

GREEN MOUNTAIN FREEMAN.

"Give me Liberty—or give me Death!"

VOLUME I.

MONTPELIER, VERMONT, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1844.

NUMBER 5.

THE GREEN MOUNTAIN FREEMAN.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, in Lyman's building, Main st. near the Union House.

J. C. ASPENWALL, Editor.

J. POLAND, Publisher.

TERMS:

Single copies \$1.50 in advance, or \$2.00 after the expiration of three months from the time of subscribing. All papers sent at the expense of the subscribers.

Advertisements inserted at the usual charges. If Book and Job Work of every description than-Book and Job Work of every description than-

them into effect, if their leaders were ready. Alas! party leaders think more of elevating themselves, than of going to work to overthrow slavery. And while they can blind their followers by fair speeches, they will hardly step forward, and help to do the work which they are morally bound to do.—Well, let such men at the South as C. M. Clay, speak and act; they will find a good number at the North who will act with them, and hold up their hands in the day of battle. And I fully believe that the Liberty Party will be as ready to help them, as any other party.

KIAH BAYLEY.

For the Green Mountain Freeman. REV. B. M. HALL'S LETTER.

The following letter was probably written without any expectation of its being published, but we think it is too good to be lost.

W. BERRISHALE, 19th Jan., 1844.

To the President and Members of the Methodist Preachers' Anti-Slavery Convention, to be held at Randolph, on the 24th inst. —

DEAR FATHERS & BRETHREN: Not being able to meet with you in Convention and enjoy the satisfaction which it would afford me, to share in your deliberations on the important subject of the connection of the M. E. Church with slavery, and with you endeavor to devise means for the destruction of such connection, while the Discipline and usages of the church shall be preserved inviolate; I cannot deny myself the privilege of addressing you by letter, though I be least of all.

You, dear brethren, cannot stand in need of any advice from one so comparatively young in the ministry, and so poorly qualified as my humble self to give it; nor will I attempt any work of the kind.

For more than eight years, have I been fully convinced of the inherent sinfulness of slavery—that it is sin, and only sin, and that continually.—To declare myself an abolitionist, cost me a severe struggle; and, for a short time, I was held trembling in the balances! In the one scale I beheld truth, mighty truth, brilliant as the diamond of the first water; while on the one side of her stood duty to God, and on the other, good will to man.—These beckoned me onward in that direction, and pointed with one hand to the slave, the down-trodden, outraged, chattelized, groaning, dying slave, and with the other, directed my trembling gaze to the tribunal of Almighty God! In the other scale lay the opposition of my brethren in the ministry to "modern abolitionism"—the advice of the General Conference, to "wholly refrain;" the suspicion with which the abolitionist was regarded by his "chief ministers;" and a fearful array of hindrances to a full, and bold declaration of abolition sentiments, well calculated to make the timid hesitate! But, looking upon both sides of this great subject, with the fear of God before my eyes, and the Heaven originated principle of benevolence in my heart, how could I long be held in a state of indecision? I could not. Nor have I for a single hour regretted the course then taken, and no fears are indulged that that course will be regretted in that day when the King shall say, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

Three hundred and sixty-five times in the year, for eight years past, has my heart been grieved at the recollection that the church of my choice tolerated slavery! As often have I blushed before the world, that our beloved Methodism should stoop from her high seat to pollute herself by pressing to her bosom so vile a monster. And often, very often, have I shuddered, when that same Methodism has thrust herself between slavery and the heavy artillery of Heaven's own truth; thereby receiving the wounds intended to be inflicted on the head of that old dragon, slavery!

In view of the fact, that the M. E. Church is involved in connection with slavery, I feel it my duty to enter my most solemn and public protest against such an unnatural union. In the name of the founder of Methodism, whose name we venerate, and who has left on record on that subject, "Thoughts that burn," I protest against slavery! In the name of a Clarke, a Coke, a Watson, an Ashbury, and the whole constellation of Antislavery stars of the first magnitude in the firmament of Methodism, I protest against slavery in the M. E. Church! In the name of our common country, whose welfare we should seek, and for whose peace we should pray, I protest against the adulterous union of American Methodism with American Slavery! In the name of our common Christianity, which requires that we remember those in bonds as bound with them; whose spirit is benevolence, and whose essence is love; I protest against slavery! In the name of the millions of heathen in this land of Bibles, of Sabbaths, of ministers,—made heathen by law, and deprived of every right, and exposed to every wrong; I protest against slavery, in the name of all that is true, or honest, or lovely, or of good report. If there be any virtue, or any praise, let slavery be put out of the M. E. Church! Finally, in the name of the Great and terrible God, whose prerogatives slavery usurps, and whose law it scorns, let slavery be anathema! O slavery! thou fiend of darkness!—Thou hell-scathed spirit! Why comest thou within the sacred precincts of the visible church of Christ! I suspect thou art allied to the spirit which, by lies to our first parents, and blasphemies against God, converted a paradise into a

place of weeping, of labor, of gloom, and death! And wilt thou bring guilt, and shame, and ruin on the church of the Living God? Nay, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." May the "Lord rebuke thee." May our beloved branch of that Church speedily be purified from so dark a stain, and stand forth in its brightness in this dark world, showing herself ready to do her full share in the work of subduing the world to Christ.

Finally, brethren, may your Convention be a happy and a profitable one. May that God who is the eternal enemy of oppression, preside over you. May our Lord Jesus Christ, the great spiritual Emancipator, be in your midst. May the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth and Wisdom, lead you into all truth connected with the great anti-slavery enterprise, and comfort you with the assurance that your ways please God. And may you have the reward of a good conscience and the approbation of God, for having labored to secure the Purity and Peace of the Church of your choice.

Your Brother, B. M. HALL.

J. G. WHITTIER'S LETTER.

The Liberty Party in the Third District, were somewhat afflicted with Mr. Whittier's refusal to stand longer as their candidate for Congress. But as he has felt restrained by his position, in the use of his eloquent pen, the friends of the cause through the country will not regret the course he has taken. The following extract is from a letter he addressed to the Convention, called to nominate a candidate in his place:

"The present is indeed a time for the friends of the slave to 'thank God and take courage.' Steady, uncompromising fidelity to our principles in the use of our elective franchise, during the past three years, has already wrought a marvellous change in favor of the great cause of Human Freedom. The passage of the Latimer Bill—the repeal of the anti-marriage Law, that last relic of the old Slave-code of the State—the Resolves of the last session asking an alteration of the Constitution, repealing that clause which enables the South to send into Congress twenty representatives of slave property—are among the indications in our State, of the growing influence of our principles and consistent practice. If we look to Congress, we note a similar progress. We are wringing from the reluctant and robber-hands of slaveholders and their Northern allies, the Right of Petition, of which we have been deprived for the last ten years. Terrified by the growing strength of the Liberty vote in all sections of the free States, the recently elected members of the present Congress, dare not trample on our petitions, as their predecessors have done; but are constrained to acknowledge our right to be heard. Leading politicians, and party editors are making loud professions of their zeal for Northern rights, and abstract abolition. Men who mobbed us five years ago for being abolitionists, now pride themselves in the name of Whig abolitionists, and Democratic abolitionists. Up to the very hour when we saw and acted upon the necessity and duty of carrying our principles to the ballot-box—through the seven long weary years of moral suasion and humble petition—what were these men doing? They maligning us in their newspapers—they invoked legislative enactments against us—they filled the ears of slaveholders with base falsehoods respecting us—until the entire South became one great Lynch Club, whetting its Bowie-knife for our throats—they hounded on the ferocious mobs which hunted for the lives of our lecturers and broke up our meetings;—in fact, the only day of respect which they gave us out of the whole 365, was that on which we made at the Ballot-Box our annual obsequious to slavery, and enjoyed the delectable privilege of voting our persecutors into office! Well, we have made an advance step—we have twisted off our old party collars—we have drawn deep and broad the line between slavery and Freedom in the politics of the country, we act as well as preach, we vote as well as pray against the slavepower, and now what do we see?—Our old enemies are as active as ever against us, but taking altogether a new position.—They no longer propose to mob our prayer meetings, they no longer regard our petitions treasonable, they have given up the idea of legislative restrictions upon freedom of speech and of the press. Nay, they declare themselves abolitionists of the old moral suasion sort, they are filled with regret that so holy a cause should be sullied by politics, they profess to occupy the very ground upon which we stood when they let loose their mobs upon us. To discuss the subject of Slavery is no longer treason. All their indignation is now reserved for those who vote against it. Courage, brethren!—If the position which we occupied five years ago is now acknowledged to be rightly by the very men who abused us for taking it, depend upon it, it will not be long before they will confess our present position to be right also. Ears deaf to our prayers and entreaties, are open to the "terse rhetoric of the Ballot-Box."

We to us and our cause if we overlook principle in a contest for men. Let us strike a deadly blow in our ranks—let us know no leaders—let us hold out no paltry partisan favors as the recompense of labor in a cause which is "its own exceeding great reward." If there are any among us who cannot sincerely thank God that they are permitted to labor in such a cause—if there are any who would introduce among us the miserable watch-words and petty jealousies of pro-slavery parties—if there are any who have yet to learn that the establishment of a National Bank or Sub-Treasury, is not the great end and aim of human existence—if there are any who love Whiggery better than Liberty, and the empty name of Democracy better than its reality,—let them go out from among us at once; the sooner the better. As we close up our ranks on their departure, our numbers may be less, but we shall at least feel that true hearts are beating on our right hand and on our left; that no non-conductors are left to break the electric chain of our common sympathy. We want Liberty men; not Whig abolitionists, nor Democratic abolitionists, nor Baptist abolitionists, nor Quaker abolitionists,—but true hearty friends to Freedom; Men who feel their obligation to God and their fellow men, who, impelled by principle, have enlisted for the war, not to be driven back by threats, or deluded back by falsehood and flattery.

Liberty—the great interests of humanity—Uni-

versal Freedom!—Who does not feel his heart glow within him at the thought of laboring in such a cause?—Does it not enlarge our souls and expand our sympathies?—Does it not bring us nearer to the great and good of past ages?—From the damp depths of dungeons—from the stoke and the scaffold—wherever the confessors and martyrs of Liberty have sealed their testimony, solemn and awful voices call upon us to persevere, and press onward. We are surrounded by a crowd of living witnesses. In France, Ireland, England, Italy and Germany, wherever the long oppressed millions are rising up from their debasement and struggling into freedom, every true and liberal heart beats warmly with ours. Freedom throughout the world is interested in our struggle. Pure and undefiled Christianity everywhere rejoices in our progress. For, to use the language of Robert Hall, in his glorious defence of Christianity as the imperable friend of Freedom, "he who breaks the fetters of Slavery, and delivers a nation from thralldom, forms the noblest comment on the great Law of Love." For such a cause, with such encouragements to action, let us spare no effort, and count no sacrifice too great. Every name added to the list of Liberty voters, is an additional weight on the mighty lever of Moral and Political Action which is now under the foundation stone of American oppression. Pledge them on then,—in the name of Humanity let no one hesitate to throw on his weight, and soon with God's blessing, turret and battlement of the foul edifice shall totter and fall, its dungeons shall burst open to the sunshine and free air, and angels and the just made perfect shall rejoice over its ruin.

From the Anti-Slavery Almanac for 1840, prepared by Theodore D. Weld. CLAIMS OF HENRY CLAY.

1. He has been a slaveholder for forty years, and now holds sixty persons as property.
2. He was one of the founders, and is now the President of the American Colonization Society, the grand antagonist of abolition.
3. When the bill for the admission of Michigan into the Union was under consideration in the United States Senate, Mr. Clay gave a specimen of colonization benevolence towards free colored citizens by making a motion to deprive them of the right to vote on the question of its acceptance by the people.—See *Senate Journal*.
4. His great personal and official influence, when Speaker of United States House of Representatives, secured the admission of Missouri into the Union, as a slave State.
5. He gave his casting vote, February 18, 1819, in favor of perpetual slavery in Arkansas, at a time when that territory was almost entirely uninhabited; thus struggling for the widest possible extension of legalized crime.
6. He first proposed the annexation of Texas, by a motion to that effect, April 3, 1820.
7. He has earnestly contended against the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or in 'any Territory of the United States,' and introduced resolutions into the U. S. Senate, denouncing 'interference of the citizens of any of the States,' to effect either of these objects. See his resolutions, passed May 10, 1838.
8. He zealously opposed the calling of a convention in Kentucky, a measure without which the abolition of slavery by law, cannot take place in that State. George W. Weisinger, who is associate editor of the Louisville Journal, the leading Clay paper at the West, in a letter dated July 6, 1838, says: 'It is well known that Mr. Clay is warmly opposed to a convention. While the convention law was under discussion, letters were received from him remonstrating against the passage of the law.'
9. February 7, 1833, he made his great speech for—Southern votes, in which he said: 'The Liberty of the descendants of Africa in the United States, is incompatible with the liberty of the European descendants.'

SLAVERY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

BY DR. CHAMBERLAIN.

Slavery in the district of Columbia is not Southern Slavery. It has no local character. It is the slavery of the United States! It belongs equally to the free and to the slave holding portion of the country. It is our institution as truly as if it was placed in the midst of us; for this District is the common ground of the nation. Its institutions exist solely by authority of the nation. They are as truly the expressions of the national will as any act of Congress whatever. We all uphold the slave code under which men are bought, and sold, and whipped, at their master's pleasure. Every slave nation in the district is held under our legislation. We are even told that the prison of the district is used for the safe-keeping of the slaves who are brought there for sale. There we sustain slavery as truly as we sustain the navy or the army. It ought then to be abolished at once. And in urging this action we express no hostility towards Southern institutions. We do not think of the South. We see within a spot under our jurisdiction a great wrong sustained by law. For this law we are responsible. For all its fruits we must give account. We owe then to God, to conscience, to rectitude, our best efforts for its abolition. We have no thought of Southern institutions. It is our own unjust, unallowed institutions which we resolve no longer to maintain. Can the free States consent to continue their partnership in this wrong? They have not even the poor consolation of profiting by the crime.

CLAY THE DUELIST.

Since it has become apparent that Clay will be the Whig candidate for the presidency, the federal editors have made the discovery that duelling is a very innocent amusement, or at least that it involves little of the moral turpitude which in the estimation of most people attaches to the character of a man who habitually practices and advises it. What charges would not be rung by them if the position of Clay and the democratic candidates were reversed in this respect? What would we said of Mr. Van Buren, for example, if he had, as did Mr. Clay, commenced his public life by calling a legislative colleague to account for words spoken in debate, and deliberately shot him?—What would have been said, if while a member of the executive department of the government he had attempted a similar chastisement of a Senator in Congress, who could not constitutionally be held responsible elsewhere for his language?—What withering reproach and deep criminality would they not have charged upon him had he advised and urged on, contrary to the wishes of others, and in violation, even, of the so-called

"code of honor" itself, that fatal encounter between Graves and Gilley, in which the latter was premeditatedly and deliberately murdered? Yet, Mr. Clay comes before the country as a candidate for the highest honors upon his hand, and the Whig papers insiduously assure us that although Mr. Clay "may have been erroneous" [we quote their language] yet the practice, if not wholly justifiable, is excused by the fact that other men have fallen into the same error! Sage conclusion—Grave and pious moralists! Fit organs of a party claiming all the religion and all the morality, to say nothing of wealth and intelligence, in the land! Who will deny that the defenders of the hard cider and pipe-laying practices of 1840 have become the apologists, if not the abettors and advocates, of fashionable assassination in 1843?—We are willing to submit to the better judgments of the nation whether such apologies are sufficient, or the individual in whose behalf they are urged, worthy the suffrages of an enlightened and Christian people.—Pontiac Jacksonian.

From the Christian Freeman.

RETURN OF MR. LEAVITT.

We sincerely regret that this Argus-eyed advocate of human liberty cannot be permitted a seat with the other reporters within the hall of the House of Representatives. We doubt not that the Honorable Speaker is a chivalrous and courteous gentleman, and fell back very gracefully upon the Virginian prerogative, *strict construction*, when he informed Mr. Leavitt that there was no room for him, unless in the gallery. No one, we imagine, can mistake the motives which led the Speaker to this decision with regard to Mr. Leavitt. Nor do we see wherein it is impossible for him, so to expand the principle of *strict construction*, as to exercise an absolute censorship over the whole corps of reporters, and determine what political principles shall admit them to the Hall.

We entertain, however, a humble confidence in the courtesy of the Southern Speaker now occupying the chair, and his illustrious successor, whoever he may be. Having acquired from the plaint subserviency of the North, the divine right of custom to an unlimited succession in the Speakership and Presidency of this Republic, we trust that they will exercise it with magnanimity in view of the placid and facile weakness of Northern Freemen. The slave power should imitate other giant forms of despotism, and sometimes be even generous where pity would do more than force.

We trust, then, that Mr. Speaker Jones will not bring under the ban of his "*strict construction*," all our Northern reporters, without regard to party. In the case of Mr. Leavitt, his "rejection" will probably occasion but little unpleasant emotion among the great majority at the North. It is known to the world over, that he is one of those "fantastical, political abolitionists," whom both of our two parties have taken great pains to represent to the slave-holding regency as unworthy of notice at home or abroad. To this class, of which we are proud to be the humblest one, the rejection and return of this undoubted champion of their cause will be a signal for a new and simultaneous effort to shake from the neck of this slave-ridden country, an iron-hearted dynasty which suppresses the dearest prerogatives of the free.

Editorial Correspondence of the Emancipator.

Washington City, Monday Jan. 15, 1844.

DEAR READERS.—It is the will of the slaveholder who now holds the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives, that I should no longer enjoy the privileges ordinarily allowed to reporters on the floor of the Hall. In accordance with my prediction, the regulation of things was put off from day to day, plantation fashion, and no definite answer was given to the reporters, who applied for permits, until to-day. Shortly after I went to the Hall, the door-keeper came to me very civilly, and said the speaker had given me no permission to be in the Hall. I asked him why not, but he gave no reasons, and returned my letter of application with the endorsement, in pencil, "Leave not granted by the Speaker." Of course, I took my hat and paper, and posted into the gallery.

Determined not to take up any second hand or conjectural ideas, I watched for the adjournment of the House, and then waited on the Speaker in person, for an explanation. He received me very courteously, and said he had many more applications than he had desks to give to reporters, and that the rules only allowed him to admit as many as there were desks. I told him it had been the usage heretofore to admit a greater number—that it was seldom that all were in their seats,—that several had seats in the Senate chamber,—that we could "ride and tie," &c., but he said the rules were quite strict and he did not like to set the example of violating the rules. Of course, I could say nothing more, and it was his business to know the rules. On returning to my lodgings, I borrowed a copy of the rules, and now transcribe all that bears upon this matter.

"18. Stenographers wishing to take down the debates, may be admitted by the Speaker, who shall assign such places [it does not say desks] to them, on the floor or elsewhere, to effect their object as shall not interfere with the convenience of the House.

"19. No person shall be allowed the privilege of a stenographer without a written permission from the Speaker, specifying the part of the House [not desk] assigned to him; and no reporter or stenographer shall be admitted under the rules of the House, unless such reporter or stenographer shall state in writing, for what paper or papers he is employed to report."

My application to the Speaker was in the following form:

"HON. JOHN W. JONES, Speaker.—The undersigned respectfully requests permission to occupy a desk, as he has done for several years, as reporter for the Emancipator newspaper, of Boston. JOSHUA LEAVITT.

December 6th 1843.

The letter was returned as stated Jan. 15, 1844. The explanation that I can give is, either that Mr. Speaker's discretion did not think it compatible with the "general welfare" to have the "reporter for the Emancipator" on the floor of the House every day, or else I was excluded under the "Virginia resolutions of 1793" on the principles of "*strict construction*," by which the words "stenographers may be admitted by the Speaker, who shall assign them a place," are found to mean, "The speaker is not allowed to admit more reporters than there are desks." The reasons in favor of one explanation are so evenly balanced by the reasons in favor of the other, that I cannot attempt to decide which preponderates. I therefore refer it to the five thousand subscribers and twenty thousand readers of the Emancipator to determine whether I was excluded on the princ-

THE FREEMAN.

For the Green Mountain Freeman.

CASSIUS M. CLAY'S LETTER.

MR. EDITOR.—I am always glad when I see such papers as the Letter of Cassius M. Clay, in the Watchman, and hope that letter will be read with attention. Perhaps I should dissent from some of his views; but in general they are excellent. The following extracts should be proclaimed with trumpet sound through the whole land: "Let Congress abolish slavery wherever she has jurisdiction—in the military places, in the territories, on the high seas, and in the District of Columbia. I lay down the broad rule, that Congress should do no more for the perpetuation of slavery than she is specially bound to do.—The United States are morally bound by all means consistent with the Constitution, to extinguish slavery. I dissent, then, from the ultra anti-slavery and the ultra pro-slavery men. I cannot join the North in the violation of the Constitution—I cannot stand by the South in asking the moral sanction of the North; nor do I regard it as a breach of the constitutional compact, that she should seek a higher grade of civilization by using all legal means for the entire expulsion of slavery in the United States."

I add one more extract for the benefit of those Christians, who are ready to vote for a slaveholder for President:

"Slavery is an evil to the master. It is utterly subversive to the Christian Religion. It violates the great law upon which that religion is based, and on account of which, it vaunts its pre-eminence."

Some of our Northern divines would do well to take a few lectures on christianity from this noble Kentuckian. For one I will not put him under the Ban, if he will come into Vermont, and give our churches and ministers a few theological lectures.

The Watchman tells us, that C. M. Clay is a whig, and has suffered persecution on that account. Well, I hope all the whigs will read his letter, embrace his doctrines and make a decided effort to carry them out. And I hope we shall see the Watchman taking the lead in such a noble cause. Let him and others take hold of this work, and I should not wonder if he could see no need of the Liberty Party. The work laid out by Mr. C. M. Clay, is a plain, straight forward, business concern. Congress is to go to work, and to abolish slavery wherever she has jurisdiction—in the military places in the Territories, on the high seas, and in the District of Columbia; and never do any more for the perpetuation of slavery than she is specially bound to do. So that if she is not specially bound to do anything for this purpose, then Congress has nothing to do to perpetuate slavery; but the United States are morally bound by all means consistent with the constitution to extinguish slavery. Excellent sentiments. And what adds to their value, they come from a distinguished Kentuckian. Every liberty man will cheerfully subscribe to these sentiments, and then help to carry them into full effect. Will either the whigs or democrats so do? That a large portion of each party believe these sentiments to be correct I doubt not, and would be ready to carry