about it." Judge ye whether my opinion, as to his want of courage, is well founded. As for his "not wanting any controversy" with me on the subject, it will be recollected that the attack was commenced on his own part, in the shape of an attempted defense of rewards and punishments. Did he commence that attack not knowing what he was about? It would appear that he did. Probably he thought I would descend with him into the common mazes and marsh-pools of theology. He had been accustomed to deal with those on less liberal ground than himself. Why then could he not know and see that if he commenced a controversy with one on more liberal ground than his own, he would be in the same attitude towards that one, that those less liberal than himself occupy towards him? Did he think that he, a sectarian priest, had got to the Ultima Thule of liberality? What then

must be his views of human progress? Be this as it may, it is manifest that he is chained and walled within exceedingly narrow limits. Poor fettered victim of popular church and state tyranny! I know how to pity him. I have been there myself. Henceforth, whoever hears the clanking of the chains that I have worn, of that description, let it be known that I am trampling on them, and not wearing them. I exhort brother Ballou to make the trial, and say which is the better music to his ears—the clanking of chains on his limbs, or the clanking of chains under his feet! Think of the weightiness of the terrible tyranny that must have borne a man down, that, up to the age of 40 or above, he has "not sufficiently progressed in his investigation of the subject," as to "the right or expediency of human governments," "to have any fixed or settled opinions about it!" And all this from a teacher of Bible doctrines! What must the man have been about? The very expression shows that he was exceedingly straightened when he made it. Did he know what he was about? Has he yet considered what he said? What? In doubt, in suspense, in the dark, as to the right or expediency of human governments? And this from a priest of a church and state religion—one of the principal conservators of human government? But I suspect he has not always been on this ground. I cannot believe he has always been in doubt on the subject? I have a better opinion of him than that. He speaks of investigation and progression in the matter. Says he "not sufficiently progressed in his investigation of the subject to have any fixed or settled opinions about it." From all this it is plain that he has been thinking on the subject. His mind is unsettled. That is certainly favorable, provided he is continuing the investigation. It is not controversy with him that I want. Should be glad of evidence that he is pursuing the inquiry. He will do as it pleases him about answering the questions. They were not put to him dictatorially, or obtrusively. They were drawn forth by his own chosen course. Notwithstanding he has been so much under the influence of party interests in what he has done in the case, I trust it will not be without advantage to him. He will come out right, if he has the courage to allow himself to think, and to act accordingly.

I have occupied many times the space intended for this subject when I began, and must pass. The next and last paper I shall now notice is the Investigator, [Infidel.] Its Editor has more candor, courage and fidelity than any of the religious editors. But he has done what I did not expect of him. Unless I misjudge, he shrinks from the fair and honorable thing. He commenced by throwing out a "Nut for Non-Resistants," as he called it. I cracked it—or tho't I did. He then told his readers, a week beforehand, that he had another for me on the following week—and moreover said, "we feel pretty certain he can not crack it in any other way than we crack it. I believe, he is not the sensible man we take him for." This was the most wanting in candor and liberality—the nearest to intolerance and bigotry, of any thing I had discovered in him. To say, if you can take a different view or have a different opinion from me, in regard to a certain piece of human conduct, you are not the sensible man I took you for, would have sounded more fittingly to me in the mouth of a narrow minded, unthinking priest of some sectarian religion, than in the mouth of one who had otherwise shown himself so liberal and charitable as had the Editor of the Investigator. It did really savor too much of arrogance and presumption. But I suffered it to pass, with a bare notice, sufficient to show that it was not overlooked—thinking that it might have been dropped without consideration as to its whole import. The next week he was as good as his promise in producing the case. And really, I found no difficulty in making such a disposal of it as I was willing to have judged of. Now after all this, what was to be expected of the Editor of the Investigator? After calling in question in advance, before his readers, the good sense of the one who could dispose of the case which he could bring, differently from what he could dispose of it, what ought to be expected of him less than that he would lay before his readers the disposal made of it by the one for whose attention he had prepared and produced it? Self moved, so far as any thing appeared to me, he prepared a subject for my consideration, and laid it before his readers, where he had previously called my attention to it in a tone of much

confidence, to say the least. I gave it kind and candid attention, and expected of course he would let his readers see what I had done. In the next Investigator the following notice appeared:—"We intended to offer some remarks in to-day's paper, in reply to the article on 'Non-Resistance,' in the last Telegraph, in which our position that it is right to use force in protecting the innocent is disputed; but not having had time to prepare such an answer as is due to the importance of the subject and the ability of our respected opponent, we are obliged, very reluctantly, to defer our arguments upon the question until next week." Now after all this, I must say I was not a little surprised and disappointed when the Investigator came, the next week, with remarks upon my article, but my article suppressed. It did not look to me like magnanimity, fairness or justice. Perhaps I misjudge. I would not accuse, find fault, or complain.

I would suggest to all these editorial friends that, as I view it, a good cause would require of them a different course. If they believe in human progress, and would promote it, they must themselves cut loose from their creeds, their standards, their stakes, throw off their chains, and travel on. For the Universalists to travel on a single step beyond the less liberal sects, and then stop, take their position, chain themselves to their post, and wall themselves about, is not the thing. So of those who call themselves, and have been called Infidels. For them to find a place somewhere above and beyond the Universalists, as well as the other sects, and then stop to defend dogmas and build up a party, is not the thing. I have heard of an old man, a Universalist, in the town of Woodstock, who rejects the Copernican system of astronomy, which makes the world round and to turn on an axis, because if he is to receive this view of things, he says it will compel him to give up the idea that the Bible is a sufficient source of wisdom to be taken for man's infallible guide. Such a view, he says clashes with the Bible. He is no doubt a man of sight. Such a view does clash with the idea that those who gave the Bible account of the creation were competent teachers for all future generations. Nothing can be more manifest to the unsophisticated, discerning mind, than that the Bible recorders of what they call the beginning of things, wrote down only traditions and opinions of that matter, without being in possession of the facts. Many things there stated can no more be reconciled with geology than others can with astronomy. What then? Are the demonstrated truths of astronomy and geology to be set aside by the authorities of books written by those who were ignorant of these truths? My commendation of the old man's sight should be understood as having reference to a single point. He may also be a man of discernment and judgement in many other things. But there is a great matter here where he comes sadly short, at least in making estimates of the comparative worth of things. To reject a demonstrated truth because its reception would displace and remove a received opinion, shows that the sight is not comprehensive, and that on the whole comparison and judgement are wanting. It is not for me to say that my editorial brethren are holding on upon opinions against facts, on account merely of what has transpired between them and me. But the case of the old man alluded to, does, in my own view very accurately illustrate the position of sectarians and partyists generally, who employ themselves in the defense of creeds, dogmas and opinions upon which they have established themselves with stakes, chains and walls. And I submit to the Editors of the Watchman and the Investigator whether their course in condescending before their readers the views advocated in the Telegraph, and then shutting away from their readers, under such circumstances as they have, the arguments produced in the Telegraph to sustain its views, does not leave them justly liable to the suspicion, at least, that they are holding to former opinions against present convictions, as the old man holds to opinions against facts. If the room and time can possibly be afforded, next week, the article in the Investigator will be copied and reviewed. The greater general candor and liberality of that paper, makes it more worthy of attention, although it should sometimes fail to be fair and just, than those perfectly bigoted things that are hired and sold out to do all manner of illiberal and ungenerous work. In the mean time, the attention of the Editor of the Investigator is invited to my remarks following a communication from Bartholomew Sommer, to be found on the fourth page of this paper.

THE REGENERATOR.

The communication below contains much that is timely, in the shape of suggestion. It is to be hoped that the friends of the enterprise will take the things suggested into consideration. Calls have been so numerous, from various quarters, for the Prospectus of the Regenerator, that the numbers containing it are about exhausted. I shall therefore publish another prospectus, in the last number of the Telegraph, next week, and have a large edition of that paper entire, to be sent to order, throughout the country. I shall take the liberty to forward quantities to some of those friends who I think will deem it a privilege to receive them and with them make efforts to obtain subscribers for the Regenerator. Will others forward their orders? And will all the friends of Freedom and Regeneration, go about the work immediately, and do something—that the world may have one free paper in it? How many are willing to hazard anything of reputation, and bestow some little labor for such a work?—There are hundreds, if not thousands now snatching up the Telegraph and reading it, wherever it is to be found, who dare not patronize it, on account of the unpopularity of the truths it sets forth. The evidence is abundant that there are many who read it with eagerness, and would rejoice to see its principles prevail, but at the same time have not the courage and strength to identify themselves with the principles so far as to give the paper their patronage and aid in the extension of its circulation. The odium is heavier than they feel able to bear. I would not be severe upon such. Should be gratified and happy to see them gaining strength and standing up in the dignity, excellence and might of manhood. Let it be borne in mind that the present is seed time. Effective labor therefore is very precious. Whoever sees the need of it, and withholds, may live to see that a sad error has been committed. While whoever bestows it seasonably, may yet have the happiness to see an abundant harvest of good.

As for the advertising, the Brother will see, if he takes observation, that I have been crowding it out lately. The Regenerator will not advertise for gain.

Del. Co., Pa., Sep. 20, 1843.

Friend O. S. Murray:—I have a tho't in relation to your, (or rather our,) Telegraph, and proposed Regenerator, that I may as well communicate. Your prospectus of the latter covers so much ground, and is withal so good, that I want to get a large number of them published in slip, or other as cheap form as possible, for gratuitous distribution among my acquaintances and others, in order to get a number of subscribers previous to the commencement of the Regenerator. It is a good thing in itself, independent of this object, for distribution. I have been unable, in town or country, to procure a paper containing this prospectus—have searched the files and columns in vain at the A. S. Office—could hear of no subscriber but C. C. Barleigh, who was in your State at the time of its publication. I have therefore been unable to do with it as I wished, and am under the necessity of sending to you for a paper containing it. I wish and intend that the Regenerator shall be more easily found in Philadelphia and its neighborhood, than the Telegraph has been. Perhaps you can publish it as I propose, or other form, as cheaply as it can be done by another. There may be another advantage in this. Publishing for distribution at this time, you may wish to make some alterations, additions or omissions. The paragraph in relation to the remaining numbers, for instance, might be omitted. I will suggest to you whether it would not be a good thing for you to send it in this way to your subscribers and urge it upon them to exert themselves to increase the subscription list of the Regenerator, in the interval previous to its commencement. If others feel as I do in relation to this free paper, there will be a great deal done in this interval, if the thing is proposed and commenced. Think of it brother. I am unacquainted with the mode of printing such a thing as I propose, but suppose it might be done upon your ordinary sheet, and left unseparated, so that the postage might not be expensive. I thought of getting one or two hundred for Philadelphia and surrounding country, if I published. If you do it send me 100. Let me hear from you soon in relation to this matter. I want to be doing. I consider this free paper the greatest instrumentality, short of the true living example, that I can lay hold of to advance the great work of a world's regeneration. If this is tho't an object worth attending to by you, and it is necessary, I can send you a couple of dollars towards its prosecution.

so or not, will be by the world considered as on the barter—quid pro quo—the money making principle. I feel much solicitude that this should not be so, and that it should be so manifested to the world. It would be highly inconsistent with regeneration, and with the principles advocated in its own columns. I would it should go forth from the first without a price—not sold at a stipulated price, and without that price withheld. But without a great and immediate change among its friends, it cannot be commenced and sustained without money. We have not the paper, the ink, &c.—Those who perform the labor have not the means of living without the assistance of others. This can be supplied previous to our going together in community, in no other way than by money, the universal acknowledged representation of wealth—of labor. Besides, our newly acquired opinions and strongest convictions aside, consistency with our present condition and habits in society does not demand it. We reward others and receive rewards ourselves for the performance of the ordinary duties of life—we pay and receive money for the minor concerns of life. While we do this we may, we ought for the major—the bread of life—the hope of a better future—its weekly promise in the Regenerator. What I want to say in relation to this matter is, that the \$2, at the head of our paper clearly implies to those who see it, unacquainted or slightly acquainted with our views, that this is the price, without which it cannot be had. You say that this \$2, is not charged on any principles of money getting. This is very good. I believe it is true. But unless this explanation accompanies each announcement of its price, non-communists will view it in the usual way, and consider it a gross inconsistency with the principles it advocates. Suppose we should say, instead of publishing the price, in every paper in some conspicuous place, and in as condensed a form as possible:—"We cannot sell the Regenerator at a price—we would not withhold it from the poor. It at present must depend upon the contributions of the friends for support. These must be voluntary." It might be stated what the cost of its publication, and what the number of its subscribers was, thus showing what each ought to pay if able, and act as a stimulant to increase its subscription list, thereby to decrease its proportional expense. If languishes for support, appeals might be made through its columns. I think the time has come when this at least might be done successfully. I think if this arrangement was made, those who are able to contribute more than \$2 would not be so likely to confine themselves to this sum, and we would not be under the necessity of withholding it from so many who are unable to pay even this. See how the bible societies have succeeded in circulating it on this principle of voluntary contribution. Let the friends of the Regenerator—its subscribers—be a society for its distribution. Something like what I have expressed above as the terms of publication for the Regenerator might take the place of the publication of the terms of business advertisements which in my opinion as well as all such advertisements ought by all means to be dispensed with. Think of this, Brother, and agitate it among our friends. For myself, I should be sorry to see the columns of the Regenerator desecrated with a single advertisement, or have it take pay for a single one towards its support. I think it a greater inconsistency than taking money for the paper in the way it is taken. We have not the same apology for it. The latter is done from necessity, and cannot be avoided. For the former there is no necessity. It is quite avoidable. I trust it will be avoided. Why should the Regenerator go into business. That it is a source of profit, thereby enabling us to sustain the paper, will not do. It looks too much like doing evil that good may come of it. As well might we go to speculating in bank stocks, or in the soil and its products, as a means of sustaining it. It cannot be said of these charges for publication of advertisements, as is said of the price of the paper—they are not made on the principle of money getting. That it is money getting for a good purpose, does not alter the case, the principle being wrong. I have charity enough to suppose that most business men pursue it to enable them to do good—to be good and happy. They commit the monstrous error of doing evil that good may come of it. Shall the Regenerator do so? I trust not. It is grossly, palpably and undeniably inconsistent. Besides, we want the space for other matter. Many of us feel little or no interest in the business transactions of the world. It will be a part of the business of the paper to expose the evils and enormities of the present system of business.—Should it then take part in it? Should it then furnish aliment to the spirit of business—of buying and selling? How would it look for an Anti-Slavery paper to publish the advertisements of Franklin & Arnfield, or other slave dealers? In one column say it is wrong, in every point of view, to hold