

①
GREAT DISCUSSION
OF
MODERN SPIRITUALISM,

BETWEEN

PROF. J. STANLEY GRIMES AND LEO MILLER, ESQ.

AT THE

MELODEON, BOSTON,

Every evening during the second week in March, 1860.

QUESTIONS:

1. *Do spirits of departed human beings hold intercourse with men on earth, as claimed by modern Spiritualists?*
2. *Can the various phenomena known as Spirit Manifestations be satisfactorily and philosophically accounted for without admitting the agency of departed human beings?*

REPORTED, VERBATIM, FOR THE "BANNER OF LIGHT."

② BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY BERRY, COLBY, & COMPANY.
1860.

Phil. 705 4.52

1861, Apr. 15.

Gift of
Pres. Felton.

Entered according to act of Congress, in the year 1860, by
BERRY, COLBY, & CO..
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

REPORTED, IN PHONOGRAPHY,
BY J. M. POMEROY.

DISCUSSION.*

IN pursuance of the following public notice, LEO MILLER, Esq., of Madison, New York, and Professor J. STANLEY GRIMES, of Boston, met at the Melodeon, Boston, on the evening of Monday, March 5th, 1860, to hold a debate upon the subject of Modern Spiritualism.

"DISCUSSION OF MODERN SPIRITUALISM.

"Dr. H. F. GARDNER having publicly challenged Prof. J. STANLEY GRIMES to meet him, or some person whom he may substitute, and the challenge being accepted, the discussion will commence in the Melodeon, Washington Street, Boston, on Monday evening, March 5, 1860, at 7 o'clock, and continue a number of successive evenings. Dr. Gardner has invited LEO MILLER, Esq., to open the debate in favor of Spiritualism. The following questions have been agreed upon as the basis of the discussion:—

"1. *Do spirits of departed human beings hold intercourse with men on earth, as claimed by modern Spiritualists?*

"LEO MILLER, Affirmative.

"J. STANLEY GRIMES, Negative.

"2. *Can the various phenomena known as Spirit Manifestations be satisfactorily and philosophically accounted for without admitting the agency of departed human beings?*

"J. STANLEY GRIMES, Affirmative.

"LEO MILLER, Esq., Negative."

Dr. H. F. GARDNER, of Boston, then read a statement of the origin of the debate, and the rules agreed upon for its conduct, as follows:—

Boston, February 25, 1860.

J. S. GARDNER, in his lecture in Mercantile Hall, complained that the Spiritualists did not and dare not properly investigate, and expressed his willingness to have the matter thoroughly discussed and investigated, if the Spiritualists would but act in accordance with their own professions, etc. Dr. H. F. GARDNER arose, and, after referring to the remarks of Mr. Grimes, stated that they were applicable to himself or to the Spiritualists of Boston, and declared that the Harvard College professors, particularly Professor Felton, declined the discussion. Now, therefore, he (Dr. Gardner) proposed to Mr. Grimes to have a discussion at such time and place as might be determined at an interview the next day; the questions at issue being,—

1st, *Do spirits of departed human beings hold intercourse with men on earth, as claimed by modern Spiritualists?* LEO MILLER, Esq., will take the affirmative, J. S. GRIMES the negative.

2d, *Can the various phenomena known as Spirit Manifestations be satisfactorily and philosophically accounted for without admitting the agency of departed human beings?* Mr. GRIMES in the affirmative, LEO MILLER in the negative.

Mr. Grimes accepted the challenge in the presence of the audience, and agreed to meet Dr. Gardner at the Mercantile Hall the next day to arrange the preliminaries. It is mutually understood that under these two heads or questions the whole subject of modern Spiritualism may be discussed without any technical restrictions.

* In accordance with the desire of the publishers, the entire discussion is given *verbatim*, the reporter not exercising any discretion in the premises. The only exceptions are in one or two cases where a correction was publicly made, by the speaker, upon the spot. — REPORTER.

MERCANTILE HALL, February 29.

Dr. Gardner met Mr. Grimes and arranged as follows:—

1st. We are to have the discussion in the Melodeon, commencing Monday evening, March 5th, continuing every evening, except Sunday, till it is concluded, unless otherwise agreed.

2d. Either party may discuss personally or by proxy, it being understood that LEO MILLER, Esq., has accepted an invitation from Dr. GARDNER to defend modern Spiritualism on the occasion.

3d. It is understood and agreed that, in accordance with the terms of the challenge, the discussion shall continue at least six evenings, and be conducted as follows:—

4th. Each speaker not to occupy more than twenty minutes at one time, alternating, until six speeches, altogether, have been made in one evening, after which each speaker shall have five minutes for explanations.

5th. Neither party to interrupt the other while speaking, except when absolutely necessary to prevent misunderstandings, and then briefly and without argument.

6th. Neither party to indulge in personalities, or in any way to transcend the rules of polite discussion.

7th. It is especially desirable that no manifestations of approbation or disapprobation on the part of the audience shall be exhibited.

H. F. GARDNER,
J. STANLEY GRIMES.

B. F. WHITTEN, Esq., of Boston, having consented to preside at the discussion, took the chair, and the question for the evening was read:—

“Do spirits of departed human beings hold intercourse with men on earth, as claimed by modern Spiritualists?”

MR. MILLER

Opened the debate, in the affirmative, as follows:—

Mr. Moderator, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Audience: Before proceeding to discuss the question before us this evening, I desire to make a few preliminary remarks on the general character of the subject. The question of direct spirit-intercourse has been suddenly and unexpectedly forced upon the attention of the world, carrying conviction to the minds of thousands and tens of thousands, on both sides of the Atlantic. And I may truly say, that never, in the annals of human history, has any subject of a moral or religious character taken such a deep hold upon mind at large, in so short a time, as has modern Spiritualism. The advent of Christ, the promulgation of Christianity, the Lutheran Reformation in the sixteenth century, sink into comparative insignificance, when compared with the wide-spread influence that Spiritualism has exerted upon the public mind, within the past twelve years. It has entered the abodes of all, the rich and poor, the learned and the unlearned, carrying conviction of its truthfulness and of its divine origin. Eminent statesmen, eminent senators in the councils of the nation, judges, lawyers, clergymen, doctors, have become the unconscious instruments of the most remarkable manifestations of alleged spiritual power, or have witnessed these through others, under their own personal investigation, so that they were forced to acknowledge the truth of spirit-intercourse. From the king upon his imperial throne, from the palatial halls of refinement and learning, down to the lowly cottage and the humble man, we find the same glad tidings of joy, that the dear departed of other days return and hold converse with those they left behind.

I do not wish to be understood as presenting this, here, as an argument upon the question, but, rather, to show the respectable character of the subject which is to engage your attention, and its paramount claims upon every person who starts out upon its investigation.

I am aware that Spiritualism, like every other newly developed truth, has met with the most determined opposition. It has been assailed on every side, without mercy, and, too often, the weapons of its opponents have been only ridicule, glaring misrepresentation, and vulgar-minded contempt. But it is too late in the day to use such weapons as these.

Spiritualism has become so deeply entrenched in the hearts of thousands that such arguments can no longer influence the wise and intelligent, — none but the ignorant, the prejudiced, and the dishonest.

In holding this discussion, I expect to meet, from my friend, a determined opposition. From his long years of experience in the realms of mental philosophy, he is competent to explode Spiritualism, if such a thing be possible. And I would here say to the audience, that should my friend find it necessary to evade my arguments or my facts — should he find it necessary to cavil, or throw dust in your eyes, — understand it is not for the want of ability to meet them, or want of information, but is owing altogether to the untenable position he has assumed.

And I would say, further, that in my acceptance of this invitation from Dr. Gardner, there was one paramount motive in view, and that was, to elicit the truth on the all-absorbing topic of spirit-intercourse, and spread it before the public. But while I modestly claim this, of myself, I cheerfully accord, to my brother, and respected opponent, the same honest intentions. Let the audience, and let the speakers, feel a desire to obtain truth, and this discussion shall be productive of much good. Let every Spiritualist and Anti-spiritualist divest himself of all prejudice. Let every argument be calmly and dispassionately examined, in the light of reason and philosophy, and this discussion shall be an honor to the city of Boston, an honor to the audience, an honor to the speakers, an honor to Dr. Gardner, and to all concerned.

The question before us this evening, and that which is to occupy the two succeeding evenings, is this:—

Do spirits of departed human beings hold intercourse with men on earth, as claimed by modern Spiritualists?

I affirm: my brother denies.

In discussing this question, I shall not, this evening, bring forward my direct proof, or direct testimony, but, rather, shall proceed to build up an argument on the antecedent probabilities of spirit-intercourse.

What I mean by the probability of spirit-intercourse, is, its intrinsic reasonableness, — that it is more likely to be true than otherwise. Now, as reasonable beings, our minds are compelled to preponderate in favor of that which appears reasonable, that which appeals to common sense. After I have made this argument on the probability of spirit-intercourse, we shall proceed to consider its absolute certainty — to the direct and positive proof.

Proceeding, then, upon the universally conceded fact that there is a spirit-world, — for this will not be called in question, — that man is immortal, and lives beyond the grave, I lay it down here, as an incontrovertible proposition, that it is reasonable and rational that these spiritual beings should exert an influence over us, on this principle of nature; that there is no such thing to be found, in the universe, as absolute isolation; that no spiritual being, in the body or out of the body, can become independent of others; but that there is a mutual and reciprocal relation existing between the intelligences throughout the realms of created existence. We know this is true of the physical universe; we know that every particle of matter has an affinity for every other particle of matter; we know that every world attracts and is attracted by every other world. There is not a bright orb rolling through space, but bears a reciprocal relation to every other; there is not a single atom of matter belonging to our earth, but, in proportion, attracts the sun, and, in turn, is attracted by the sun. This mighty system of worlds is bound together by indissoluble chains of attraction and gravitation. This, my friend, and the world, will concede as true in the physical universe. And is it not

equally, and more beautifully, true, when we rise above the physical and come to the great empire of mind? Is it possible that minds are isolated from other minds, or is there a mutual, reciprocal relation, throughout? I say there must be; I declare unto you there cannot be angel, archangel, or spirit of man, but bears relation to every other angel, to every other archangel, to every human soul. All spiritual beings are bound together by the strongest ties, by the chains of spiritual attraction. If, then, this be true, the beings of that spirit-world must exert an influence over us;—it cannot be denied. And, to my mind, it is a strong argument, at least of the probability of spirit-intercourse.

This position is confirmed, also, by another position which I take, here, to establish the probability of spirit-intercourse; and that is, the united and confirmed testimony of the world. Go back to the remotest ages of time, to the savage inhabitants of the islands of the sea, to the untutored inhabitants of the forest, and they recognize that they are surrounded by an invisible intelligence,—all believe in a superintending Providence. The poor idolater, bowing down to sticks and stones, looks to his fancied deity and feels that there is a spirit-world. And not this alone, but the universal desire of man for immortality is proof that he shall attain immortality. And when we find it equally true that man recognizes the invisible intelligences surrounding him, is it not a strong argument in favor of the fact of the existence of such intelligences? Is it not true that the spiritual instincts of man have realized their presence?

But have we to dwell, alone, upon spiritual philosophy? We have the united declaration of the wisest and best men who have ever lived in any age of the world. The ancient bards, prophets, and seers claimed to have been influenced by spiritual beings, to have seen spirits, and to have talked with them. And in more modern times, this is universally acknowledged. I say this is acknowledged, among the most spiritually minded, among that class of persons who would be most likely to know whether or not it is true: the great poets, the great sculptors, warriors, and artists, feel the presence of the invisible intelligence which aids them. Swedenborg declares that, for twenty-seven years, he daily conversed with spiritual beings. All grant him the possession of a refined and spiritual mind. Milton declares we are surrounded by spiritual beings, that

"Walk the earth
Unseen, both when we wake and when we sleep."

And our modern poets breathe forth the same sentiment. Longfellow, and Tennyson, and others, express the same thought. Henry Ward Beecher says, "There are times when my children in the spirit-world appear to be more immediately present, when I hear their voices more plainly than ever on earth." Harriet Beecher Stowe says, in substance, that the spirits of our departed friends often become our naturally and divinely appointed guardian angels. We have this testimony, I say, from the most spiritually minded men and women of every age and in all time: and who, I ask, would be more likely to know whether or not this is true,—^{the}he who is spiritually minded, or the gross and sensual? On almost all occasions when those who are gone hence are brought to mind, the pulpit orator breaks forth in strains of rapturous eloquence, declaring that those who once lived were present. Last summer, when the corner-stone of the monument at Plymouth was laid, Mr. Warren, who presided on the occasion, called on the one hundred who landed from the Mayflower, and, in a burst of inspiration, declared that they were in our midst, and looking down upon us with eyes of love, joy, and gratitude. Last summer, at the laying of the corner-stone of the chapel at Hamilton Collège, in New York, the reverend gentleman who presided said that those who

had gone hence, the founders of Hamilton College, were looking down, with eyes of heavenly love and wisdom, taking part in the ceremonies, and rejoicing to see the work of their hands prosper. Is there not, in all this, a probability of the truth of spirit-intercourse?

But further, my friends, I hold in my hand, here, a record of the spiritual and religious growth of man, in a period of more than four thousand years out of six, and I find that this book is replete with the evidence of the return of spiritual beings. For four thousand years out of six, man daily held converse with the spirit-world. And now I ask my brother, I ask the world, — when the conditions by which they may hold intercourse have been revoked. We have no evidence that they have ever been so repealed. The Bible, I say, is replete with this evidence; and unless there can be some good reason why this law should be repealed, why the ministry of spiritual intelligences should be withdrawn, I shall consider that it exists, and may exist to-day, as well as of yore.

And I would here call your attention to this one fact, that like conditions always produce like results. Whatever has been, may be again, provided we establish similar conditions. Now, if ever it were possible for spirits to communicate with men, and I think, with the position of my brother, he cannot deny that this has taken place, then I say that all that is necessary for spirit-intercourse, to-day, is the establishment of like conditions. Let me illustrate it. To-day, we can take daguerreotypes. The artist, by conforming to certain conditions, may take the human face divine, in an instant, almost. He must adjust his camera just so, he must make his plate duly sensitive, and use the sunlight of heaven; and if he has established the conditions, the man's face is produced. Now, suppose we take away the camera, disperse the pictures, and take no more for eighteen hundred years. Every boy knows, that, if at the end of that time we can establish similar conditions, similar results will take place. If men will but take their camera, and make sensitive the plate, and adjust the camera properly, the same results will be attained.

I ask my brother to give us some reason why these conditions should be revoked. We shall show, from this record, that, for a period of four thousand out of six thousand years, spiritual beings were daily in the habit of conversing with men, and, moreover, that the conditions which then existed, exist to-day, and that the manifestations of the spirit at this day, are analogous to those of the past.

In offering this argument, on the probability of spirit-intercourse, I quote from the Bible. I quote it as good testimony, in speaking of these facts, and I shall endeavor to show that the fact of to-day, and that of eighteen hundred or two thousand years ago, are precisely analogous. And when we come to the direct proof, we shall endeavor to show, further, that the same testimony which the Christian Church has received to establish Christianity, the same testimony which the world has received to establish the facts of the Bible, we have, to-day, — and more of it, — to establish the truth of spirit-intercourse.

MR. GRIMES

Opened the debate, upon the negative of the question, as follows:—

I am sure that the audience must have been very much interested in the remarks made by my friend, — so very eloquent, so pious. I think you must have been delighted by his acknowledgment of the Bible, — so very rare for us to hear from a Spiritualist, that it does us good. I am glad to find that he is disposed to found an argument, in favor of the true Spiritualism, upon the Bible. I was, only, a little surprised that he

should feel it necessary, here, in this argument, to show the probability of spirit-intercourse ever having existed at all. I am not aware that that is doubted by any sect of Christians, whatever. The question is not, — Do spirits communicate? — but, — Do they communicate as pretended by the modern Spiritualists? It is the way and manner of the communication, and not the fact itself, that is before us. That is the question.

The gentleman said that modern Spiritualism is opposed because it is new, as all new things are, — that there was a prejudice against it, on account of its very novelty; and he glanced at the fact that other new discoveries, of great importance, have been opposed. He referred, by the way, to the fact that this doctrine has taken a wider spread, — wider and deeper and more extensive, — than the Reformation of Luther, or almost any other, — is received by larger numbers, and produces greater effect. Now, there is one difference between this novelty and every other superstition that ever came before the world. There is one feature in modern Spiritualism, that is peculiar, — and, indeed, it is the very cause of the discussion here, to-night. I regard this modern Spiritualism as a superstition. But it differs from every superstition that the world has ever seen, in that it pretends to challenge investigation. Every other superstition that the world has ever seen, has based its claim to belief upon a direct inspiration, or a pretence of miracles, or something beside investigation. They shrink from an investigation; they have always done so. The Spiritualists make a pretension, which I admire and always have admired, and but for which I should never have thought of meddling with it; they have dared us to investigate; and a man who has a particle of manly spirit within him is bound to accept the challenge. When Mahomet promulgated his doctrine, which, by the way, is no more a superstition than this, he did not ask you to investigate and believe it, but thrust it down your throat at the point of the sword. The Mormons, also, — and they have a system of spiritualism having many things in common with this Spiritualism, — hold to the doctrine that they shall force opposition, that they shall plunder the Gentiles, that their mission is to trample on all that oppose them. But these modern Spiritualists take a different ground. Many of them are liberal men; they belong to the liberal classes of the community; some of them are men of education; some profess to an acquaintance with science. Except our friend here, they treat the Bible with the utmost contempt. I have heard the most eloquent among them sneer at Jesus Christ, and ridicule his cross. I am glad my friend did not; — he spoke so beautifully upon it, that it did my heart good; — I never heard it from them before; but, you know, "progression" is the word. They are unwilling to be held down by despotism of the creeds and churches. They are in favor of progress, in every respect. This phrenology, that is so unpopular, they encourage; mesmerism they encourage; geology, astronomy, all the sciences, are welcome to them; and they welcome modern Spiritualism as merely one of the experimental sciences, to be ranked with the experimental sciences. That is glorious; therefore it is that I meet them. And I say that if Spiritualism is true, the mode in which they propose to examine it and bring it before the world will make it, inevitably, the religion of the world. Every church must come down, every other spell must fail before a power like that. They do not pretend to put their light under a bushel, — not they; they bring out their doctrines here, before day. They do not darken their rooms, — oh, no! they light up, and investigate at the very noonday. Therefore it is, I repeat, that I meet them, and am pleased to meet them.

I thought that some of them did not act consistently with that doctrine. When I came to investigate, I found they would shrink, and I complained: and I was rejoiced when

my friend Dr. Gardner took up the question, and said I had done injustice, — that here in Boston, in this centre of light, they do not shrink from inquiry; they may do it at the West, but here in Boston is the intellectual centre, and here they are ready to investigate according to the rules of science.

The gentleman refers to the fact that mankind have always manifested a desire for spiritual knowledge, — that it exists in the palace and in the cottage, among the rich and the poor: the veriest savage, indeed, even the

"poor Indian, whose untutored mind
Sees God in the clouds, and hears him in the wind,
And simple nature to whose hope has given,
Beyond the cloud-capped hills, a humbler heaven," —

sees the spirits there, — even he has a heaven, rude, to be sure, for he had a rude earth. Now, that is all true. But what does it prove? Does it prove that the spirits came, in all these different nations, and enlightened these men? If so, why didn't they tell the same story? Why in one land is there one superstition, and in another, another? Why did the spirits in Judea tell one story, in Australia and South America and this region another? Were spirits of the other world unacquainted with geology? Let me tell the gentleman what that doctrine proved; — not that the spirits came and communicated, but that man is naturally superstitious. It is natural to man, when he is in ignorance, and sees the phenomena of nature around him, to attribute these phenomena to some intelligent principle.

The evidence of the existence of God is all around us. There is intelligence in all the works of God; and the man of limited mind sees that intelligence in some narrow circle and knows not that the Being who made that little bush made the planets above him. He does not grasp the idea of one supreme intelligence — for that is the modern word, which Spiritualists have introduced — they say, not spirits, but "intelligences: " — a very good word, and one which applies to the belief of the savage very well. When the heathen saw these spirits in the wood, they had the spirits of the wood, in the water the spirits of the water, in the heavens the spirits of the heavens. In all they saw, they perceived, not one Being, who rules every thing, but a host of minor spirits. So it was with all mankind — all except one people, to whom God gave his Revelation. Why he gave it to them and not to others, I know not; but so it was. Look at the Greeks, a most wondrous people, — at their poetry, their eloquence, their architecture. Then look at their system of Spiritualism, — how exalted and beautiful! Do you suppose spirits told them there was a Jupiter, a Neptune, an Apollo, a Bacchus, a Venus? Did they learn it from spirits, or did it spring from the spontaneous imaginations of their own creative genius? Do we not find superstition around us, now? Tell a child that there is a spirit in that dark closet, or here or there, and he is ready to believe it. This is nature. And it is the very same thing that makes the Spiritualist believe that a spirit is tipping his table, or rapping, that makes the savage believe there is a spirit in the winds, and the waters, the thunder and lightning.

The Spiritualists are for investigation; and they shall have it; I insist, now, upon your investigation being carried out. They don't ask us to believe. The Christian asks you to believe; he insists upon it as a duty. The Spiritualist says, — No, we don't want you to *believe*, but to *know*. The remark of Dr. Gardner, when he offered this challenge was, — "I don't *believe* Spiritualism, — I *know* it." I would thank him and his friends to distribute their knowledge, and let us have a share of it. If Spiritualism is true, let us all be Spiritualists. Don't you see, my friends, that if the evidence of Spiritualism was so abundant as they declare, there could be no sceptics? When Galileo

discovered that Jupiter had several moons, he didn't ask men to believe. When he said he could show the moons, he didn't ask men to believe; he didn't complain about people doubting his word; he only asked them to just look through that tube, and he complained because they would not look. Now, I come to look. I want to look through this tube. I want to see these planets, — to see these spiritual beings manifest themselves. I don't want to be called upon to believe upon evidence that no court of justice in the world would admit. The gentleman says that if we will only have the conditions as they had them in olden times, we can have the spirits as they did. Will not some of the spirits that communicate with him, so much, be kind enough to tell us what the conditions are, that are required in order that we may have these manifestations? What are the conditions necessary to raise the dead? What are the conditions necessary to make the sun stand still, as when Joshua called upon it to stand still upon Gibeon? For the gentleman says, — Only get up the conditions, and we can have the manifestations now; — and he believes the Bible now. What are the conditions required, that a man may be born of a woman as Christ was? And the gentleman believes all this — you know, he believes the Bible. What are the conditions requisite in order to have water turned into wine, to have a man walk upon water, to have a man rise up into the clouds, and to go to heaven without death? All we want is, "the conditions"! And we have spirits around us, — the very spirits who went to heaven at that time, — Christ, and Paul, and all the apostles are ready to whisper in our ears and tell us what the conditions are. Now will not they do their wonders? Christ did not go into a darkened room and perform his miracles. The loaves and fishes were shown openly. The sun shone just as brightly, when it stood still, as when it moved. And if these wonders were worked under the laws of nature, are the laws of nature changed? If not, why don't we have the wonders?

MR. MILLER.

Mr. Moderator, and Ladies and Gentlemen: My preliminary remarks on the general character of Spiritualism have afforded my friend an opportunity to have something to say. But I would beg to remind him that the question, to-night, is not, whether the public will investigate Spiritualism, or not; but is, — Do spirits of departed human beings hold intercourse with men on earth, as believed by modern Spiritualists? He has made several statements, here, which, were this a proper place, I should be pleased to answer; but as it is not, I must pass them by. However, he has stated that it is really refreshing that I should come forward, here, and accept the Bible. Now, I would say to my friend, and to this audience, that you cannot find an intelligent Spiritualist in Boston, — or, if you wish me to take away the word *intelligent* — you cannot find a Spiritualist in Boston, who does not believe that that Bible is full of divine inspiration. You cannot find an intelligent Spiritualist in the world, but considers the Bible replete with evidence of revelation from the spirit-world. It is true that in regard to the nature of inspiration we may differ from the theology of the world. I acknowledge that the Bible contains inspiration; the only issue that I take with the Christian Church, is that while they claim inspiration as infallible, I claim that it is fallible, — while they claim that it was plenary, I claim that it is universal, or general. The other remarks of my brother are not applicable to the question. I laid down two positions, in regard to the probability of spiritual intercourse, neither of which he has attacked. First, that spirits, in and out of the body, must bear a mutual and reciprocal relation to each other, and mind act upon mind. He has not made an allusion to this. He has merely recapitulated, in regard to the other statement, what I have already said, — that the tes-

timony of all the world is that we are surrounded by spiritual intelligences. Does the gentleman pretend to deny that there is a superintending Providence? Does he deny that the Indian has his Providence, to whom his untutored mind looks up in adoration? My brother asks, why, if there be such a mutual relation and necessary intercourse between all spirits, as I have claimed, there was, for so many centuries, no revelation, to the other inhabitants of the world, of the existence of the native tribes of this country. I might pertinently retort, and ask why God does not teach to the Indian, the natives of South America, and the Asiatic, all the same doctrines.

The gentleman has conceded much. He has conceded that spirit-manifestations occurred in olden time. And now, my friends, let us look at this a moment. I will read a portion of the twelfth chapter of Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians.

"Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant. * * * * *
 Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal. For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another, the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another, the working of miracles; to another, prophecy; to another, discerning of spirits; to another, divers kind of tongues; to another, the interpretation of tongues. * * * * * And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments diversities of tongues. Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles? Have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?"

My brother says those are gifts that existed in Paul's day, in the Christian Church. Paul says they all emanate from the same principle. I agree with the gentleman, here, but in a universal sense, that God governs throughout the universe; but it must be borne in mind that the Infinite employs instrumentalities and agents, and in this the agents are spiritual beings,—"Spirits of just men made perfect." God will not help us to do that which we can do ourselves. The germ of the grain is indeed, given to us, but you must prepare your ground, and sow the seed, and reap the grain, and carry it to your table, and raise it to your lips. Then, when it is in your digestive system, God will take care of the rest. God will not take care of your public schools. Your children may grow up in ignorance, before the infinite God will instruct them. And now I say to you, here, on this authority of nature, that, if it were possible for spiritual beings to make the revelations which this world has received, to bestow the various gifts existing in the Christian Church in the earliest days, then they did make them. God will not produce, by a direct effort of his will, what may be effected by intermediate agencies. Now, is there any thing here that spiritual beings could not do? No. Paul says it is the same spirit. Yes, it is the same great spirit that superintends; but he employs subordinate agencies. And in the fourteenth chapter of Corinthians, Paul rebukes the Corinthian Church for babbling too much in tongues. He says it is not edifying or profitable to speak in tongues which no hearer could understand. Now the gentleman claims that every miracle was produced by a special and direct manifestation on the part of Deity. If so, then Paul was rebuking Jehovah. But if those gifts were all the work of spirits holding intercourse with us, it was a subject of rebuke, as it would be to-day. It would not be edifying for you, if I should talk in Indian, to-night. It is well known, to those investigating Spiritualism, that we generally have such a gift as we desire. If a person is desirous of speaking in tongues, he will, very likely, attract a spirit of an influence of this nature; and he will acquire that gift. But if you assume that these gifts were miracles, wrought by God, then Paul was rebuking the Almighty. I assert that these manifestations were similar to those of our own day. And have we any evidence that the law by which these manifestations were produced has been repealed or revoked? I declare that you may read the Bible

through, and may go outside the Bible, and you will not find one word to show that the infinite God has ever ordered these things to cease. And it is contrary to his laws, to the plan of his universal government. Go into the fields of nature, and you find that Nature's God is ever ready to supply our demands, and never gives us a superabundance of any thing; but the car comes along, unloads its freight, just to the extent of our need, and then passes, until the individual shall need it again. Last year, we had an abundant supply of corn, but not enough for eighteen hundred years;—we shall have a new supply the next year. The air, the food, the light, of to-day, will not suffice us forever; we must have, each day, a new supply. We are told that, eighteen hundred years ago, God gave the world inspiration, and said,—There, that is all you get for all coming time; make the best of it. Then, too, he gave the gift of healing. But now, is there no demand for healing mediums? Yes, my friend; there is as much need now, for all this, as eighteen hundred years ago, and no evidence exists that God ever revoked that law.

The last words of Christ before his ascension, were,—

"Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.—"

Boston is in one part of the world,—Go there and preach the Gospel to every creature,—

"And these signs shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils;—"

The undeveloped spirits,—

"They shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover."

And did these gifts close with the Apostolic Age? That they ceased measurably, I acknowledge; but they did exist in the Christian Church, for two or three hundred years, while this Church was pure. Polycarp tells us this was true. Ecclesiastical history tells us it was so for two or three hundred years. John Wesley tells us that these gifts did so exist. It was not until the Church became corrupt and vicious, that they ceased. No: God has not revoked this law. That those manifestations ceased, I will acknowledge; but not because God had changed, but because man had changed his relations to the spirit-world. Some conditions must exist, that those manifestations may take place. One condition necessary when we mesmerize a person is, that the mesmeric subject shall be passive and receptive, the operator positive and active. Then the subject may receive the influence of the other's mind. Otherwise it is impossible, or, at least, more difficult, to control his mind so that an influence can be brought to bear upon him, capable of controlling him. These differences in spiritual manifestations must exist. Every one knows that, about the second or third century, the Christian Church became corrupt. The Dark Ages set in for a thousand years. The Church became gross, licentious. The priesthood became despotic; the gory Inquisition was established; the tenets of the Church were forced upon men, with torture and suffering. Here, then, the gift ceased. As we have once before said that like conditions produce like results, all that is necessary for man to receive these manifestations to-day, is, to relate himself properly to the spirit-world. I know that the Christian Church has proclaimed that all manifestations of spirit-power closed eighteen hundred years ago. But there is not one shadow of proof of it. Man has changed his relation to the spirit-world, but not so with God. He is the same immutable, eternal, unchangeable Being, to-day and forever. Let man, who has closed his eyes to avoid the sun, open them, and look into the heavens, and there is the sun, shining as brightly as ever. Man has gone into the dungeon. There, in the dark-

ness, he has asserted that all light is gone forever. Let him come up out of his darkness and draw the sullen curtains; let him sweep off the accumulated dust of ages, and let the sunlight of heaven pour into his soul, and his nature will be inspired, to-day, as eighteen hundred years ago.

We find, then, that these gifts did not close with the Apostolic Age, but about the fourth century, when the Church became corrupt and the Dark Ages set in. When Martin Luther came out from this corruption, he did not seek to re-establish these manifestations; he was content to feed upon a past inspiration, and not to seek a fresh light. There are those, to-day, who see and converse with spirits,—those who become entranced and see spiritual beings. Was it not true eighteen hundred, and thousands, of years ago?

But, you say, we can have nothing to do with these things because the mediums go into a trance. At the time of the transfiguration of Christ, upon mount Tabor, there were Peter and James and John who went upon the mount; and while asleep, and in a trance, they saw Moses and Elias talking with Christ. Here, then, while entranced, they saw two spiritual beings. Paul, on his way to Damascus,—

[The speaker's time here expired.]

MR. GRIMES.

The gentleman asked me a question that has been asked millions of times, and which I certainly cannot answer; and that is, why God has done thus, and why God has done so, and why he did not do thus and so. I know not why it is that God has given a revelation at one time and not at another, why it was that he saw fit to introduce the Patriarchal, then the Mosaic, then the Christian System. I do not know. I do not know why he had miracles in those ancient times, and does not see fit to have them now; nor do I know why he made the heavens and the earth, and why he made them as he has. "Who, by searching, can find out God?" The first step, in scientific investigation, is not to find out why God does what he does, but to find out what he has done; and when we know he has done it, that is enough; his reasons are in his own mind, and he has not seen fit to communicate them to us,—and even if he had, there is not the least probability that we could understand them. It seems as if, in mercy to our nature, he has given us just enough knowledge to enable us to perform our duties, and no more. He has seen fit that the world should progress; and as the world progresses, more and more light shall pour in upon it, in his own way and in his own time. We have not to question, why does the Judge of all the earth do this or that. The question is,—what does he?

Then, as regards St. Paul. St. Paul rebuked the Spiritualism that existed in his day. I would, if I might with the same power, rebuke it here, now. The same kind of superstition that exists here, now, Paul witnessed. When he was travelling he came among the ancient Greeks, and saw that they had built three thousand statues and temples, more costly than any churches you have at present. He walked among those statues and temples of the gods,—he stood upon Mars Hill, and said, "Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious." For, with all their gods, there were some phenomena of nature which they did not know to what god to attribute. They did not know what caused the lightning, and it was Jove; or what the tempest, and it was Neptune; or who caused the eruptions of Vesuvius, and that was Vulcan, who had a spiritual blacksmith's shop there. Then, to account for those unappropriated phenomena, they erected an altar to the Unknown God. And, standing by that altar, Paul said unto them:—

"Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For as I passed by and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, To THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you. God that made the world, and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth in temples not made with hands; neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though he needed any thing, seeing he giveth to all, life, and breath, and all things."

To Him it was that he referred, and not to Nature. This gentleman refers to Nature, and says that God does nothing except by these fixed laws. According to his idea, God himself, as some of those ancient heathen believed, was the slave of Nature, instead of being its Master and Creator. That is the idea of modern Spiritualism,—that God sits there, an impotent omnipotence,—instead of the Christian belief, that God made heaven and earth, and all that in them is.

Now, one word in regard to miracles. If they had miracles in the ancient times of the Bible, why not have them now?—is the law abrogated? The gentleman says we do have them now; I say, we do not. That is the gist of the whole matter. He asks why God has seen fit to suspend them. I don't know. God knows, and that is enough for us to know. Why he did it, he has not seen fit to tell us. That he has suspended them, all nature proclaims, throughout all her works. If there were miracles now, who, think you, would be most likely to find them? Would not those professors of Harvard College, be the most likely to discover them? If there had been a miracle, would not Professor Agassiz, a man so deeply learned in all the science of bugs and shells, have found it? The gentleman says they had miracles in Bible times. He did not see fit to comment upon the stopping of the sun in its progress, or the raising of the dead. He seemed to think it would be a little difficult to "get up the conditions" now. I think it would. I had been laboring under the delusion that the age of miracles was past. The whole Christian Church has been laboring under that mistake. The gentleman says we are mistaken. No man can be more glad than I; for I should be delighted to see a miracle. If there be any more miracles, may I be there to see. Don't darken the room. I am perfectly willing—what man on the earth would not be?—to see a miracle. Who would not give half his life to see it? And yet this gentleman talks as if the whole Christian world were shutting their eyes for fear they should see a repetition of these miracles of olden times. He sees it. Thousands are having these communications; only these stupid, blind, prejudiced Christians are so "undeveloped" that they are unable to see the miracles taking place around us. My ground is, that miracles did take place in the era of Bible history, that spirits did really appear. I am not a biblical critic; I am not going to dispute with the Adventists, who hold that spirits never did really appear. But I take the Bible, and, taking plain common sense as an interpreter, I find it full of miracles from one end to the other,—contradicting nature and overturning the laws of nature. Is that done now? The gentleman does not pretend it. The doctrine of the Spiritualists, on that subject, is that these miracles are the manifestations of spirits. Why will not some of these obliging spirits, since they have your trance-mediums talking such indescribable nonsense as they do, pouring out their hifalutin poetical blarney, by the two hours together, till you are almost tired to hear it,—why will they not give us a little sense, give us some useful information, and do something beside tipping tables and supplying quack-doctors with money? Why will not some benevolent spirit like St. Paul, so anxious to do good and stop these injudicious manifestations, when living, come and do the same good now? Why does not Swedenborg, who said, and whose followers say, that he communicated with the spirit-world—I don't know whether he did or not—why does not he come here and give us some valuable information upon the "conditions" of ancient spiritual intercourse? The strong desire of our spiritual nature makes every one ask for such mani-

Shakespeare

festations; and there is no man so sensual that he will not start up with joy if he can have the hope of conversing with one who has come, as 'Shakspeare has it,—and no man knew human nature so well,—from "that bourne from which no traveller returns." And it is to be noted that in very many of Shakspeare's plays, he introduces characters—Hamlet, Richard, Macbeth—who thought that they were holding converse with the spirits of the dead, and yet he speaks of that bourne from which no traveller returns. I wish to call the very special attention of my friend to this point as to the Bible, because it is one which we shall come to again and again, and I have been waiting to see the gentleman come to it. It is a common argument with Spiritualists, the moment they find they are talking with a man who professes to believe in the Bible, as I confess I do,—that same old Bible which the Spiritualists think so fallible. They believe in it; oh, yes! they believe in it as General Jackson believed in the Constitution—he believed in it as he understood it! They believe in the Bible just so far as it suits them, just while it gratifies their passions; but the moment it punishes their sins, they don't believe in it. When I was lecturing in Taunton, and said, in the course of my lecture, that the Spiritualists did not believe the Bible, Mrs. Currier, speaking under the influence of St. Somebody, rose up, and, she being a great, strong person, I knew enough not to attempt to stop a woman, especially as her own soul had been ousted by some intruding spirit who had no right to be in there. This spirit interrupted me: "The gentleman, in his lecture, said The Spiritualists do not believe the Bible:—it is a lie! we do believe the Bible." I rose and apologized, and said I didn't know it,—I had read their books, and heard their lectures, and, judging from them, I supposed they did not believe the Bible. The audience took the joke and began to laugh; and she felt the point, and rose to explain.

[The allotted twenty minutes here expired.]

MR. MILLER.

I beg to remind my brother that the question before us this evening, is not, whether the Bible is true or false. That the gentleman knows there is a prejudice to which he can appeal, is very evident; and that he has taken pains to appeal to that grain of prejudice which exists in the public, is very clear to every mind. Let him confine himself to the argument upon the question. This Bible is my own, and I have as much right to quote it as I have to quote Shakspeare, and have just as much right to my views, in reference to the Bible, as he has to his. And I would say, again, that every Spiritualist does believe that the Bible contains inspiration. That which is spurned by Spiritualists, is the idea of infallible inspiration. So long as man is imperfect, so long will the inspiration he receives partake, more or less, of his imperfections. And the great mischief arises from receiving this as infallible inspiration. The great mischief is, that men quote the Bible to support error. The slaveholder quotes it, as an infallible book, to support slavery; Brigham Young quotes the Bible to support polygamy. And allow me to say, good friends, that he who has the most error to support, he who has a system of oppression, or the divine right of kings, to support, always quotes the Bible. But he who has truth to utter very seldom appeals to it as infallible authority. We differ in our views in regard to what constitutes inspiration.

And now, in regard to the miracles, so called, recorded in the Bible. I would remind my brother, and the audience, that a very large and respectable portion of the theological world have come to the conclusion that all miracles are in accordance with the laws of nature. The idea of God being a lawless being, working without law, regardless of law! That the world has fallen into the idea that he is above the laws of

nature, plainly arose from its want of knowledge of those laws. When a celebrated German scholar told the king of Siam, that water congealed and became so solid that an elephant might walk upon it without its breaking,—said the king of Siam, That is impossible; I cannot believe it. He had had no experience; it seemed, to him, against the laws of nature. There was a time, when, if we had been told that a train of cars could be whirled along at the rate of thirty miles an hour, we should have pronounced it impossible, and contrary to the laws of Nature. Yet, now, nothing is more familiar. And so, if we come to examine the wonders recorded in the Bible, we shall find them in perfect accordance with the laws of nature, and not above them.

The gentleman wants us to tell if Spiritualism can stop the sun. Does he, or any intelligent man, believe that the system of the worlds was stopped to enable Joshua to conquer in that battle? I supposed it was generally understood that it was simply intended, in the Bible, that the armies of Joshua were represented by banners, with emblems, and that upon one of these was the sun, and upon another the moon, perhaps upon another a sword; and that he caused the army which went under the banner of the moon to stop in the valley of Ajalon, and that which went under the emblem of the sun to rest in another place. Can it be possible that the infinite God caused this earth, revolving at the rate of a thousand miles an hour, passing through space at the rate of a thousand miles a minute, to be stopped in its revolution? No sane man can believe this for a moment.

And now, in regard to the raising of Lazarus. The Bible expressly declares that he was not dead, but slept. They said to Jesus that Lazarus was dead, and he replied, "He is not dead, but sleepeth." When he could not impress upon their minds that Lazarus was in a trance, he allowed their idea that Lazarus was dead, to prevail. If Lazarus was really dead, why did Jesus contradict them at all? Now, that individuals have, in our own days, been restored from long trances, in which they were, apparently, dead, is a notorious fact.

As to the "dark circles,"—we might give high precedents of dark circles. The circle on Mount Tabor, when Jesus talked with Moses and Elias, was in the night. The stone was rolled away from the sepulchre, in the night; Peter was led out of the prison, in the night; and we might enumerate many other manifestations that occurred in the hours of darkness. Jesus Christ directs us, when we pray, to go into our closet, and shut the door. You have to conform to conditions. You get up your prayer-meetings; a few congenial souls meet together, and their spirits go out in rapport with those spiritual beings around them. Let a scoffer, let a sceptic, come in, one who ridicules and denounces, and away goes the spirit of worship. Do they feel as before? You disturb the conditions. Why, an "anxious seat" is indispensable to a revival. To a psychological subject, you say,—"Be passive, be quiet, don't laugh, look steadily at your hands." He must conform to the conditions.

Now, my friends, I wish to show you that the cases recorded in the Bible, and those of the present day, are analogous. There are at least twenty thousand mediums, in the United States, who daily see and converse with spirits. Do you reject their testimony? Jacob declares he saw spiritual beings. At night he beheld a ladder let down out of heaven, and angels ascending and descending. I must receive that testimony. If I reject it, I am a heretic. I am an infidel if I do not believe that that ladder has been removed, so that no more angels can come down. There are mediums, to-day, who give the same testimony: and I ask, is not their testimony reliable? When Paul was on his way to Damascus, suddenly his external senses were shut up, and, with his eyes closed, he saw Christ. There were two men with him, who did not see Christ. My

opponent tells us that you have to go to sleep, to see spirits: now why does he not reject this? why does he not believe that Paul was asleep? Paul came into Damascus, blind, led by the hand. What a figure must the learned Saul, whom my friend would now ridicule as a trance-medium asleep,—what a figure must he have cut! The spirit directed Ananias to go to Saul and open his eyes. He was a sceptic, and resisted the influence; but he obeyed the vision, went to Saul, and a manifestation was produced. When the eyes of Paul were to be opened, they found it necessary to bring a medium there, who could exert an influence upon him; else the mission of the Damascene disciple to him was a mere farce. Ananias ran out to meet him, and, doubtless, made ridiculous manipulations over him, and cured him. And again, when Paul was on his knees, trembling and astonished, there suddenly shone round about him a light from heaven. He fell to the earth; and while on his knees, he heard, in a trance, the voice of Christ, saying, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Even Christ could not speak to Paul until the external senses of Paul were closed. Again, Paul saw a vision of the third heavens. He says he saw such things that it would be unwise to mention them to those around him. And yet, he says he does not know whether he saw these things in the body or out of the body. Suppose the medium who spoke in this hall last night, had declared that she had a view of the spirit-world, that she had seen it clearly, and, at the same time, had declared she did not know whether, when she beheld it, she was in the body or out of the body; would it not have become a subject of ridicule to my brother? Was not John, in Patmos, in a trance? and will not my brother say that the communication, to him, of his Revelations, was a miracle? You talk of God performing these miracles. It was a spiritual being that rolled the stone from the door of the sepulchre. It was an angel that broke the fetters of Paul and opened the prison doors and let him go forth. It was an angel that taught the Revelation to John; but when John sought to worship him, the angel said, "See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God." There are those to-day who have averred that they have seen spirits, and have conversed with them. Will you reject this testimony? The same law governed the ancient manifestations, that governs these, to-day.

A few weeks ago, for the first time, I visited the city of Boston. I went to Neponset, and called upon Mr. Southworth, a gentleman of the place. He was a stranger to me; it was the first time I had ever met him. His daughter, a girl of fifteen years of age, who could not have known any thing of my sister in the spirit-world, said,—“I see a spiritual being here, and from the relation she seems to bear to you, she appears to be a sister.” She described the appearance as accurately as I could have done, myself; and said,—“Over her head I see a name.” She spelt it out, slowly,—L-u-c-y. I know, as well as I know any thing in the world, that that girl had never seen my sister. Will I doubt this testimony, and receive that of men who lived eighteen hundred years ago? No, my friends, I cannot.

But the gentleman says it is not for him to decide or determine why God has changed the ancient order of things, under which miracles were produced. Let him first show that the Almighty has changed it. I say he never has repealed the law, or revoked it; and when the gentleman says it has been repealed, it is a bare assumption, without one particle of truth. I say, it did measurably cease, for the reason that man became corrupt and vicious, not because God had refused to permit the sequence of the same effects under the same condition. Christ says,—“These signs shall follow—”

[The speaker's time expired.]

MR. GRIMES.

I was speaking about that woman —

MR. MILLER. — Will my brother talk to the question, and let the woman go?

MR. GRIMES. — Oh, no; you Spiritualists are just as fond of the women as I am. Why, everybody in this audience knows that I have spoken to the question as closely as he has, — if I have sense enough to understand it. Did I not speak to the question, when I said — If the law has not changed, if we have the same manifestations now, let us have them. It seems to me that is to the point. I gave a reason why we do not have them now; — that the Creator, for reasons best known to himself, has seen fit to suspend the manifestation of those miracles. If I am wrong, I am glad to know it; for I have a curious desire to see them. He gives us no reason why we should not have them. Then let us have them. And I say that that is the very question before us. All turns upon that.

Now, in regard to that woman. I was speaking about belief in the Bible, — that Spiritualists do not believe in the Bible as Christians understand believing in the Bible; for it is the veriest farce to say they believe in the Bible, and then treat it in a manner —

MR. MILLER. — Will the gentleman please to discuss this question with me? I say I receive the Bible as a record of past inspiration.

MR. GRIMES. — Yes, he believes in inspiration, and inspiration means nothing at all. According to the Spiritualist idea, I am inspired now. Joe Smith was inspired, and everybody that gets a crooked idea into his head is inspired. They say the Bible is an inspired book, and then degrade the Bible by saying that every man who has a notion in his head, and runs about preaching it, is inspired; that the Bible is reliable, to be sure, and inspired to be sure, but that there is nothing reliable in it more than in an old almanac.

Now, I may return to that woman, again. When I was lecturing in Taunton, and this woman interrupted me, and said that I lied, because I stated the Spiritualists did not believe in the Bible, and when I had apologized, — she, finding that the audience were a little against her, arose, and explained. She said, "We do believe in the Bible, in this way, — so much of the Bible as is true we believe to be true, and so much of it as is false, we believe to be false; — and in that way we believe the whole of it." In that way she believed in the Bible! and that is the sense in which Spiritualists believe in the Bible. They believe it to be fallible; they believe it to contain falsehood. They do not believe it to be a proper guide to our feet and lamp to our path. They believe that the patriarch Abraham was a respectable old gentleman who knew a good deal for his time, — that Moses was more "progressed," — that Christ was more progressed than Moses, and that Andrew Jackson Davis and the Fox girls have gone ahead of the whole — the Bible is inspired, but the Fox girls are more inspired. If I do injustice, no one is more capable, as you have seen, of showing it, than the gentleman, who is as much inspired as the rest of them.

The gentleman tells us the miracles stopped, in those dark ages, because the Church became so corrupt. And mark how the miracles began again. It was when some part of the people in this lower world got over corruption, and became enlightened, and purified. And the Fox girls were the first. Only think of it! They were the first that had emerged from this mass of corruption which had been gathering for so many cen-

tures. And the Fox girls, and Andrew Jackson Davis, and other gentlemen and ladies—you know who and what the Spiritualists are,—have come out from the Christian Church, as it has been so corrupt, and are become better and purer than anybody else! This is the gentleman's position, mark you. Is it not excellent? He gives as a reason why the miracles were suspended, the deterioration and corruption of the Church! And now, of course, by the same reasoning, the miracles have been again given for the reason that the world has become purified. And, furthermore, the purest, of course, must be most capable of receiving these manifestations. But our scientific men, our professors at Harvard, were so degraded and corrupt in intellect and morals, that no mighty works could be done, in their presence, by the Fox girls, and the Davenport boys, led on by my friend, here.

DR. GARDNER made a remark to the speaker, in a low voice.

MR. GRIMES.—Yes, the raps were made, but that was because they were not so corrupt on the floor.

The gentleman talks about reasoning from antecedent probability. But is there any one, with common sense, who does not feel that it is infinitely improbable that the whole Christian Church is so terribly corrupt, that the professors of Harvard College are so corrupt, while here, in this temple where purity reigns, the manifestations can appear? That is not probable; and you know it.

One word, now, in regard to the gentleman's comment upon that miracle,—that it was not at all likely that the Deity would stop the revolution of this world, when it was going so fast,—a thousand miles an hour, on the surface, beside going at the rate of sixty-eight thousand miles, in its orbit. It was not likely, the gentleman said, that God would stop that; the speed was altogether too great; it was too much trouble; and this rendered it improbable that the Almighty would stop it for any such reason as that assigned. That is to illustrate the very idea I charged upon the gentleman,—that he made God the creature of law. What is a law? Does it not imply the lawgiver? Is not a law as much the work of Nature's God, as a man, or a planet? What is earth, to that Almighty Being? Let my friend go out and survey the bright heavens above him, let him think how little, miserable a thing this world is, how many millions of millions of worlds stretch through space, and then think how much it would be, for the Creator of these numberless systems, to stop the rolling of this little ball. It is not likely he would do any thing so stupendous as to stop that motion, and produce—the gentleman says—a discord!

He says, again, a miracle, as I employ the term, is the setting aside of a law. I agree to it, but not in the sense which he intends. The great Creator gave laws to every thing; and when he performs a miracle, it is a higher and additional law proceeding from the same Lawgiver. In that sense, only, is the ordinary course of things a law. The will of God is the law to the whole creation.

A word upon one other point. When I spoke of the miracles of the Bible, the gentleman proceeded to explain them all. It could be easily shown that there was no sun and moon stopped,—that what was meant by the sun and moon, was a mere inscription on a banner. He did not point out any passage of Scripture, or any evidence whatever, that the ancient Jews carried any banner with the emblem of the sun or the moon. I think that was not their banner. The Jews never so employed the emblems of the sun and moon. That was a Mahometan idea,—that was originated afterward. The sun, and moon, and banner and all, sprang from his own imagination; or, if he read from some book, I should like to hear the original. He says all these miracles in the

Bible are easily explained. But when you come to the manifestations which the Spiritualists have got up, and ask them to explain, they will tell you they are mysteries which they cannot explain; and when you tell them that you don't believe there are tables raised and bells rung, because it is against the laws of nature, the gentleman makes it out all very plain:—"Oh, you can't understand it; there are a great many things you cannot understand:" and they forget, all the time, to use this same reasoning in the case of the Bible.

I do not deny Spiritualism because I cannot understand it, or because I think it is improbable. I do not deny that the tables may rise; I do not deny that spirits may come here and communicate. I do not deny it, at all,—only, I want to see it. I protest against their letting a favored few see these wonderful things, while I cannot see them.

MR. MILLER.

I am sorry, indeed, that my brother seems forced to bring in a side issue. The question of the fallibility or infallibility of the Bible is not the question for us to discuss. It has been dragged in as a side issue. He has not even attempted to show wherein the analogy between ancient spiritual manifestations and those of to-day fails. He has passed it slightly by, though I endeavored to show that the two are similar and analogous. He wastes many minutes in relating what some lady said in regard to the Bible, and spends much time in talking about the sun and moon standing still. Now, I might tell my brother, if I could put on the face, that I don't deny that the sun and moon stood still, but I want to see it. I will not deny that the dead are resurrected; but I want to see it. Has my brother any precedent, in Revelation, where the divinely inspired man came forward and demonstrated his inspiration before sceptics? Did Paul, in the presence of his judges, perform miracles? Did he there heal the blind, and cause the lame to walk? The Jews said they would not take the testimony of others. Christ said that human testimony was reliable, and rebuked them because, others having testified to what they had seen of his works, they did not believe. They said, "Let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe." I don't think it was of infinite importance that they should believe, nor that my brother shall; and if I have seen and he has not, the difference is, that I have and he has not.

He says that Spiritualists have become pure-minded. I will not say, here, whether they are pure, or not; yet I will say this, which is to the point, that among the churches they do not seek to have these gifts. There never can be a supply until there is a demand. Christ says, "Knock, and it shall be opened unto you; seek, and ye shall find." When they go about seeking it, they will get manifestations. The manifestations will occur to-day, as they did in olden time: but the churches pride themselves on their dignity, on their fine chapels and high steeples, upon their popularity and self-righteousness, while Spiritualism comes up obscurely,—born in a lowly family—as the Gospel Dispensation was born in a manger, in the presence of four-footed beasts. There are many men and women whom you may stigmatize, who desire communication with spiritual beings. Now, it seems to me more reasonable that my mother, who has, as Christians say, become like the angels of heaven,—it seems to me more reasonable that she should come to communicate to me than that God should cause the sun and moon to stand still, that they might give light to a lot of poor devils to butcher each other by. And it seems to me much more reasonable to believe the one, on living evidence, than to believe the other, on the testimony of some man,—we don't know whom. When Christ was brought before Pontius Pilate, he produced no miracles as evidence of his mission.

None of the apostles ever produced a fact when the truth of their doctrine was disputed. The manifestations produced by Christ were, as regarded the time and place of their occurrence, incidental,—not got up for any special occasion, but called forth by the circumstances in which he found himself placed.

MR. GRIMES

Said he had understood that the additional five minutes allowed to each speaker, at the close of the evening's debate, was for explanation, only. He would, therefore, simply call attention to the remarks of Mr. Miller in regard to the probability of the truth of certain miracles recorded in the Bible.

The gentleman (Prof. Grimes proceeded) thinks it much more probable that his friend in the other world should converse with him than that God should cause the sun and moon to stand still to assist the victory of Joshua. He began by saying he believed in the Bible; I told him how glad I was to hear it; and he winds up by sneering at it—not at all probable that God would stop the sun while poor devils should do this and that.

MR. MILLER. — I think the more reasonable, and best interpretation, put upon it, is that, instead of stopping the sun and moon, the armies were commanded to halt. I do not sneer at it. I prefer that interpretation. If you tell me that the Bible teaches the doctrine of infant damnation, I do reject it.

MR. GRIMES. — That is the sum of his belief, — what I think reasonable, I believe, and what is not reasonable, I sneer at. He doesn't believe in the Bible, further than it agrees with his views.

MR. MILLER. — Am I to take my interpretation or yours?

The discussion, for the evening here closed.

SECOND EVENING.

TUESDAY, MARCH 6TH.

The debate was continued, on the evening of Tuesday, March 6th, as follows:—

MR. MILLER.

Mr. Moderator, and Respected Friends: Perhaps it might be well to recapitulate, briefly, the positions which I took, last evening, on the affirmative of this question. I did not present my direct evidence and proof of spirit-intercourse, last night, but, rather, endeavored to build up an argument upon its probability, or reasonableness. And the first position that I took was based upon this law of nature: that like attracts like; that every thing in the universe has an affinity for its kind; that there is no such thing as absolute independence to be found anywhere in God's Creation;—that all particles of matter bear a mutual and reciprocal relation to every other particle of matter, act upon and are acted upon by every other particle in the universe. This we acknowledge to be true. And is it not equally true of the spirit-world? Taking it for granted that there is a realm of spiritual existence, this existence must, of necessity, exert more or less influence over minds in the body.

The discussion was continued, further, upon various other arguments based on the universal testimony of mankind in regard to that overshadowing Providence which rules the destinies of the world. I called attention to the fact that, in every age, man has recognized the presence of invisible intelligences. This position was further sustained by the record of the Bible, that for four thousand years out of six, spirits were in the habit of conversing with men. From the book of Genesis to Revelations, we find it full of the records of spirit-intercourse; and I asked my brother, when the laws and conditions that allowed spirit-intercourse were repealed? When had God changed the laws of spirit-intercourse, and said that we should have it no longer? To this I received no reply.

We also spoke of the gifts existing in the early Church, and of the fact that those gifts did not cease in the Apostolic Age, but, according to ecclesiastical history, and the writings of the early Fathers, continued for three or four hundred years after the Christian Era; and that, in the Dark Ages, man ceased to have these gifts, for the simple reason that he did not seek them—he plunged into sensuality, and bloodshed, he did not ask any light, and therefore he received none.

This evening, friends, I propose, for direct proof of spirit-intercourse, to present facts, and shall continue to do so,—piling up facts upon facts, and making an argument upon the absolute certainty of the truth of spirit-communion. It is true, I shall not introduce manifestations, here, before this audience; but I shall speak of facts, and give the evidence of witnesses who speak what they do know and can testify what they have seen.

Is human testimony reliable? Why, dear friends, in all the events of life, we are obliged to rely upon human testimony, in receiving nine-tenths of all our information. We cannot reject human testimony. The Christian Church has said that we are, in candor and reason, bound to receive the testimony of individuals, upon which their religion is founded.

Do spirits hold intercourse with mortals? Have they returned and established their identity? I say we have as positive proof of their identity, as we have of that of individuals whom we do not see and who are not immediately present. Is it possible to establish the identity of an individual from his handwriting? It is a matter of business, every day, in our courts, to establish the identity of individuals from the handwriting. A or B has signed a note, and some one testifies that that is his handwriting, and this is considered sufficient evidence to take away, upon it, the rights and property of the person. Do spirits establish their identity by their handwriting? Hundreds of instances of it have been given, even through little children, who could not write; and who knew nothing of the persons whose signatures were given by their hands. Mr. and Mrs. Hamlin, of Madison, Madison County, in the State of New York, have a daughter who, before she could form a single letter, would, under the influence of an invisible intelligence, write out medical prescriptions and give the signatures of persons who have passed on into the spirit-world. And shrewd, strong-minded men have seen that little girl write, and, as they have recognized the handwriting of a partner in business, a brother, or a wife, they have turned pale, and their knees have shaken at the sight.

Are individuals identified by their voices? A crime is committed in the dark, and a man comes into court and testifies that he knows the guilty party by his voice. Do spirits give such tests? Yes: there are hundreds who have heard the voices of their departed friends, from mediums. If I have heard the voice of my mother in life, I have heard it from her spirit, through a medium.

Are individuals identified by their appearance. Yes: and upon such identification alone, a man's liberty, his rights, perhaps his life, are forfeited. Do spirits return, and thus establish their identity? There are at least twenty thousand mediums in the United States, who see spirits and describe them so accurately that those sitting around, recognize the description as true. I gave one incident last evening, — that, when I first came to the city of Boston, I had occasion to call at Neponset, and that a daughter of the gentleman upon whom I called, saw, and described to me there, my sister, who had been for years in the spirit-world. Spirits have returned, and identified themselves, and reached every sense that possibly can be reached, in establishing their identity.

Let me, here, give two or three instances of the presence of intelligent beings not of this world. We shall come, presently, to speak of cases which are more to the point. Last sabbath, I was in Taunton. Mrs. Willard Tripp told me that, — last summer, I think it was, — she made a mental request that a certain gentleman should visit there upon a certain Friday. H. T. Fairfield was intending to stop in Taunton on the sabbath. It was his intention to go there on Saturday. He was in his home at Greenwich. There was company at the house of Mrs. Tripp, in Taunton, and they desired to see him. She mentally requested a spirit-friend to go and tell him to come on Friday. He solemnly avers, that, while engaged in his business, a voice came to his interior mind, — "Go to Taunton to-morrow; you are wanted." His mother said, — "Why not wait till Saturday?" "They have sent for me;" he replied, "a spirit has sent for me to go." He did go; and when he met Mrs. Tripp, at the door, she asked why he came, and he answered, — "You sent for me." Paul, on his way to Damascus, heard a voice,

saying, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" The Christian world brand me as an infidel, if I reject the testimony of Paul; and yet, here are equally reliable witnesses, who testify that they have heard the voice of a spirit.

Let me give you another instance, of the voices that have been heard. In the village of Madison, New York, resides Noah Tyler, a well-to-do farmer. Some years ago, on a hot, sultry day, while upon his way to market, he was attacked by apoplexy. He fell back in the wagon, and the horse stopped; and, being alone, he remained there in that condition for nearly half an hour. He says he felt he was dying; he could not move an arm or a finger. One of the neighbors came along, and, seeing him in that condition, got into the wagon and drove to Mr. Tyler's house. Neighbors came in, expecting, every moment, to see him breathe his last. Mrs. Tyler told me that if she ever prayed in her heart, it was then, that a healing medium might be sent, and that her husband might be restored. Christ says: "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." Sixteen miles from Madison, in the village of Earlville, resides Mr. Potter, a philanthropist, and a prosperous farmer. He is accustomed to hearing voices, which are audible; and those in his presence, often hear voices, and look to see whence they come. He told me that he was engaged in the barns, about half-past nine, which was the time when Mr. Tyler was carried into his house, in a dying condition. Mr. Potter was engaged in cutting his hay. He heard a voice say,—"Mrs. Tyler wants you." He answered, audibly, "Tell Mrs. Tyler that I will go there." When he came to himself he thought the spirit wanted to trifle with him, and he would not go. He heard the voice again, and said,—"I will go." Taking his carriage, and his wife with him, he drove sixteen miles, on a hot, sultry day, over the hills. The neighbors thought him mad; for he was obliged to whip the horses, and put them in foam. When he arrived he asked,—"Why am I sent here?" Mrs. Tyler said,—"Good angels have sent you." He became entranced, and formed a circle of the neighbors, had them join hands and take hold of the hands of the dying man. He laid hands upon the dying man, who, in a short time recovered. The point to which I wish to call attention is not the curing of the disease. But, I ask, what voice was that which spoke to Mr. Potter upon his farm? He has given hundreds of dollars, to clothe the poor, and feed the naked; and every man in the vicinity thinks him reliable, and an honest and upright man. Can you, as intelligent persons, receiving human testimony to establish facts, reject that testimony?

Mrs. Gerritt Smith told me, last summer, that if she ever heard her boy's voice in this world, she had heard it since he was in the spirit-land; that if she had shaken hands with and kissed that boy in the flesh, she had shaken his hand and kissed him since he had passed into the spirit-world. Can we reject the testimony of so estimable a lady, who lives to-day, and may be interrogated? Must I refuse to receive that, and go back and receive the testimony of persons who lived thousands of years ago? No, my friends; we cannot, in honesty or integrity. If my brother has not seen these things, it matters not. It is a rule of evidence that, if one fair witness testifies to what he has seen and known, it will outweigh any number of witnesses who have not seen the same things. Christ considered that human testimony was sufficient to establish a fact. The Jews of his day, said to him,—Come down from the cross, and do your miracles in our presence, and we will believe; you always do these things in the presence of your immediate followers. And I would remark, that Christ and his apostles never produced any of their manifestations to satisfy the unbelieving or incredulous; but all of the miracles of Christ—and I speak of miracles only as the manifestations of the spiritual nature—all the miracles of Christ were simply incidental to his teaching. There

was no time fixed; there was no Harvard Investigating Committee, to look into this matter; there was no opposer who was to have these manifestations produced before his eyes; but they were incidental; as he was journeying from one village to another, he healed the sick and restored the blind to sight.

MR. GRIMES.

The gentleman has, very correctly, I think, taken the course of briefly recapitulating the ground he went over last night. And then it was very natural for him to say that I did not reply. Well, perhaps, some who are here will recollect that I did reply.

MR. MILLER. — To one particular question. I said that my brother did not answer one particular question — when these laws were revoked?

MR. GRIMES. — And to that particular question some persons will remember that I did reply; and, in order to help the memory of the gentleman I will repeat the reply. The point was this: and I deem it to be a very important point. "When did God repeal the law by which the miracles recorded in the Bible were performed?" Did not I answer? Did I not say they were not performed by a law of nature, at all? Did I not say that a miracle is not in accordance with a law of nature? The very word *miracle* implies that it is something above nature, — that it is a departure from the ordinary laws of nature: and it is that very thing which the gentleman denies. He confounds the miracles of Christ, manifestations of the power of God, the Author of nature and of nature's laws, recorded in the Bible, with the miserable jugglery of his own mediums, — indeed, places these mediums above Jesus Christ himself, who worked those miracles. The point that I made was, that the law, as he called it, has never been repealed, because it never existed. I said that when God created this universe, he gave it laws. Every department of it had its laws, and when, on any particular occasion, he saw fit to suspend one of those laws, he did so, in order to perform a particular act, and that was a miracle. The gentleman asks when the law was repealed or suspended. I did not say *when*. I say, that now the same God rules, and if he should see fit to perform a miracle now, he has the power to do it. The gentleman himself thought that God would not take the pains, or, if he did, it would be too much trouble for him, to stop this world, going around at the rate of a thousand miles an hour. As if the Almighty could not make the world stand still, without a discord! As if the Author of all nature could not do any thing he chose, with it! I denied that the miracles of the Bible were performed in accordance with a law of nature: that is the great distinction between those and any manifestations got up now-a-days. He took the ground that the age of miracles is not passed, — that the causes which produced miracles exist now, as well as ever, and declared that, if we could get the conditions now, as well as ever, we could have them now. I called upon him to let us have them, and, if he didn't know the conditions, he could learn them from St. Paul, and these spirits who can talk to Mr. Potter and Mrs. Tripp, and give so much information. Why can't they call the spirits of Newton and Franklin? And, indeed, they can, if we can believe them; for I noticed that these mediums, when they get into the spirit-world, get at once into good society, if they never did before. They talk with Washington, and Channing, and all the most aristocratic society, though they could never get into decent company in this world. The gentleman says these manifestations are produced under conditions, — just like the raising of potatoes, — get, only, a little earth, and warm weather, and we will have them growing. Let us have the ancient manifestations new.

They tell us we can get wine from water, if we only had the conditions. My friend Mr. Longwood would have to lose business, if that were true. We would have the Catechism coming down through the streets — the License Law would not be of much use. Now, I deny that any power but the direct power of God can produce a miracle — can raise the dead. The gentleman says Lazarus was asleep, not dead. Was Jesus Christ asleep, when he rose and went into heaven? What were the conditions for raising Christ? What are the conditions necessary, that a man may be born of a virgin, and, after death go to heaven — or to the other place — and return? For, according to his story, all we have to do is to fix up a few conditions, and we can have it. So much for that reply that I did not make: — I hope I have made it, now.

Another point was made: that the only reason no miracles occurred after the fourth century, was, because the Church became so sensual, licentious, corrupt. And I made a reply to that, to which he has not seen fit to allude — that, taking the doctrine and carrying it out, so corrupt has been the Church and the world, that these mighty works could not be done until now, when we have come upon the age of Andrew Jackson Davis, and the Fox girls, and the Davenport boys, who are so pure that we can have the miracles again. I wondered at the gentleman's recapitulating that. I should have supposed he would have kept still about any thing which exposes them so much. It would seem that the modern Spiritualists are like the manured field — the more filthy the manure is, the more beautiful the products are. Why, I have too much respect for the feelings of the Spiritualists, I pity them too much, to even give the briefest accounts of the purity of their Church. The corruption of the fourth century! If it surpasses that of your Spiritual Church, then I have not read your history aright, — and, indeed, I am not going into it for the present, for fear it will do you much injustice; but if you urge it very hard, I may produce it at some future time: it is on the record, and I will not go beyond those records.

Then the gentleman began what he called his direct proof. Last night, he only showed the probability. Why! if there was ever any thing improbable, on the face of the earth, it is, *a priori*, that there should be any such things as the modern spiritual manifestations. The question before this meeting is not, whether there are spiritual communications, whether the beings who have departed do sometimes communicate with beings in this world. Every Christian, except some of the Adventists, admits it, admits that spirits communicated, in ancient times, as recorded in the Bible. The question is, whether spirits communicate *as taught by the Spiritualists*, in the way and manner they pretend. Now, look at the probability. Is it probable, at all, that this modern Spiritualism would have begun in the way they say it did? What was the beginning? Who was the first medium? It happened in Poughkeepsie, a Dutch town in the State of New York. The medium was Andrew Jackson Davis, an ignorant boy, who knew less than other boys in his village. He was so pure, — and he was pure, I will give him the credit for that — he was perfectly innocent — he had no vice, nor had he any knowledge, either, any more than just enough to enable him to live and keep from starvation — his head was empty, he was pure enough, he was a perfectly fit subject for a medium. For when the spirits want a medium, they look around and find an empty head, where there are rooms to let, and take possession, — and he was, certainly, a good one. And what for the probability? The gentleman calls this modern inspiration. But, does God inspire fools? when, according to the history of the past, he inspires such men as Shakespeare, Milton, and Byron? Does he inspire the Coon boys, with their shillies, and the Davenport boys, with their ropes, that the doctor took to Harvard, to the professors? He certainly did bring the foolish things of this world

to confound the wise! He was, according to Scripture, *wise*; but, unfortunately, got terribly confounded, because his mediums did exactly nothing. I understand it cost the doctor four hundred dollars, and he didn't get any thing, not even a rap — yes, they did bring two or three raps on the floor, but almost anybody could make better.

So much for the probability. The gentleman began an argument about human testimony. He asks us if we will not believe human testimony. Is not all we do dependent upon human testimony, altogether? The gentleman did not do justice to that. No man I ever knew had eloquence enough to do justice to the importance of human testimony. I regard that element of the human mind from which we are influenced by human testimony, as the very crown of the mind. I have spent some little time in the study of the human mind, and if called to say what is its highest faculty, I should say it is that which makes us bend before human testimony. Let him say all he can upon that, and I will subscribe to it, and add to it. History would be nothing without it. The lower animals are below man, in that, more than in any thing else. They cannot write history, and if they did, they do not know enough to believe it. They have not the power of faith. It is a superadded faculty, which raises man above the brutes, and does enable him to approach to heaven. The very faculty which enables us to believe our fellow-men, enables us to believe the word of God, in the Bible. We should not have religion without it. The want of this faculty is the reason why animals have no religion. Religion is founded upon history. Without it, we could have no courts of justice. The judges hear the testimony, and decide the cause only upon human testimony, in almost every case. What we call literature is based upon it. If a man wants knowledge, he can get but little by his own experience. If a man wants information, he goes to his library to seek it:—and happy is the man who has a good library, and grateful ought every one of you to be to those who have given you the splendid libraries in this city;—you do not know what a blessing they are. Let me not, therefore, disparage human testimony. And what then? Are we, because we are to admit human testimony, to be so credulous as to believe the miserable stuff on which this Spiritualism is founded? Are we to believe everybody that talks, every impostor that has something to palm upon the world? Is there to be no limit to human credulity? What a heaven that would be for quacks and humbugs! There would be no bound to their reign, if you could not set any limit to human testimony, anywhere.

My time is out, though I had meant to make one other point.

MR. MILLER.

Mr. Moderator, and Ladies and Gentlemen: I wish my brother had had more time to make a point. He tells you of the libraries in the city, and informs you of how much, more or less, Brother Gardner lost, with a great amount of other matter entirely foreign to the subject. He is desirous of covering himself with all the refuse matter of Spiritualism, and of strongly appealing to the prejudices of the people at large. I would beg to remind my friend and brother that ridicule is a mighty strong argument with the weak, but a mighty weak argument with the wise. And I will beg to remind him, also, that every subject under heaven is susceptible to ridicule. There is nothing that cannot be held up in a false light. Suppose I take a statement of the Bible and commence ridiculing it. Suppose I take that vision of Peter, who went up to the house-top to pray, and, falling into a trance, saw heaven opened; and a vessel, descending to him, like a great sheet, knit at the four corners and let down to the earth; in which were all manner of four-footed beasts and creeping things and fowls of the air; and heard a voice

saying to him, "Rise, Peter, kill and eat"—suppose we should bring an artist, and have a picture painted of the scene, and draw, on the canvas, a great sheet, and Peter, with his eyes closed and his mouth open, and the animals ready to be devoured,—represent a large frog in the foreground, with eyes protruding, and another ludicrously drawn animal here and there, would it not make a most ridiculous caricature? Suppose I draw another picture, of the whale swallowing Jonah; would it not produce ridicule? A man's nose is susceptible of ridicule; and I remember reading a satire on the human nose. The writer turned it up, and down, and both ways, and made it come back; and upon reading the piece, I was almost tempted to cut off my nose; but upon second reflection, I made up my mind that it was a very important member, after all. I shall be sorry, indeed, if the gentleman finds that he is so hard-pressed that he is obliged to ridicule this subject. He has stated, simply, that the miracles of old were above the laws of nature. I have clearly established the fact that the cases of to-day are precisely analogous with those. He said,—Let them work miracles, let them work miracles now. The cases are precisely analogous. It was called a miracle, in ancient times, for men to speak unknown tongues. Judge Edmonds says that a niece, in his house, who knew no language but English and a little smattering of French, could, under spirit influence, speak Greek; and that a Greek spoke with a spirit through her. The gentleman calls our mediums fools—does he say of Judge Edmonds, that he is a fool? Does he say of Andrew Jackson Davis, that he is a fool? His writings do not, certainly, indicate it. Friends, foolish as all this is, it has confounded the wisdom of the world.

My brother says that he will receive human testimony, and, therefore, I will proceed to give it. For I cannot follow him in all his wanderings. If he is disposed to evade these facts, if he is disposed to evade these arguments, let him do so; I shall attend to my duty, and endeavor faithfully to present this subject before the public.

I will now speak of a fact which is, to my mind, and it seems to me must be to every mind, one most positive evidence of spirit-intercourse. The gentleman seems to acknowledge that spirits do hold intercourse with men on earth; but will he please to tell us how? Two years ago last August, I was wandering through the State of Ohio, on very much such a mission as was Saul of Tarsus, two thousand years ago; I being engaged, as is my friend to-day, as an opponent of Spiritualism. I had been, for four years, engaged in the field of opposition; and I would here briefly remark that, of all men in the world, the public opponent of Spiritualism has the least opportunity of knowing its truth. The gentleman may boast that he knows as much and more about it than any other man. I know that while he is acting as a public opponent, he has not the opportunity to investigate, except with a few public test mediums. When he is known to cavil, and to treat the subject as he has to-night, will he be admitted into the sanctuary of your family circle, there to witness manifestations? I know, by personal experience, that I had not the opportunity; and my brother has been engaged in the field himself, almost from the first—I, like thousands of others, in the infancy of Spiritualism, presumed it was a great delusion and humbug. I went into the field, supposing I knew something about it, and speculated and theorized. But, two years ago, in the city of Shagrin Falls, two miles from the city of Cleveland, I gave two lectures against Spiritualism. When I had finished, a young man came to me and said he was impressed that he could take a likeness of my friends in the spirit-world. This to me seemed strange. I had no idea that such a thing could be. But his candor and sincerity impressed and staggered me. I told him I would give him a fair trial. To corroborate the facts which I shall relate, you can have the testimony of thousands of others. I

went to the house of Dr. Harlow, where I met Mr. Rodgers, who had, ever since he was able to work, been in a tailor's shop in the city of Columbus. He was never known to manifest the least artistic taste or ability. Dr. Harlow showed me some of his pictures; and when I was told that they were executed in fifteen or twenty, or thirty minutes, I gave him a trial. He would not allow me to be in the room with him. That was reasonable enough. I knew that mind acts upon mind, and that my presence might thus hinder him. He desired, moreover, to have the room somewhat darkened, — not wholly so, but shaded. Remember that light is a powerful nervous irritant. The blood circulates much more rapidly in the daytime than at night. You cannot sleep as well in the day as at night. To have a room darkened favors a natural sleep. The trance depends upon the condition of the brain and nervous system, to a certain degree. This requirement seemed fair enough. I selected a piece of marbled paper. I took a sheet which had a little stain upon the back, which would be noticed by no one. I placed my signature, and the names of my father's family, upon the back of it. I arranged private marks carefully upon it, and had these marks and names arranged in a certain relative position to each other, in the form of a diagram. It would be impossible for him to detect these private marks. I didn't know but he might go out from the room: though if he painted the picture, in fifteen, or forty minutes, this would be inexplicable, whether it was a likeness of any of my friends or not. I went into a bedroom of the house; I rendered the room so dark that I could not read in it. After taking all that precaution, I sent Mr. Rodgers into the room, with the piece of marbled paper, and with some dry paint, and, in thirty minutes, he came out with an accurate likeness of my sister, who had been in the spirit-world four years. He came out with this painting [Mr. Miller here exhibited the portrait in question] finished, as you see before you. I never had met Mr. Rodgers, until that day; I never have seen him since that day; and I know he had never seen my sister, — that he could never have known any thing of her, more than this gentleman. She had always lived in Mount Morris, and had never been out of Livingston County in her life. That painting was executed upon the same paper which I had taken so much pains to mark. The likeness was accurate, and recognized by my father's family, and by scores of my sister's schoolmates. For, when I returned to my home, I hung the painting in the hall, before her schoolmates, and many gazed upon it with wonder, and acknowledged the faithfulness of the likeness. This is not the only painting Mr. Rodgers executed. During the two years and a half that he was a medium, he probably made from five to eight hundred of these pictures; and to each one of these, there are at least ten, fifteen, or twenty witnesses, who recognized them as faithful and accurate likenesses. Here is a cloud of witnesses. There is a lady in this audience, from the West, who has a faithful and accurate likeness of her brother, which was executed through the mediumship of Mr. Rodgers, and in the same length of time. I hold in my hand a letter from Mr. Hiram B. Smith, of Livingston County, New York, a gentleman worth, perhaps, two hundred thousand dollars, a member of the Baptist Church, a man well known for his integrity. He gives me, in this letter, a statement in regard to a painting of this kind.

"Avon, August 15, 1859.

"LEO MILLER, Esq., — Yours of the 11th came duly to hand. Glad to hear you are still laboring in the good cause. You wish me to give you the facts in regard to the likeness of my little boy.

"In the fall of 1856, I was passing through the State of Ohio. I had read, in a newspaper, an account of E. Rodgers taking spirit-likenesses, at Cardington. I saw by my check that we passed through Cardington. I at once resolved to stop over, one train, and see the man. On inquiry, I found that he had gone back into the country some four miles. I procured a horse and buggy, drove out, and found him in a wild-looking place, boarding with an old farmer. I told him I had seen a notice in the paper, stating that he could make like-

names of spirits, and that if so, I had lost a mother, and would like to get her likeness. He replied that he could not tell whether it could be made, or not. He remarked, that, at times, he became unconscious, — it seemed like going to sleep; and when he came out of this state, he found that portraits had been made. After some further conversation, he requested me to mark the marble-board on which the likenesses were made, that I might be satisfied it was no old picture. This I did, with great care. Soon his eyes closed; he got up, took the marble-board, and went into a small dark room, and left the door open. In twenty-five or thirty minutes, he came out and handed me a beautiful, correct likeness of my little boy, made on the same board I had marked. This boy had been dead some fifteen years; he was five and one-half years old when he died. I recognized it the moment I saw it. The resemblance between him and his sister now living, is very striking. As he presented it to me, I said to him, — 'Do you call this a likeness of my mother?' He looked at it as though he had not seen it before, and said, — 'No; it is a likeness of some little boy.' He then explained, that the pictures were made, sometimes, and he was directed where to send them. He went back to his table, and said, — 'Here is something that has been written.' He handed it to me; it was written with pencil: — 'We have given you Edwin's likeness, this time; next time, we will give you one of your mother.' I had no communication with Mr. Rodgers, that I had ever lost any friends but a mother. This is the only likeness we ever had, of this child. I was never in that part of the state before. I was not with Mr. Rodgers more than an hour and a half. He knew nothing of me or my family.

"The boy's name was George Edwin; but we called him Edwin.

"Yours respectfully,

H. B. SMITH.

"P. S. Please let me know how the discussion comes out.

"I have written this in a great hurry

H. B. S."

Can you reject the testimony of this witness? Mr. and Mrs. Newkirk, of Laporte, Indiana, have a likeness of their two children. Here is a piece taken from the *Laporte Times*, which is not a Spiritualist paper:—

"SPIRITUAL PAINTING.

"There are three pictures now in the house of Mr. B. Newkirk, of this city; portraits which we are told represent Mrs. Newkirk's mother, and two children; all of whom have been for many years, dwellers in another sphere. The production of these pictures has produced a good deal of sensation; and we have been requested to state the facts, for the benefit of the curious:—

"Mr. Rodgers, of Cardington, Ohio, who has been known for some months in spiritual circles, as the Artist-Medium, a tailor by trade, uneducated, and without any of the accomplishments of an artist, after urgent solicitation, visited this city a few weeks since, and stopped at Mr. Newkirk's house. He came on Thursday. On Friday he felt 'influenced' — took a sheet of Postalls painting paper, requested Mr. Newkirk to place his signature on the back of it, which was done. In a few minutes the medium was entranced, and a portrait was produced upon the same sheet of paper. On Saturday he again repaired to his room, in a similar condition and in twenty-five minutes' sitting produced another portrait, of a young girl. On Monday following, at the house of Mr. Cathcart, after similar precaution respecting the paper, in twenty-nine minutes the picture of a young lad was brought-out; all of which are paintings of more than ordinary merit; and one of them an exquisite picture of rare beauty and excellence. The picture of the lady bears strong resemblance to the family. We recognized this on first observation. The pictures of the children we know nothing about. Whether they are representative or not, the parents are pleased with them.

"We have but this to say in the matter:—There is no reasonable doubt but these pictures were produced by a man under influences the laws and nature of which we are entirely ignorant of—in the incredible short time allotted to each—that they are more than ordinarily good, as portrait paintings, so far as the art is concerned—that they could not have been executed by the most experienced artist short of many hours' labor on each.

"It is needless for us to add that it is claimed by the medium and others that these are the works of spirit-artists, operating through the organization of Mr. Rodgers, who is unconscious of the design, execution, or appearance of the picture while in his tranced state. Colored crayons are used, the colors are blended by the fingers of the medium—no other instruments being employed. We make these statements without comment, as we do not wish to enter into a discussion of Spiritualism in any newspaper."

Will my brother meet these facts? Will he respect the feelings of others, who receive these truths, and will he meet these facts, gentlemanly and like a man?

MR. GRIMES.

The gentleman seems to be deeply sensitive to ridicule. Well, so am I. But I should like to ask who loses, in a debate, by ridiculing the truth. Let any man, before a Boston audience, ridicule a truth, and how much does he gain by it? He will lose

his case at once. Indeed, you cannot do it successfully — you cannot possibly do it. Let the statue of Truth be brought before us, clothed in rags, and let me step forward and pull off these rags and tell what a miserable thing it is; by the time you get all the rags off, you see it in its perfect beauty, — and what harm have I done? Have I not rather done a favor to it? I have exposed it: and the more you expose truth, the better it is. Bring forward one of the beautiful productions of our true artists, and present it before an audience, and let some one say, — “What a homely thing! how ridiculous!” — who would laugh? A lion’s skin is a sublime object; you cannot ridicule it. It is associated in the mind, with every thing that is noble. When a man presents it to the audience, and let another pretend to laugh at it — it will not do. The thing shows its own noble character. But when you pull it aside and it shows a calf beneath, and you laugh, who is to blame? If a thing is absolutely ridiculous in itself, and I expose it, who is to blame? A portrait painter once came to a wealthy man, and said, “I am almost starving, and money will save my family.” “Oh, well,” said he; “if you will paint me, and make me look respectable —” “Oh, I shall have to starve,” said the artist, “it can’t be done.” Now, I say we cannot represent Spiritualism as it is, but every one will laugh. I should have to give the thing up. A thing so perfectly absurd that, when it is looked at in the light of the ludicrous, no man with a sense of the ludicrous can help laughing at it. If it be regarded in the light of morals, one must, indeed, be shocked; because, in that respect, its influence is most pernicious; if that is the gentleman’s god, let him worship it. “These be thy gods, O Israel!” — as Moses said when his people worshipped calves I must be excused from worshipping such things. I must do as Moses did, — dash it down, and break it in pieces. Those of you who look upon Spiritualism with such solemn respect, go worship it; but I will have no such gods before me.

The gentleman asks if Judge Edmonds is a fool. I ask you if he was a sensible man when he wrote that book. Let me read an extract from it. Now, I do not mean to ridicule Judge Edmonds; but I will read his own writing, I will give you the picture that he gives of himself; and if it is ridiculous, mark you, it is not my fault. Judge Edmonds was a judge of the Supreme Court of the State of New York and a judge of the Court of Appeals, the highest court in our state, — a man of character, integrity, talent, — there is no doubt of it. I know well, for I have been present in the court, when he has presided with dignity and ability. No man, I believe, respected him more than I did, in common with all the members of the bar. We looked up to him with reverence and admiration. Now, Judge Edmonds, when he was thus in his height of glory, descended like Lucifer from heaven. He sank, not only in the estimation of the members of the bar, but of the whole state; and his fellow-members of the Democratic party dare not nominate him again. It would have been considered ridiculous; he would have lost his election. This might be set down to persecution. But do you ask me, since he was a man of ability and integrity, how it was possible for him thus to descend. I answer that, beyond all question, the man was insane — he was laboring under a disease of the brain. Do you doubt it? It seems, to me, to be the most charitable explanation you can give of his conduct.

In his book upon Spiritualism, he says:—

“The idea is, I am aware, entertained by some, that this new philosophy is at variance with the revelation through Christ, the Redeemer. This is, indeed, a sad mistake, and one that believers would be too happy to correct, if only the opportunity could be afforded them.”

I should like to know if that is not insanity, to begin with. They cannot agree among themselves; they are quarrelling with each other, to begin with, — their spiritual gifts are so various!

Then in another part of the book, he says:—

"The human mind thus prepared for its advent,—"

And, by the way, I wish to show that after he said Spiritualism was not at variance with Christianity, he begins to exalt Spiritualism, and to run down Christianity —

"This new dispensation comes to supply the want to the countless thousands who are now lumbering in indifference or tolling in infidelity; to teach man his origin, his duty, and his destiny; to convict him of his immortality, and instruct him how to make it happy; to open to his view the great doctrine of progression, involving an eternity of action, and the supremacy of his reason over the besetting propensities of his material nature; and to impress upon him forever the precept to love God and his fellow. It comes —"

Now, mark the contrast — the new dispensation

"comes not with the flaggot and the sword, —"

implying that this was the coming of Christianity —

"but with healing on its wings, at once the Redeemer and the Comforter; not in a distant and subjugated province, but amid a mighty people who are free to receive and embrace it, —"

referring to the fact that Judea was a subjugated province of the Romans, — whereas, this came in this country, "amid a mighty people" — it is democratic. — Again: the new dispensation comes

"not to a few obscure men in lonely places, but everywhere broadcast throughout the whole civilized world, and among all classes; not to be taught covertly amid the caverns of the hills or the dens and vaults of Imperial Rome, but openly in the face of God and man, challenging investigation; not asking a blind faith or dependence upon authority, but the exercise of man's most God-like quality, his reason."

Now, let me refer you to the passage where, after having told of the mean way in which Christianity came, and the noble way in which modern Spiritualism came, he proceeds to show the manner in which Spiritualism came to himself, and gave some of those sublime experiences which I shall attend to, I warrant you, in good time — I will haul up these stories of his, and that picture, and tell you what they are, before I have done. Let me read from Judge Edmonds' work.

"I was asked what evidence I would have."

For he says that after seeing many of these things which that gentlemen says nobody can help believing, he was a determined sceptic. That gentleman tells us we must be passive, and willing to believe; but Judge Edmonds says he insisted upon proof. But let us proceed.

"I was asked what evidence I would have. I replied, I cannot say, for if I do, I tell you what to do."

That was rather sensible: for you know crazy people are often insane upon one subject and upon no other.

"The answer was, You shall have evidence that shall satisfy you. It was on the 21st May, 1851, that the evidence came, and in such form as to leave no doubt on my mind as to two of the points of my inquiries.

It was on an evening when the circle to which I belonged was to meet.

We found there a party of at least twenty persons, among whom were five mediums. We were surprised to meet each other; for we met without preconcert, and found upon inquiry, that we had been assembled by directions given to different persons in like manner with those given to the medium whom I accompanied. For three hours I there witnessed physical manifestations which demonstrated to me beyond all doubt that they were not produced by mortal hands, and were governed by an intelligence out of and beyond those present. It is vain for any one to say we were deceived. I knew that I was not, and so did every one of that large party. So is it vain to say the mediums did it, for they were actually more frightened at what occurred than we were —"

Don't you think it is likely that persons used to seeing the thing were more frightened than those who had never seen it before?

Now, let us see how the new dispensation came in.

"Then it was that the chair run back and forth on the floor—"

There was a new dispensation!—

"The bell was rung over our heads—"

He doesn't say it was dark; but I happen to know, from another source, that it was. You don't get these bells rung over your head, in the light. —

"And one of the party was forcibly torn by an invisible power from my grasp, in spite alike of his strength and mine. Through one of the mediums we were told, 'Go to the front door and let them in,' and when the door was opened an unexpected addition to the party, not one of whom was known to the medium, was found ascending the steps, but had not reached the bell. As I stood in a corner where no one could reach my pocket,—"

It seems he had some idea what company he was in —

"I felt a hand thrust into it—"

Just think of a spiritual pickpocket! And that reminds me that in the city of New Orleans a girl was arrested stealing, and she said it was not she that stole, but she was a medium, and a thieving spirit had got into her, and she couldn't help stealing. If Judge Edmonds were on the bench, why should not he rule that she was insane, under this new dispensation?

"As I stood in a corner where no one could reach my pocket, I felt a hand thrust into it, and found —"
found what? surely, something sublime —

"I found that six knots had been tied in my handkerchief."

Was that so very solemn? Was that entitled to such profound respect? Shall we not be excused if we smile a little, at some of these things?

"A bass viol —"

that is a big fiddle —

"was put into my hand and rested on my foot, and then was played upon. A violin —"

that is a little fiddle —

"was placed in my other hand, and likewise played upon. Another violin was hung around my neck by one of its strings, and I was struck frequently with a fiddle-bow. My person was repeatedly touched, and a chair pulled out from under me."

Mark: there he was, a judge of the Court of Appeals in the State of New York, standing in the corner of the room, with six knots tied in his pocket handkerchief, a bell ringing over his head, a bass viol in one hand, a violin in the other, a violin hung around his neck, his chair pulled from under him, and a fiddle-bow punching him in the ribs! In that situation he is receiving the new dispensation: — and you ask me not to laugh at that! Keep on long faces and talk about it! — if you can do it, you can do more than I can. Just let a picture be made — why couldn't some of these spiritual artists paint a picture, representing Judge Edmonds receiving the new dispensation? — not in a distant and subjugated province, not amid the caverns of the hills, or in the dens and vaults of imperial Rome, — but in a corner of a dark room, and under a load of fiddles!

And if you investigate these stories, you will find them all substantially of the same sort.

[Mr. Grimes' time here expired.]

MR. MILLER.

Mr. Chairman, and Ladies and Gentlemen: How much more refreshing it would have been, had the gentleman attended to my facts, which have been introduced here as bearing on this question,—instead of taking up facts to which I have made no allusion. I shall not attempt to follow him through his devious course. I cannot. But I will simply suggest, just here, that, if Judge Edmonds fell from his high public and official position, so low that he has lost the esteem of his countrymen, did not Saul of Tarsus, the learned Paul, he who had sat at the feet of Gamaliel, learned in all the Jewish law, so fall? They said,—He is mad: much learning hath made him mad. And they buffeted him; he lost public respect; his own people turned against him. Strong evidence of his insanity, that he would not go with the crowd, and curry favor with Mrs. Grundy and her relatives. These are the gentleman's arguments, to which you have listened to-night. Friends, I will pursue the even tenor of my course. I will give but one additional fact here, and shall then proceed to speak of the gentleman's rejection of human testimony.

Are the cases of to-day analogous to those of eighteen hundred years ago? What are the facts? The gentleman loses sight of these. Jesus Christ, by laying his hand upon the sick, healed them, and thus, too, restored the blind to sight. So did the apostles. Let me give you a modern case. Mrs. Dr. Brown, of Utica, a well-known lady, was blind, with a severe case of amaurosis, occasioned by disease of the optic nerve, an affection of the eye not to be cured without a surgical operation,—and this a hazardous operation. This woman was totally blind, for months. She told me she visited a healing medium in St. Lawrence County, New York, and that medium laid his hands upon her eyes and cured her, and she can see as well, to-day, as I. She was thankful that good angels had laid their hands upon her eyes. And she, with other good Samaritan women, went into the houses of misery and shame, and gathered a band of children, and brought them to a large hall, instituted a ragged school, and every sabbath food is brought in to supply the wants of the children, they have raiment given to them, they are taught to read and write, and to serve God by loving each other. And, after their lessons, they receive a hearty meal, and are dismissed to their homes, often, with a basket of food. And while she and others carry out the lessons of Christianity, the priest and Levite pass by on the other side, with their gilt-edged hymn-books, and denounce them as infidels. God knows, that this is as true to-day, as when, eighteen hundred years ago, Christ uttered it against the Scribes and Pharisees.

My brother is absolutely driven to deny human testimony. I wish, now, to call your attention to the fact that the Christian Church has considered human testimony reliable; that every single recorded fact in the Bible rests upon human testimony. Do you believe these facts because they are in the Bible? No; but you believe the Bible to be of divine authority because of the facts. The facts rest upon human testimony. Men testified that they witnessed these things; that establishes the divine authority of the Book in your mind. Let me say, further, that the great battle-field between the Christian world and the infidel world has been on the ground of human testimony. The infidel world has said,—We cannot receive human testimony,—we ignore human testimony. Hume says: Three men come down from Mount Tabor, and say that while asleep, with their eyes closed, they saw Moses and Elias talking with Christ. He says such things do not exist in our day, and it is more reasonable to suppose the alleged witnesses were deceived, or deceivers, than that this should be true. The Christian world called him an infidel, because he rejected this human testimony. But what shall we say of that infidelity which will reject the testimony of thousands and tens of thousands of

living witnesses? Hume, Paine, and Voltaire rejected the testimony of, comparatively, a few witnesses, who lived eighteen hundred, and thousands of years ago. Here your own fathers, mothers, brothers, and sisters, come forward and testify, and you ignore it. It is hard, indeed, when my brother has to give the lie to his neighbors and friends. It is evidence he is hard-pressed. But I wish to show to you that, in his position upon this question, he has taken infidel grounds, those which every infidel has always taken. And I add, that every man, woman, and child, that fraternizes or sympathizes with his views, has taken infidel ground; and I say, further, that to-day, the entire Christian Church, in its opposition to Spiritualism, has taken infidel ground. I challenge them to come forward; and I will show that they have taken the same position for which they have branded Hume, Voltaire, and Paine, as infidels. They reject the testimony of their own friends, who can be interrogated and cross-examined in regard to their statements. I declare to you, here, to-night, that the infidelity of Thomas Paine whitens into immortal virtue when compared with the infidelity of my brother, and the opposition to Spiritualism, manifested by the Christian Church, to-day; and it will be so written upon the pages of human history; yea, it is now being written upon the records of time.

And not only have they taken infidel ground, but their position is that of Antichrist. Have they not set aside the words of Christ? Christ said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. And these signs shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover." The Church says this will never be done more. Christ says it will. Christ says, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father." My brother says these works cannot be done. The Christian Church, now, repudiates it. Jesus Christ says, "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." Antichrist says it is not true. You may call upon the spirit of your sainted mother, to talk with you, and God will send an evil spirit and strong delusion that you may be damned. Christ says, If ye ask for bread, will he give you a stone? Yes, says Antichrist; and Yes, says my friend. Christ says, If ye ask for a fish, will he give you a serpent? Yes, says Antichrist; and Yes says my brother. I do not say that my brother has purposely taken the ground of Antichrist; but these are the facts. We hear them prating about infidelity; but if they will open the Book, and read carefully, they will find they are the ones that are pointed to in these passages.

I presented a fact; I have produced a painting; I have given my own statement in regard to it; I have corroborated it by competent witnesses. I do not ask you to receive this, but allow you to investigate. Will you ascertain whether these things are true or not? You may sit down and read this Bible through, and when you have got up from your reading, you cannot find one-half the evidence of immortality that you can find in this painting alone. I appeal to you, to-night, to say, if you could get a picture of your friend, under such circumstances, would it not be more of an evidence of the life of that friend, than any you ever had? And I say to you, to-night, that God and his good angels know that if the Harvard professors, or the ministers of the Gospel would appoint a committee, to-morrow, to inquire where and how this painting was executed, they would be engaged in a more laudable enterprise than they were ever engaged in before. It is true that we can never have present truths and revelations accepted by all men. Never is revelation accepted in the present tense. When Christ healed the sick and restored the blind to sight, he was accused of having a devil. But

they tell us, now, — We know that these things occurred two thousand years ago, but as for this fellow, we know nothing of him. And my brother takes the language right out of the mouths of the Jews, and says, — We know these things occurred two thousand years ago, but as for these men and women, what are they? Christ was accused of being possessed of a devil, of associating with harlots and wine-bibbers, and of being a gluttonous man. Read Mosheim's History of the Primitive Church, and see how the Christian Church was held in the respect of the world.

We have introduced evidence, here, of the truth of the affirmative of this question, and we shall produce more. Christ declared that, in the spirit-world, men and women become like angels. My mother, then, has become a spirit, and why should she not be a ministering angel? Does my brother deny the doctrine of ministering angels, acknowledged by the whole Christian Church? Who is a more fit and natural guardian angel for me, than my mother? A band of angels leave heaven, to come here as guardian-angels; and my mother says, Oh, let me go — I have a son there — let me go and be near to him. Will they say, Go to a corner of the universe, and there remain? I say, upon the authority of reason, of the Bible, on the authority of the instincts of the human soul, that that mother, by a law of spiritual attraction, comes back, and becomes the guardian angel of those who are left behind.

I know I have not time to introduce a further argument, and I therefore leave the subject. The gentleman can go all over the field; but I come here to present these facts and arguments, and, Heaven helping me, I will do it faithfully, before my God, my conscience, and the angel-world.

MR. GRIMES.

I wish to meet a point that has been raised, here, again and again. The gentleman wants me to be serious and not ridicule; and these Spiritualists continually, when I talk with them, talk as if I have not used a serious argument, and say I ridicule because I cannot argue. Now, I have an argument here, and I would thank that gentleman to note it, and I would thank this audience to observe it; for I consider it a vital argument in this discussion. I consider it the very hinge on which the whole turns; — and it is this. The gentleman says that I reject human testimony, when all that I said upon the subject was the very reverse.

MR. MILLER. — I can save my brother a great deal of remark. Mrs. Gerritt Smith says she has shaken hands with her child, since it has been in the spirit-land; and has heard its voice. Do you take her testimony as reliable?

MR. GRIMES. — If you will allow me to make my argument, sir, I will proceed, and I will attend to Mrs. Gerritt Smith, presently.

Now, concerning human testimony. What is it worth? How are you to view it? Why, my friend, every court of justice in the civilized world, in every nation where men argue questions, has rules of evidence. Every lawyer — and, I believe my friend, here, is a lawyer and, therefore will not deny the positions I am about to take, — every lawyer will sanction what I am going to say; and it is a perfect death-blow to what the gentleman said upon the subject. It is this. The rules of evidence are used not alone in every court, but wherever men meet as referees, in any way, to determine upon evidence. The question is, what shall we consider proper evidence? I have no time to enter upon it more than briefly. But one rule is this: The man who asserts that a thing is true, must prove it; and the other side has a right to stand and deny it, and does not, by so doing, call you a liar. You are guilty of an offence. I charge

you with the guilt. You have a right to say you are not guilty; and the other side must proceed to prove it. Let me show how we are continually violating these rules. The spirits, instead of proving their manifestations, call upon me to prove the opposite. "Mrs. Gerrit Smith says so and so; now prove that it is not so." I got up in the morning, jumped over a meeting-house, landed upon a solid rock, and it didn't hurt me; and I do it every morning, and it doesn't hurt me: and I call upon you to prove it is not so. I say it is a spirit; and, if it is not a spirit, what is it?

MR. MILLER. — I have not asked my brother to prove it was not so. I asked him how to dispose of this testimony.

MR. GRIMES. — That is what I am doing. I will dispose of that testimony to the gentleman's satisfaction, I warrant you. I will dispose of it as Judge Edmonds has done, in my presence, again and again and again, — saying that he would not have it in court a moment, he would kick it out at once. Now, I make this assertion, that, in any court of justice in the world, if you should claim an old horse, not worth five dollars, you could not get it, upon the evidence my brother produces here to-night. I will stake what little legal reputation I have, upon that. Let Spiritualism come into court. We want your evidence. Suppose the Spiritualist says, "I acknowledge that it belongs to me to prove its truth, and I will prove it." The rule is, that when any case is to be proved, it must be proved by the best evidence which that case admits, whatever it is; and evidence is divided into classes. The first class is the best, then there is a second and third best, and so on. Now the best evidence must be produced, and it must be produced first: and if that best evidence is anywhere in existence, you cannot introduce the other. The court will not allow me to do as the gentleman does here, who brings in fifty witnesses, of the "most respectable" people, and then goes on to talk about their respectability. What would Judge Edmonds say, if in court? "Is that deed in existence?" "Yes, sir; but it is a good deal of trouble to find it." "Not one will be allowed to swear to it." "Well, but, your Honor, that deed is in a book in a certain room, and my wife has gone from home and has the key. It is a great deal of trouble; — surely, you will not treat with contempt all this testimony." "Not one will be allowed to swear."

Now, my friends, will you give up the Bible, in which we believe? will you give up the Christian religion, at which the gentleman so sneers? — will you give up all we believe upon earth, and more than that, our hope of heaven, — upon testimony that would not be received in any court upon earth? The gentleman says, — that picture was made so and so, and is a portrait of his sister; and he brings the picture here. Does that prove it was made in the manner he asserts? He brings hearsay testimony, — which you cannot bring into court, except in the case of a dying man. The proper evidence in the case is this, — let the artist come here and take a picture of somebody else. I will take a picture, and cover it up in a book, and the gentleman can bring on all his mediums, and artists, and if they can paint a picture like it, I will never say a word against it. I will write a single word, and they shall tell what it is; and if they can do it, I will never utter a word against Spiritualism again. He says that it cannot be done here. I will go anywhere else; the room may be darkened; and if it is done, I will never again oppose Spiritualism. He can't do that, but he can tell us stories about Mrs. Tripp and Mr. Potter and Mrs. Brown, in abundance. Do you not always reject human testimony when you can get any thing better? You have a patent-right case. You say: "Your Honor, I have invented this machine; I have a model in my garret; and I can bring

fifty witnesses here, who have seen it." "Bring your machine." "Well, but we have altered the room, so that the machine cannot be brought out." The jury will go and see it. And they do that in the case of lands, where the jury can well visit the premises. I cannot prove that there was such a man as Charles the First, by any man living. The case does not admit of it. The best evidence is history. The best evidence of the existence of Jesus Christ is history. That is the best evidence of which the case admits. If a deed is lost, if a man says, "I had that deed, your Honor, and I gave it to my boy, to carry it where it might be recorded, and my boy lost it, and I can prove that there was such a deed, and that it was lost before recording," the testimony of witnesses will be admitted. If these gentlemen say that they saw such and such things in Ohio, I should suppose we ought to admit it; but if a man walks into court without his deed, and his witnesses are not allowed to testify, what should we say if he should answer to the demand of the court for it, — "If you don't believe these respectable people, I will not give you any other evidence?" Now, you have tables that rise right up when anybody touches them, pianos that will go clear up, with a man on top of them, and ten thousand have seen it: — I beg leave to have the best evidence — I should like to see *that* piano go up. You have mental questions answered, continually: — I will write a mental question, on a piece of paper, and cover it up so that they cannot cheat, and if it is answered before this audience, I will hold my tongue forever, on this subject. Let me have one rap made under circumstances where there is no cheating — you say it cannot be done without conditions, — I will give you all conditions but one, the condition that you shall not cheat — let there be a rap, let the table move an inch, under such conditions, and I will give it up. I have searched and searched, and I cannot find it. I don't ask you to do it here: I will go anywhere in the world, to find it. I don't want the room darkened, that is nonsense, — let us have light. You say you have the table tipped with your hands on it, but that you don't push at all. I will have some putty put under your fingers: if you will tip a table with that putty under your fingers, I will give it up. The putty will testify against you. You say you don't push, but the putty will say you do push. Now, do you say I ridicule? Then, every court of justice, and every work on evidence, and every lawyer that knows any thing, ridicules. The question of Spiritualism may come up in court. Let us get up some sham suit, and have it tried in court. "Your Honor, we want to prove that the table rises right up; that is part of the case." I don't see how the Court could very well refuse, if it was necessary to the case. "Let us see the table rise." "We don't want to do that; but we will bring a great many people who will say they have seen it rise." "You cannot be allowed that." It is a very common thing to have experiments taken in court, in regard to poison. The testimony of men will not be taken, if it admits of an experiment. If the jury insist upon seeing it tried, they must see it. Not only is this so in court, but where philosophical experiments are tried, it is the same.

Then, again, the gentleman speaks about the Christian world and infidelity. Why, the professors at Harvard College were not prejudiced. Agassiz is not a particularly religious man, any more than all scientific men are. He seeks evidence. When Dr. Gardner offered to bring the evidence before him, he asked him to bring the evidence; and Gardner, like a man, endeavored to do so. He spent a great deal of money for it, and acted in a very creditable manner. The raps were not any better than the professors could make; the mental questions were asked, and there were no answers at all; and the boys were tied and could not be untied. And you charge them with being unjust. You can find a few men who can swear these boys disentangled themselves from the

ropes, in this box; but when you come to try it, the ropes were cut, and every thing showed them to be tricksters. Even Dr. Bell, who previously believed that the phenomena actually took place, as pretended by these boys, had to give it up.

MR. MILLER.—Is this the point?

MR. GRIMES.—Well, if you don't like it, trot out the boys,—let us have the boys.

MR. MILLER.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: As I am restricted from replying to my brother now, I will say that I have no particular explanatory remarks to make. That gentleman has struck a vein at last. I am glad to say he has, in candor, talked about the character of testimony; and when I come to reply to this, I shall endeavor to show that this which I give is the best testimony. And I will endeavor to show, also, that it is the only testimony that Christ and his apostles gave to a sceptical world. I shall endeavor to show that we cannot find a precedent in human history, in the case of any revelations or spirit-manifestations, where the inspired man, where the prophet or the apostle, called together the masses of the sceptical world, and there proceeded to demonstrate the reality of spirit-intercourse. They did ask Christ for the same testimony and evidence that the gentleman has asked here to-night. He said,—Let me see the piano go up. The Jews said,—Let us see Christ come down.

MR. GRIMES.

I will make one remark, only, since the gentleman was telling what Christ did. When Thomas, one of the disciples, called for the best evidence that the case admitted of, doubting whether Christ had really risen, and said,—“Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe him,”—Christ gave it him,—gave him the best evidence. I would thank the gentleman to imitate Christ, and to give to us the best evidence, in the future.

THIRD EVENING.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7TH.

At the opening of this day's debate, it was publicly arranged, between the speakers, that the first question under discussion should be continued through this and the succeeding evening.

MR. MILLER.

Those of you present before this evening, will remember that I have endeavored to set forth the fact that human testimony, in every age of the world, has been considered reliable; that the entire fabric of human belief is based upon human testimony; and that the great battle between the infidel and Christian worlds has been upon the ground of human testimony,—the infidel world rejecting it, as hearsay testimony, the Christian world, relying upon the integrity of humanity, claiming that human testimony is sufficient to establish facts. It is true that my brother replied that human testimony is to be received, except testimony in regard to spirit-manifestations, so called, at the present time. And he proceeded to introduce before you one of the technicalities of law, in receiving human testimony. He says there are degrees of evidence, according to the technicalities of law; there is the first-best evidence, and the second-best evidence, and the third-best evidence: that in the absence of the first-best evidence, the second is good; in the absence of the first or second best, the third evidence is good. This I acknowledge to be true in the technicalities and formalities of a legal process. And I am willing to grant that it is true in receiving the testimony here, to-night, in regard to spirit-manifestations. But I wish to draw the distinction which every enlightened court upon the face of the earth makes, between the evidence of an individual and the evidence of a passive instrument,—a will, a contract, or a deed. There is a vast difference, in our courts, between the evidence of a deed and the evidence of an individual. The deed is passive; it tells but one story,—bring it in. The individual cannot be made always to testify. Let me take a case in point,—the same of which the gentleman spoke last evening. A man lays claim to a certain portion of God's earth. He comes into court with forty witnesses to swear that a deed had been made out, and that witnesses had witnessed the signing of the deed; but the claimant tells the court that the deed is at home, that it is locked up and his wife has the key; and now,—"Receive the testimony of the forty men." It is presumptive evidence, upon the face of it, that there is dishonesty,—not that the evidence of the forty men is not good, but that there is a flaw somewhere. And, therefore, the technicalities of the law require that if the deed is in existence, it shall be brought forward; but if the deed is destroyed, then that second-best evidence is good. Now, if we cannot bring forward the first-best evidence of spirit-manifestations, the second is equally positive. Let us see the difference between the evidence of a passive instrument and an individual. Suppose I hold a note, signed

by my brother, and there is a suit against him for it;—what is the first-best evidence? It is his acknowledgment of the signature. But he is not present, or, he says, "I will not acknowledge it." What is the next best evidence? Bring in witnesses to swear to the identity of the individual, from his handwriting. Here we see the difference at once. Now, in no spirit-manifestations do we claim that we move the tables. If we did, we would move them here. The gentleman would have a right to ask us to produce them here, to be sure. But I claim that there are spirits, individuals, with an identity as positive as your own, who produce those manifestations; and if they are not disposed to make them, we have to take the next best testimony, that of those who have witnessed them. Go to your courts, and they will acknowledge this to be logical, and in perfect keeping with law and common sense. The subject of spirit-manifestations has never been introduced into court; there is not a record of it in time. Can you prove, in court, that there is a God? Can you prove the Christian religion, in court? No. And yet, the gentleman says you can receive it only upon human testimony. Yet, I was glad to see that acknowledgment of the value of human testimony: it was like a sweet oasis in the desert; for it was the only time when my brother seemed to exhibit a spirit of candor.

And now, since I cannot bring the first-best evidence, I bring the second, human testimony, and ask you to receive it. The Jews asked Christ the same things which my brother asks me, here, to-night. He answered, "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness." The manifestations were never produced, I repeat, before a promiscuous crowd; they were always incidental. Hume took the same ground, in regard to human testimony, that my brother takes. "If God and his angels exist, let them give me the first-best evidence; otherwise, we will reject it, as human testimony." How beautifully Archbishop Whately destroyed such sophistry as that, when, in a little book, he published an argument proving that no such man ever existed, as Napoleon First. My brother will not admit that the second-best evidence affords even a probability of truth.

The courts consider the second-best evidence just as good as the first, unless the first is so held back that there is evidence of dishonesty. He asks why they cannot produce the manifestations here. There is a lady in the house, my own companion, who for two years past,—has seen spirits. Yet it requires a state of passivity in her mind, to enable her to see them. Professor, I will give a guarantee, to you, of five hundred dollars, if you will demonstrate to this audience, to-night, the fact of a natural normal state of sleep. You cannot sit there, before this audience, while I am talking and this audience gazing at you, and go to sleep. It requires certain conditions, in order that you may be able to go to sleep. A woman full of faith and confidence simply touched the hem of Christ's garment; her own spirit went forth to meet his; he felt the magnetism go forth from him, and he perceived that virtue had gone out of him; and the magnetism that went from him restored her system to harmony. And yet he told her that it was her faith that made her whole. Christ did not many works in Capernaum, because of their unbelief. There were sceptics there. I do not decry scepticism. I like honest scepticism. But, beside faith, another condition is, to ask and seek. Not to ask as the Jews did,—Come down from the cross and we will believe. The command of Christ was,—Humble yourself, and be like a child, and you shall receive. Be sceptical; but for God's sake, and your own as well as his sake, be honestly sceptical.

Can the poet be inspired while he is suffering the toothache? He must feel well in body; and then he retires to the summit of a hill, or to Niagara Falls, and there, in a passive

state, the inspiration of nature is drunk into his spirit, and it pours forth again from his soul as the great living tide of being ebbs and flows. Conditions are necessary in prayer. "Enter into thy closet and close the door." But let a man of scepticism, a sneerer, enter the closet, and how quickly it frightens away the Holy Spirit. Here are three or four mothers in Israel, or men and women, convened together. Their hearts are in harmony and unity; the spirit of love is upon them. A scoffer, a sneerer at the pure Christianity taught by Christ, comes into their midst; and does not the spirit take its flight? Do they not tell us that that peace is gone? I want to know if the sceptic has driven away the Holy Spirit,—has frightened away God and his work? or has the presence—yes, the presence—of that man, destroyed the devotional condition of the mind of the worshipper? You cannot take your pen to write, you cannot get on this stage to speak, without conforming to conditions.

Now, I say, since spirits cannot be compelled to come here, the second-best testimony must be received as reliable. And again, since we have clearly shown that it is impossible for them to do so, they are exonerated from all blame. God gives the supply to every demand. When the demand is created, the supply is given; and when we demand these influences, they will be supplied. And if my brother doesn't want it, if he is determined he will not have it, the spirit-world will wait. Time will work a change; and ere long, he will begin to feel the want of this inspiration.

MR. GRIMES.

My eloquent friend began by speaking of candor. And I really hoped that he would give us a practical illustration of it. Instead of that, I never in my life heard or saw an exhibition of the want of it, equal to that which we have just had. And, indeed, it seems to me that want has been exhibited—I do not mean intentionally—throughout this argument. Let me show you what seems to me to be a want of candor and sophistical.

In the first place, you will observe that it is perfectly well known, to everybody, that the Spiritualists trample the Bible under foot, as believed by Christians. They have no more respect for the Bible than for any other old book. They deny that it has any peculiar inspiration; they deny that it has more inspiration than Shakspeare, or an almanac, or any other work. They speak as contemptuously of the characters of the Bible as of our modern Indians. They think no more of Abraham than of Pocahontas, no more of St. John than of St. Tammany, no more of St. Paul than of St. Patrick or St. Jonathan or anybody else. I had, just now, a book written by Henry C. Wright, on the Bible; and he speaks of it as sanctioning every kind of evil,—sanctioning slavery, and all wrong, and making God a tyrant-despot. The whole end and aim of Spiritualists is, to bring down the churches. When I talk with Spiritualists, they say: "We care nothing about the phenomena; what we love is, the doctrines. We like to hear their doctrine, we love it, because they denounce the churches." They hate Christ; they hate the churches. They love sin; and they roll, as a sweet morsel, under their tongue, the idea that God will not punish. I heard one, here, last Sunday, saying, "God will not punish sin—just obey the law—that's all." Every man in this city knows that Spiritualists sneer at evangelical religion, at what Christians, of every denomination, without a single exception, call religion. And, after having taken the Bible, and, with all their ingenuity, torn it to pieces, then when they come to this argument, this gentleman, with all his smoothness and plausibility, natural, and evidently cultivated, says,—The Bible, my reverence for the Bible! And for Christ! And all his arguments are drawn from the Bible. He is very much in love with the Bible;

and when he seeks to defend Spiritualism, he does it from the Bible. The Bible is also false — Mrs. Currier, a celebrated medium, one of the orthodox, believes as much of the Bible to be true as is true, and as much as is false she believes to be false, and in that way she believes the whole — and our friend does the same. Yet, he brings out the Bible, all the way through, — and talks to me about *candor*! What is the question? "Do spirits communicate, here, in the manner in which Spiritualists claim that they do?" That is the question: and the gentleman brings forward a book, the authenticity of which he denies, — a book spurned by the Spiritualists, an *obsolete* book, the authors of which did not know as much as the Fox girls, or Davis, — and alleges that as his proof of Spiritualism. There is better evidence for Spiritualism, they will tell us, than in the Bible. Why don't they bring forward the better evidence? What have we had but the gentleman's own *ipse dixit*? That, and the Bible, is all his authority.

And he is very much afraid we are getting to be infidels. Here is a set of men who, according to the popular idea of infidelity, are the most remarkable infidels the world has ever seen, men who utter the most blasphemies of any sect whatever; and they are afraid the Church is getting to be infidel! I heard a beautiful woman, not long since, rise and declare that one of these spiritual circles was a thousand times more sacred than a communion-table. That was Miss Hueston. I heard another, one Miss Macomber, sneer at the blood of Christ, and say it was a filthy affair. And these are the people that love the Bible so! Heaven and earth! — think of it! — and then talk about "*Candor, Candor!*"

The first argument the gentleman brought forward in favor of Spiritualism, was that all nature is in sympathy, — the stars wink at one another, the sun attracts the earth, and the earth the moon, and gets moonlight in return — all nature is in sympathy and communication. Spirits must communicate with one another. I should ask the gentleman to let me know how it was that the Indians lived so long on this side of the water, while the people on the other side never knew of their existence. Why didn't the inhabitants of Australia know until so recently, of the existence of Europe, or the people of Europe know of the islands of the South Sea? Why did the ancient Greeks and Romans live, as Plato said, around the Mediterranean, like frogs around a pond, never knowing of the existence of the greater half of the world? Everybody knows the houses of Boston may be full of suffering people, — yes, the next door to your own, — and you not know it. Rev. Mr. Beecher, I know, says, that, when certain conditions are right, the evil spirits can no more help coming into this world than water can help leaking through a dyke when there is a hole there. That is, when there is a hole somewhere, the spirits can get through. I don't blame the Spiritualists for that. It is the language of one of those miserable opponents of Spiritualism who attribute it to evil spirits. Pshaw! There are no spirits about it; — nothing but humbug — that is all there is to it.

I do not blame the gentleman. He has done as well as he can; he has done better than any Spiritualist I have ever heard. He has been more candid than the most of them. Even that virtue I will give him, in the superlative degree, for his class: for I never met a Spiritualist, in argument, before, who had any. But he says we must take the testimony of those Spiritualists. Think of that! The testimony of the Spiritualists, people who do not agree with each other for five months! Shall we take the testimony of Mr. Hatch, or his wife? We should have a beautiful case of conflicting testimony, even if we received it. But, as I said last night, — and I repeat it here, — no court of justice in the world would take the testimony of Spiritualists, in this case. That is, if Spiritualism were brought into court, its testimony would not be taken. The gentleman talks about the technicalities of courts. Let me tell him that not in court alone,

but in every place on earth where physical manifestations are made, the question, the rule, is the same. What is the matter in question? Physical manifestations. Now, in the name of common sense — only of common sense, — when physical manifestations are the question, what should be the evidence *but* physical manifestations? Let a man swear he has a paper in his pocket, and not show it; and say, "No, I will not show it; I will swear to it." Now, the gentleman did not deny that every court of justice in the world demands that when a thing exists, you must show it. He says you must have conditions, and went into a long argument to show their necessity. Who does not know that? Every thing moves by conditions. We cannot believe without conditions; and one of these conditions is, the best evidence that the case admits. He says, — If you have these, and keep them back, you are guilty of fraud. In this predicament you are. "Thou art the man!" — not you personally — it is only in a Pickwickian sense. And let me say that if I ever appear to say any thing personal to my opponent, I do not express myself as I intend. I love him; indeed I do. I do not mean it, if I unwittingly seem to transfer to him the sentiments which I entertain toward the cause which he has come forward to defend. For, so help me God on the throne of the universe, I do not believe one word of this Spiritualism; I believe it is a lie. They say, "Oh, you are a Spiritualist." So help me my heavenly Father, I am not. It is false, in every particular; it is damnably wicked, or I am terribly mistaken. I oppose Spiritualism, not intellectually alone, but morally and religiously. Tell me not I am uncan-did: if I have a soul, if I have one particle of sincerity, it is all poured into detestation of this most horrible of all enormities that ever cursed this earth. I say I wonder why the people of Boston have been so quiet, when this monster was at work among them. But they say Spiritualism is dying out. It is not dying out. It is lying low, and working like a snake in the grass, and making thousands of converts, at this very moment. It is not dying. I have no notion of saying Peace, peace, when there is no peace.

Now, what was my friend's reply, when I asked him that? It was a most honest answer — it was a most honest one — I hope the reporter will put it down in capitals. The reason he does not give us the best evidence, is, because he can't. I thank the Saxon for that word — he *can't*. It is a surrender of the whole case; it yields every thing. I say they can't. They say, We have raps, that are made without cheating. I say you can't produce them; *he* says they can't: we agree exactly. What did Judge Edmonds say? Did he say they can't? He says there is not a village or hamlet in the United States, where these manifestations cannot be shown. O learned judge, you are mistaken! My friend says they *can't*.

MR. MILLER. — I beg your pardon, I have not said —

MR. GRIMES. — The gentleman says he didn't; and, if he says he didn't, he didn't.

MR. MILLER. — I will explain in what sense I said it.

MR. GRIMES. — He can't do it in any sense. He cannot do it under any conditions whatever, if the chance to cheat is left out. But I don't think he would cheat; and therefore he cannot show it. I will tell you what I will do. We will have a piece of board planed, and hung so nicely balanced that if a fly touches it, it will turn. We will all stand back and ask the spirits to move it, and if they do move it, all shall be conceded. The spirits will not turn it. Ask for a rap, and you will not get it; or, if you do, it will be when the "conditions" are right. The gentleman says he cannot do it here. Mental questions are answered, — are they not? There are people, by the dozen and hundred, in this city, who will tell you that mental questions are answered. It cannot be done here. It cannot be done anywhere. I will go anywhere, I will go

in a dark room, you may have fiddles, and all you want; but not one single mental question will be answered.

MR. MILLER.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I will here very briefly explain in regard to the evidence that is to be received. I said that I cannot compel spirits to come; I cannot force them to be present. And I say further, that, with the great class of spirit-manifestations, the conditions of a promiscuous crowd, like this, defeat every thing like positive demonstration. There are certain test mediums by whom certain manifestations which have been given, and, unquestionably, may be given, before a promiscuous company or an indiscriminate crowd; but the general law is, that they cannot be given so long as these disturbing causes exist, so long as there is such perfect antagonism. For, be it borne in mind that spirits must work through us, through our minds and our conditions. But I do say that the evidence of spirit-intercourse is within the reach of every child of God; that in every village and hamlet and neighborhood and city, there are abundant means afforded, of knowing that this is truth. You may have it in your own private circles. You may have it where all is harmony, in your own domestic relations; but before a promiscuous crowd, in this way, at the present time, with all the antagonisms, I do not think that the experiments can be successful. Therefore it is that I say they cannot be produced. I am speaking, now, in reply to his argument, when admitting that they cannot be produced. According to the rules of evidence, resort must be had to the second-best testimony and evidence. For, if a man has lost his deed, and it cannot be produced, the next best is equally good. Does my brother deny this?

He has not met my facts. It is true, I did not expect him to explain them in the debate upon this question. There is another question, on which he takes the affirmative and says the manifestations can be satisfactorily and philosophically accounted for without admitting the agency of departed spirits. But let me reply to a few remarks which he has made in regard to the Bible. My brother has been free to make assertions without any positive evidence. Will he discuss this question with me? Can he, with what he has stated, in regard to my candor and sincerity, when I have professed an admiration and love of the principles embodied in the teachings of Jesus Christ, and the pure and holy inspiration which has flowed through the imperfect channels of the past, — can he in candor, say that I sneer at Christianity, at religion, at the Bible?

MR. GRIMES. — I did not mean the gentleman — I mean Spiritualists. I speak of him as their representative; and he knows that what I have said of them is true.

MR. MILLER. — I say, whoever has heard me speak of Jesus Christ, has heard me speak of him as being the greatest moral representative of the human race, with more of that God-like spirit in his breast, perhaps, than any other human being who ever lived. But, that I disagree with the gentleman's theological notions, I confess. I have read the Bible through and through, and I can find no evidence that Jesus Christ was the very God. I say, if the Bible does teach infant damnation, then I don't believe it. If it does teach that the enslavement of human beings is right, I cannot accept such principles as true. Then the question is, does it teach this? I look upon all inspiration as more or less fallible, for the reason that it partakes of the medium through which it comes. It is like light flowing through these windows; it partakes of the nature of the glass. If the glass be red, then every thing in the room is correspondingly red; if green, every thing is green. Not that the light itself is so, but the medium through which it passes is. He who will read the Bible, will find, in the writings of Moses, the stamp and impress of the character of Moses. He who will read the Psalms of David, will find they flow through

the poetical conception of his mind. He who will read the writings of Peter or Paul, will find the impetuosity of Peter, and the craftiness of Paul. He who will read the works of John will find the inspiration flowing beautifully through his spirit — none of that impetuosity of Peter, none of that learned cunning which belonged to Paul, but more like that of the Master, — beautiful as that which flowed through the channels of the mind of Jesus. And, knowing this to be true, I cannot receive inspiration as infallible. But why are we dragged away thus, — why am I compelled thus to leave the question, and follow my brother in a side issue? I want him to meet me in the positions I take. He says the Spiritualists quote the Bible a great deal. And I say there is no book in the world, that proves Spiritualism more than the Bible. How is it that we quote it, and yet hate it so? We may hate some ideas, some interpretations of it. They say we scoff at the blood of Christ. I do not believe Christ said his blood was going to save us from our sins. I believe it a mistaken idea. I believe that if I teach young and old that you may go on, violating the laws of your nature, and life, and yet, at last, through the blood of Christ, you may go to glory, I should be teaching a demoralizing doctrine. Obey the laws of God, and you will not need to be forgiven.

There are many other remarks of my brother, which he did not mean to make in earnest, and does not wish to have inserted in the Report, and when he comes to revise the Report, he will undoubtedly remove them. He says I am the only candid Spiritualist he has talked with. This, and his other remarks of a similar character, I pass by. My brother does not, I am sure, believe many of the things which he says about Spiritualists.

I will now proceed to give you a statement of a stubborn fact, vouched for by the signatures of eye-witnesses: —

"BOSTON, March 5th, 1860.

"At the house of John Dimond, No. 6 Hawkins St., Boston, in the year 1857, a young lady about eighteen years old, was carried up by alleged spirit-power, more than a distance of three feet, and held in a horizontal position, and there suspended for the space of ten seconds without any human agency. This was done in bright gaslight.

"On the same evening, a medium sized parlor centre-table was raised more than three feet in the air, and there suspended while Mr. Henry D. Huston counted fifty-four. This was done in bright gaslight, without any touch or contact from any person, or any earthly power.

"We, the undersigned, vouch for the truth of this statement.

"H. D. Huston, Franklin St., Somerville.

Mrs. Zilpha C. Huston, " " "

Mrs. Sarah Bailey, " " "

F. C. Page, Myrtle St., Somerville.

John J. Dimond, No. 6 Hawkins St., Boston.

"I vouch for the genuineness of these signatures, and the veracity and respectability of the persons.

"A. B. CHILD."

Friends, I do not know but these are the signatures of professors in your college; I don't know whether they are the signatures of ministers of the Gospel or whether the signatures and testimony of poor fishermen. It is possible they are poor fishermen. Depend upon it, if they are, they will be ridiculed by the opposition. Here is the testimony of men and women. We shall have plenty of facts to introduce, and my brother shall have enough to "attend to." Let me speak of other cases. I spoke to you, last evening, of a painting, and the circumstances attending its execution. Now, I would say to my brother, that that medium, the 9th of last April, went to the spirit-world. He left the form from the village of Laporte, Indiana. For his services as a medium, he received but little of this earth's goods. He left a wife and three little children, as subjects of charity. That medium has gone, brother; I cannot bring the body from the grave. Now, we shall have to take the second-best testimony.

I attribute to my brother the same candor for which he gives me credit. I believe that when he said, before God, he did not believe Spiritualism, he spoke truthfully. He is not a Spiritualist, neither can he be till his mind is changed, and he is born again, into the kingdom of truth.

I would state, that, during the two years that Mr. Rodgers was a medium, he executed five or six hundred paintings. I have seen a number of them, and could give the names of many who have them. I hold in my hand a letter which I obtained last summer, while holding a discussion in the State of New York, with Dr. Moran. You will see, when I read this letter, why I do not give the man's name: it is attached to this letter, and any one can see it, provided they will not bring the parties before the public, as they do not desire publicity. Mr. — was at the West. He obtained the likeness of a darling child, who had but recently passed to the spirit-world. He obtained a life-size portrait of his child, and packed it away in the bottom of his trunk. He came home at night. He determined not to say anything to his wife, that night about the picture of the child, who was the idol of her heart. He would wait till the next morning. I have talked with his wife, but not with him, in relation to the picture. She told me she rose early and got breakfast, and thought she would let her husband sleep, and in the mean time, she would throw the dirty linen from the trunk. She drew out article after article, and at the bottom she saw the likeness of her child. In a burst of joy and surprise, she ran to the bedroom, and said, — "Where, oh, where, did you obtain the likeness of our darling boy?" I have seen the portrait, and have never seen a more beautiful face. The child was the darling of his parents. He had long, curly locks, and his mother was in the habit of turning a little lock on the forehead, where the hair parted. The artist had brought out the lock perfectly. But, strange to say, that mother does not believe in spirit-intercourse. She is a member of the Baptist Church, and perfectly priest-ridden. They told her, at first, that it was the work of devils; but she spurned that, and said, "My child is not with devils." They then told her about psychology and mesmerism; and thus the mind of that poor woman was set to vacillating. I wrote to Mr. —, for a statement of the facts in the matter, and received the following letter: —

"New York, Aug. 21st, 1858.

"MR. LEO MILLER, — Dear Sir: — Your favor of the 11th inst., is received, having been forwarded by Mrs. — (to me) of this city, asking me to forward to you a statement of the facts connected with the production of a likeness of my child, through the agency of Mr. E. Rodgers, to be used by you, in debate, in establishing the cause of truth and in illustration of spirit phenomena. So far as my own feelings in the matter are concerned, I have not the slightest objection to the granting of your request; although it would most undoubtedly place me upon the public stand of impeachment, by a large number of persons, who are wholly unacquainted with my character for truth and veracity; thus compelling my evidence to be taken with allowance and under protest for its apparent absurdity. Yet, with all these obstacles, I would cheerfully comply were it not that it would drag the name of another, who, I consider, has equal rights with myself, into a controversy, most unpleasant to her. I allude to Mrs. —, who is an unbeliever in, and a conscientious opposer of the spirit philosophy, who cherishes the memory of our child with a sacredness so dear, so pure, and so holy, that she cannot endure the thought of having exhibited in a public debate, even the facts in the case attending the production of this likeness. Mrs. — never denied that it looked like him; and I have often heard her say that it was a very correct representation of our deceased boy, and that she would not part with it on any account; it was so lifelike. Still she attributes its production to some principle in clairvoyance, not yet understood.

"Now, in consideration of the reasons assigned, please have the goodness not to include any thing I now write, in your debate; and further, excuse me from giving more facts at present, after adding that the likeness which we have in our possession is a very correct one of our child, who left the form, without any likeness of him, in September, 1857, and was painted by the hand of E. Rodgers, at Cardington, Ohio, in June, 1858, without collusion, description, or any knowledge of the looks of our child, which Mr. Rodgers could have possibly possessed through any ordinary channel of information at the time.

"Very truly, yours,

"————"

MR. GRIMES.

My friend, as you perceive, still holds to the position that to prove that spirits do communicate as the Spiritualists claim, he has only to read these papers, signed by nobody knows who, except those who signed them, and a few friends. We don't know them; we don't know who they are; and if we did, it would not make any difference. There is not a lawyer in the world who would not exclude these, in a moment. Not only a lawyer — there is not a man who should preside at an inquiry, that would not exclude it in an instant. But I wish, further, to show you that the gentleman's reasons for not bringing that evidence into court are not sufficient. He says that they cannot give the best evidence that courts require, cannot give the raps here, cannot raise the table here; — and why?

MR. MILLER. — We do not claim to do it. Tell me how we can compel the spirits to come: that will settle the whole matter.

MR. GRIMES. — Do you say you do not claim that you do it at all? Then you have had a new revelation, just like Brigham Young, who has one every week. Is it not something new? Am I mistaken? Have I not been laboring under some delusion? I certainly have supposed that the Spiritualists have, all along, professed that they did prove their new revelation by physical manifestations.

MR. MILLER. — We do not claim that we make the manifestations.

MR. GRIMES. — Well, nobody says you do. I don't believe any honest Spiritualist ever makes any of those manifestations; but every single manifestation that is actually made, is made by some dishonest person, always. Not by a Spiritualist. And I will tell you what I mean by that. No man who really believes that the spirit of his father, mother, sister, and children, are around him, would be guilty of a juggle or trick. I do not know how wicked men may be, men who think they are perfect already, that they need not pray or ask forgiveness, — I don't know what they might do; but I do not know how, on the principles of human nature, a man could sit down here and think that the spirits of his father, mother, and children, who are gone, are around him, and yet could make a rap, tip the table, and cheat the company. I can scarcely believe that men are so bad. That is the reason that I do not charge sincere Spiritualists with tipping tables and lying. But I do say that I have examined this matter of physical manifestations with what little ability I have, and the result is, that every rap made is made by a rogue, — that every physical manifestation is produced by some trick. And, instead of showing the contrary, they ask me to believe, and read me a document written by some one in Ohio, or somewhere else. Why, it is outrageous! What was the reason the gentleman gave? Let me read his very words. He said: "Here before a promiscuous crowd, here, amid these antagonisms, we cannot do it."

MR. MILLER. — The spirits cannot do it.

MR. GRIMES. — I don't care whether you do it by spirits or how you do it; you can't do it at all. I will never speak one word against Spiritualism, if you will give us one honest rap — if you don't do it on my head, — or answer one mental question. Mark you the reason why he can't do it. It is on account of the antagonisms. Now let me show you the utter inconsistency of that objection. "Antagonisms." "Promiscuous crowd." Mark you, that is what prevents him; yet, on this very stand, Sunday after Sunday, the spirits come, in obedience to my friend Dr. Gardner's advertisement, and raise a woman, sometimes weighing a hundred pounds, and make her talk most brilliantly — move a

woman's tongue,—think of that;—and rule her will—rule a woman's will, too! Antagonisms are overcome. What becomes of the argument about promiscuous crowds? What becomes of the arguments about antagonisms? The gentleman says he don't know,—and neither do I know; but every man with common sense feels, at once, the inconsistency—it is not possible to avoid it. Again, the spirits anywhere, for fifty cents, for twenty-five, for sixpence, I believe, will tip the tables, and tip them over—I mean, among Spiritualists, genuine, sincere Spiritualists,—if there are any.

Grant the tables tip. The table tips with persons having their hands upon it, and it raps out *rap* after *rap* and *tap* after *tap*; and they declare it is a manifestation of spirits. Again, the hand will be seized by a spirit, write before a crowd, and indite communications from the other world. I can get them by the yard—plenty of them. Everybody has got them, till they are surfeited with them. 'Our booksellers' shelves are loaded with them. The literature is more than a horse can drag down hill, on ice. But when I ask them to just let that table tip when the hand is not on it, when I ask them to write just one single answer to a mental question, they cannot do it. Last Sunday, a splendid looking young woman, who spoke gloriously—and not she, but a doctor in Ohio, and a pretty smart fellow, too,—stood ready to battle with me. He was not afraid of me, nor of anybody in all the world. The doctor gave me some pretty sharp answers; "antagonisms" made no odds. Now, why couldn't that doctor who came all the way from Ohio—he must have come by telegraph—why could he not answer one mental question? He will argue with me, dispute with me, put me down, show how much smarter he is than I am, but will not tell me one single thing going on in Ohio. Let him telegraph me the price of wheat. Not a bit of it;—he tells only what everybody else knows. Do you wish me to give you the reason for all that? It belongs to another branch of the argument, and when I come to that I will then tell you all about it. Don't you see, my friends, that it is plain enough that there is a little want of authentic evidence, throughout all these proofs of spirit-manifestations? They paint no pictures *here*.

MR. MILLER. — The medium who executed that painting, has ascended.

MR. GRIMES. — The gentleman brought out a painting. I didn't like to touch it; it was the picture of his sister: a man does not like to make any critical remarks in regard to any thing so connected with another's sister, especially if that sister is in the spirit-world. There was a sincerity in the gentleman's bringing it out, and I did not like to talk about it—and I will not talk about his sister—I respect the feeling that dictated it. Let us talk, then, of some other painting. He says some other paintings are produced. Now, observe you, the medium will stand here, and imitate the handwriting of a person, before your eyes. Why will they not stand here, just as well, and make a portrait? I will find you sincere spiritual mediums, by the dozen, who will stand here and write; but when you come to have a portrait executed, it must be done in the dark, in Ohio, by Mansfield, or some of his friends. I don't want to give the history of Mansfield; everybody knows it, and everybody who is not besotted with Spiritualism knows that the history of that Mansfield is one that can only make us feel badly. Everybody knows how terribly corrupt he is—one of those men who doesn't need the forgiveness of God, for the reason that he obeys the laws of God!

MR. MILLER. — I didn't say so.

MR. GRIMES. — I hope you won't. O my friends, let us not hold to that doctrine. What man is there that lives, and knows there is a God and that he has laws,—knows

any thing of the frailties of man,—but knows that he sins against God, every hour,—that if God punished our sins without mercy, we should all of us be destroyed. But let us look God in the face and say,—“We obey your laws and do not need any forgiveness,”—there is something so blasphemous in it—but the gentleman does not believe it, he cannot, in his heart, say it.

He said that in the Bible times, Christ demanded faith, in order that his miracles might be performed. Now, I do not doubt, at all, that those conditions are the same as in the Bible times. I cannot repeat, except very briefly, my remarks of last night, upon that point. I say that those miracles were not performed by natural law, and that there is no proof of any natural law by which miracles can be performed. Ananias and Sapphira were not struck dead by natural law, surely. Christ was not raised from the dead by natural law, surely. They only want faith. The only condition, then, was faith; and, surely, you have faith among the Spiritualists. I believe two-thirds of this audience are Spiritualists. Can't they get their faith all in one concentrated battery, and raise the table, or are they too unbelieving? There is not one here who believes they can do it. The gentleman says they can do it; he will say they can tip tables—with hands on them,—they can write, they can speak,—they can do anything except tip tables without putting hands on, when the room is light, where people can see if there is any cheating. Pianos have been raised, in this city. There is a paper, there, which says they are raised right up, in full daylight. I don't believe it. What evidence of it have we? The piece of paper;—that is all. Go into any quack doctor's shop in this city, and he will show you a pile of papers to show that his miserable stuff has cured almost everybody,—just such stuff as that. “My grandmother took two bottles, and was better,—took four more bottles, and was entirely well.” “Such a one took so many more:”—certified to, generally, by a minister, a judge, and some Chairman of the Board of Selectmen. You will find the papers full of just such evidence as that. Now, “will you reject human testimony?”

MR. MILLER.—I ask my brother if he thinks these names are forged. Would it add any thing to the force of the argument, to bring the witnesses on the stand, here, to make, personally, a statement in regard to these facts?

MR. GRIMES.—I think it would, in the minds of some Spiritualists, but to nobody else.

MR. MILLER.—I will not stop to dwell, to any length, upon human testimony, or testimony in courts. There is not an instance in history, where the visit of an angel, or any spirit-manifestation, has been proved in court. Courts have nothing to do with these things. These questions are addressed to the reasoning faculties. The argument of my brother strikes at the root of all Christianity. And I say to you, reject this testimony, here, and, in the mind of every honest man, the testimony upon which Christianity is founded must go down. The position which my brother has taken up, to-day, in this argument, only has a tendency to make infidels, the world over. All that he may say about those ancient manifestations being miraculous, will not weigh any thing, for a moment, when we find that modern manifestations are precisely analogous. I will not stop, here, to define what a miracle is. In the general orthodox acceptance of the term, it implies that the laws of nature have been suspended or transcended; but many of the most celebrated divines have come to the conclusion that the miracles were simply manifestations of nature, above any thing that we have yet learned or understood, and that when we come to comprehend better these laws, then these manifestations will cease to be mysterious. And now, to show you, friends, that these ancient

wonders were not, in the sense in which my brother uses the term, miracles, but were governed by conditions, I will speak of one case. Daniel wished to see and converse with spirits. Now, the gentleman says that in ancient times, when men saw spiritual beings, it was a miracle. A miracle disregards all conditions; a miracle has nothing to do with conditions; for it is above all the laws of nature. But Daniel found it necessary to fast; and he fasted for three weeks, and at the end of three weeks he saw a spirit. Here, by a system of fasting he destroyed the gross, animal fluids in his body, gave more activity to his spirit, and in that condition was prepared to see spirits. The greatest efforts of the meek and lowly Nazarene, were exhibited after he had fasted forty days and forty nights. Conditions were necessary for him. It is said, of Christ, that he did not many mighty works in Capernaum, because of their unbelief. Were those "mighty works" miracles? Do you suppose the unbelief of the witnesses would have any effect upon miracles? The cases are precisely analogous. Jesus Christ placed his hands upon a man's eyes, and he was restored to sight. And you receive it on the testimony of the historian. You have it not from Christ; Christ does not himself give the account, but you take it on hearsay evidence. [MR. MILLER here repeated his former statement of the cure of the blindness of Mrs. Brown, of Utica. See page 34.] If you claim that the other is a miracle, the modern instance is a miracle: and if the modern one is not a miracle, the other is not. The idea of accounting for manifestations, upon one plan, and then of accounting differently for those precisely analogous, is absurd. Here are men who can read the traits of the character of others. Jesus Christ read the thoughts of the woman of Samaria, and told her how many husbands she had had. Now, that can be accounted for on natural principles, as well as the cases of to-day. And Charles Beecher, appointed by the Presbyterian Synod, of Brooklyn, to investigate this matter, says that if we attempt to account for all these manifestations, upon supernatural theories, it will destroy the Bible, and its only protection will be its pasteboard covers; for, he says, cases precisely analogous are governed by natural laws. Now, I say, if you reject this testimony, you reject the testimony of the Bible witnesses.

But, my friends, do not apprehend that I am willing to let Spiritualism stand or fall by any other system. I do not bring this in here, as poof that if Spiritualism is not true, Christianity is not true. By no means; for I have made a direct argument, and brought forward the positive proof that Spiritualism is true; and I have only introduced the Bible, and the facts of the past, to show their analogy, and to corroborate and confirm the present manifestations.

But I will give one or two more facts, and my brother shall have plenty of time to answer them. It is true, he says, that it seems almost impossible that men and women should sit down and trifle, amid the most sacred and endearing relations of life and death. Yes: we cannot believe that one-half of the world has concerted together to deceive the other half. I have more confidence in human nature than to believe this; I cannot conceive of the blackness of the heart of that man or woman who would thus trifle in these sacred relations. What do they obtain for all this? There may be a few public mediums who have received something like remuneration. But there are at least one hundred and fifty thousand mediums, in the United States, in private life, cut by their acquaintances, turned away from their schools, called insane, called fools. Is this the reward for dishonesty? Dr. Gardner has demonstrated his sincerity, here, in this place. When he freely and with candor invited those gentlemen to come forward and examine, it was one of the most positive evidences of the truth of the principles for which he challenged investigation. That man declares that he has been taken up

bodily, and carried from the bed to the floor, and has witnessed other remarkable manifestations: and, placing as much confidence in them as he did, he thought he might bring them before the public. Does it not demonstrate his candor and earnestness, that his mediums came forward, willing to present the manifestations. I have shown, here, that it cannot be done at all times. As to the manifestations to be produced here,—this is no place to produce them. This is an excited controversy. What young lady wishes to come forward, here, to be catechized by you or me, under these circumstances? None: and you know it. There are some spirit-manifestations which I believe spirits can control more readily than others. I may sit down here and address an ordinary letter to my brother, with confusion and noise all around me; but if I wished to go down into the strata of thought, if I wished to make a labored effort, under such a surrounding it would be impossible. There are some manifestations that can be publicly produced, no doubt; but the conditions necessary for these positive facts of which we are here speaking—and here I simply take my own experience in it—require passivity on the part of those present. The conditions are so nice, with some manifestations, that they are easily turned; with others, they are such that many difficulties may readily be overcome. This principle my brother knows to be true. This is no place to induce these manifestations; but there are candid and honest-minded men who testify that they have witnessed them; and yet my brother says the proof is nothing but a piece of paper. He does not respect this evidence even as rendering the facts any more probable; he rejects it *in toto*. I have shown that, according to his own statement, when the first-best evidence cannot be got, the second is taken; and Mr. Rodgers cannot be here. The gentleman refers to others. Let me say, Mr. Mansfield had nothing to do with Mr. Rodgers. I am not here to say that Mr. Mansfield is dishonest: if he is, one counterfeit doesn't prove that the whole is false; on the contrary, it rather confirms the idea that there is a truth, of which the counterfeit is the imitation. Ninety-nine failures never disproved one positive demonstration. Long years ago, in the Academy of France, the question of mesmerism was introduced—that philosophy which my brother teaches: and Benjamin Franklin, together with other *savans*, pronounced it a humbug. Did that destroy mesmerism? Let me say that in such public investigations as this, with the prejudice which accompanies, they do not give us half the opportunity, to know the truth, that we should have if we should go quietly, passively, but earnestly, into the investigation.

But I promised other facts. I will give one. Mr. Noah Tyler, of Madison, Madison County, New York, was formerly a sceptic in regard to the immortality of the soul. Although respected by his neighbors, as a candid man, he did not, as he told me, believe in a future life,—to use his own expression, he didn't believe that man had any more immortality than a mullen-stalk. He had parted with a father and brothers, and he said he believed they were forever dead. He had a little boy, the idol of his parents and companions. The boy was something of a poet. One day, Mr. Tyler was grafting apple-trees, and the boy said he wanted to graft a certain little apple-tree on the hill-side. His father gave him the instruments, and he grafted it. The work prospered, and the boy was very proud of his tree, and was in the habit of going to that tree to sit beneath its shade, when he wished to be alone. In a short time, the spirit of the child fled. He stepped into the spirit-life. The father and mother determined to transplant that tree, the favorite of their lost child, to the garden. The transplantation was not known to the neighbors. At the time of the removal, the father and mother expressed fears that the tree would die in consequence of the transplantation. In the course of two or three years it did die. Within three or four years, Mr. and Mrs. Tyler

were at a circle, at the house of James Peck, in the village of Deansville. A lady was entranced. The couple took their seats in the crowd. Mr. and Mrs. Tyler, and the only remaining child they had, a young man, were asked to stand up there. And then the medium turned to the mother, and said,—"I am your child." Ah! that father believed his boy was dead. The child improvised, through the medium, the following verses in regard to the apple-tree. (Let it be known that, of that circle, not one member, as they declared, knew any thing of the circumstances I have previously narrated; they were not known in the vicinity.) I do not produce the lines as a piece of literary merit, but simply for the sake of the test which they afford.

"VERSES GIVEN THROUGH THE MEDIUMSHIP OF MRS. VAN DEUSEN, FROM THE SPIRIT OF EUGENE BURETTE TYLER, AGED 12 YEARS.

"When from the hill-side you removed
My little favored tree,
'Twas not the little tree which you so loved;
Ah, no, but it was *me*.

"And when you bore it from the lot,
Where 'neath the bank it grew,
I saw you place it near the cot,
For I was there with you.

"And there I heard you gayly talk
About the tree which grew
Adown the hill-side, on the bank,
For I was watching you.

"And as you talked, I came so near,
I looked within each eye;
And there I recognised a fear
That the apple-tree might die.

"And as you view each withering bough,
Let it remind you, of the past;
You labored to save me once, — but now
I live among the blest.

"For now I'm blessed with beauties bright;
I see with unveiled eyes.
Beauties are twofold in the light
Of my home in the upper skies.

"Beauties are transparent here;
They glow with a life divine;
And every flower a light doth bear,
Of its own sweet native clime."

Then the child addressed his mother. She told me that, for a long time, she had been accustomed to have beautiful and singular visions, in her sleep, which she had never mentioned out of her family. Turning to her, the medium said:—

"Mother, 'tis *me* who throws across
Thine vision in the night,
Those beauties which doth bear the gloss
Of our celestial light.

"Those dovelike pinions, as they float
Upon our sea of light,
Are but the images of thought,
Thrown off within thy sight.

"Mother, those light and fairy pinions,
Floating in our liquid sea,
Are but the bright and fairy emblems
Of what thou wilt be."

Can such a communication to that mother, given under such circumstances, make that mother immoral? O friends, ask your own souls. Mother, ask your own soul. You have a tender child who has passed before. If you realized that that child could read your inmost thoughts, would it make you immoral and licentious? No, no! But I wish to say one word more, in regard to this occurrence. Mr. and Mrs. Tyler were completely overwhelmed; they could utter not a word; the fountains of the soul were broken up. The audience sat in almost breathless silence. When the parents were able to express themselves, they explained the circumstance of the grafting of the apple-tree and its transplantation; and then there was not a dry eye in the room. I will not say how sacred that scene was; every thing is sacred when there is purity in the heart. But that man till then believed his child was dead; to-day, he stands up and sees the veil parted, and that child looking down to him, full of love and goodness.

A word, brother, upon another matter. I say there is need of repentance, of asking God to forgive us and to help us to do better. I wish we could live so in accordance with the laws of our spiritual being that there should be nothing to have forgiven. I am sure that no Spiritualist lecturer has been so blasphemous as to deny man's need of repentance. You cannot find it in any Spiritualist newspaper;—you cannot find it in the *Banner of Light*, in the *Spiritual Telegraph*, in any Spiritualist paper. I never knew an intelligent Spiritualist but said, that every transgression of the laws of God is followed by its punishment, and that there is no escape from it.

MR. GRIMES.

I must very briefly touch upon some points that the gentleman has gone over. He says this is no place for the production of the manifestations. I offer to go to any place. I will go, with him, anywhere. If the antagonism of this room doesn't please him, I will go to any room. I will take a piece of paper, write a word upon it, fold it so that the contents cannot be seen, and if they will tell what word is written there, I will never speak against Spiritualism again. And they may have the clairvoyants that they speak of—the gentleman speaks of my experience in mesmerism, and I believe I know something about it—they may have clairvoyants, and spirits, and Satan and all, to help them;—just let them tell what is written on that paper. The gentleman says there are tens of thousands of witnesses, and two million believers, and thousands of these manifestations; and I only ask for one—one answer to one mental question, under any circumstances he chooses, provided it is so arranged that they cannot open the paper.

Your city is full of stories about such questions being answered; and I stand ready to give up the whole case, if I can get an answer anywhere. I know what these Spiritualists can do, and what they cannot. They can't give the answer to a mental question. And among all the mediums you have got,—and you have them by the hundred,—and among all the literature you have poured forth by these mediums, if there is one single new idea that has come through them, I don't know what it is. Here we have the whole spirit-world, with all their experience, with all their opportunities, in that state, to go to Europe, to Central America,—anywhere—and, with all, they can't give us one idea! Here are men longing for knowledge in science. I have spent my whole life, trying to find something new in nature,—I have spent a large part of my life in trying to solve one problem,—and these spirits cannot give—not to me, but to any one—a single new fact. I have heard Mrs. Hatch, under the influence of some philoso-

pher, lecturing on geology in a manner in which a schoolboy might have done it. It was creditable to her, as a woman half educated, but discreditable to a spirit who has been so long over the world, looking down through the geological strata, to know no more than that, and to state, with some things which I knew, long before he repeated them, to be true, others which were perfectly absurd, to any man with the least smattering of science.

MR. MILLER. — I will here say, to my brother, that if he will go to the telegraph office to-morrow, he can get these two facts, re-affirmed. This testimony is not far-fetched: when we get the wires working, the "conditions right," he can get it. If he will pay the expenses if the statements are confirmed, I will give the expenses if they are not, and five dollars to pay for his trouble.

MR. GRIMES. — Why go to the wires, while these wires are all around town? Here is a man who has a machine. He will not show it, but wants me to buy stock in the patent. He will not show it; the conditions are not right: he will bring many a man who has seen it!

Here they stand: they ask us to give up the Bible and take stock in a new religion, upon precisely this evidence. It is an excellent religion; they are very pious; they reverence Christ greatly; indeed! I heard a Spiritualist say, in Buffalo, the other day, speaking very eloquently about Jesus Christ, that Christ was very well for a young man, considering he was a Jew, and prejudiced — thought a great deal of Christ, under the circumstances, but he didn't know any thing when compared with the men of now-a-days.

The gentleman doesn't like Mansfield. Rodgers is excellent, but not so Mansfield. There was a time when every Spiritualist in this city swore by Mansfield. I offered five hundred dollars, if Mansfield would examine a letter and read the enclosed writing. I went with a friend, who is here, and he thought I was a little wrong; — I put five hundred dollars in a letter, and said I would give it to Mansfield if he would tell what the bills were. He looked at me — and thought the conditions were not right. Rodgers is dead, the gentleman tells us, and therefore we are to take this testimony. Suppose a gardener says there is such a kind of fruit, very curious and excellent. You doubt it. "Show me a specimen." "Oh, the tree is dead." "Is there not another?" "Oh, that tree is dead." And he refuses to produce the fruit. Are you to receive this as evidence? Did all these picture-painting mediums die with Rodgers, or were they all frightened out with Mansfield? The gentleman passed what I said of the writing. Here is a person cured of blindness. Why, is not the world full of such cases. There are healing mediums; why will they not heal. I will bring sick people here and cover them up so that you cannot distinguish them, and if the spirits will tell which is sick, and which is well, I will give up the whole controversy. The greatest humbug ever conceived is that of these healing mediums. They ought to be sent to the House of Correction for obtaining money under false pretences. Let me give a fact. I might give an immense number, and will, one of these days, when I get into one of my story-telling moods. When lecturing on Cape Cod, I had among my hearers, a Dr. Olander, a Spiritualist healing medium. The next door to the house where I lived, there was a woman sick. (I tell this on the authority of all the neighbors, and do not tell the story to prove my position: I don't prove any thing in that way; I tell it because I am in the mood of telling stories.) There was, in attendance, a scientific physician — never mind his name — the scientific man minds his business, and is allowed to languish, the quack obtains notoriety and thrives upon his quackery. The scien-

tific physician was told he was not wanted any longer, because the people in the house were Spiritualists and wanted a Spiritualist doctor. The Spiritualist doctor came, and he asked what the scientific doctor had said. They said he had ordered beefsteak and oranges for the patient. The medium asked the spirits if that beefsteak and oranges were all right. The spirit answered, Yes. So, the "healing medium" asked in what way the beefsteak and oranges were to be administered. The spirits replied that he must eat them, and take hold of the patient's hands, and thus communicate to her the benefit of them! So the doctor eat it all up—the beefsteak and oranges, held on to the woman's hand,—and she died. She went into the "spirit-world"—she wasn't "in the form," any longer. That is a fact: and if any of you are sick, send for Doctor Chandler.

MR. MILLER.—Bring your witnesses.

MR. GRIMES.—I will bring the doctor himself. If you are sick, let me send for him.

The gentleman couldn't let the question of evidence alone,—though he said he would,—and keeps harping upon it. Why, how does the case stand, my friends? This Spiritualism relates to physical manifestations. How is it in science? When I go to a scientific man, and he says that such a thing is so and so, who ever heard him ask you to believe his testimony? Go to Professor Agassiz, go to the Harvard professors, of whom you speak so contemptuously, and see if they ask you to believe their testimony. They produce the things themselves. If Agassiz tells you about a fish, he doesn't tell you a fish story; he brings in the fish, barrels of them—he has got a new museum, on purpose to hold the fish. You Spiritualists work like a Frenchman who undertook to prove that the world was round. He got into a discussion on the subject, and people said he had not made out the case: he declared he would not argue any longer—it was true—upon his word of honor. Spiritualism is true, upon your word of honor, and upon the word of Mrs. Brown and Mrs. Gerritt Smith. Who, for a moment, would receive that, in the case of astronomy; yet the cases are perfectly analogous. The Frenchman was going to fight a duel over it. If my friend had a loaded pistol in his hand, and said,—“On my word of honor, Mrs. Brown was cured of blindness, by a healing medium,” I must say—“Oh, yes—I believe it—it is all right.”

The gentleman alluded to my knowledge of mesmerism, and spoke of the fact of Franklin being upon a committee appointed to inquire whether mesmerism was or was not a true science stating that Franklin condemned mesmerism.

MR. MILLER.—I said that the Royal Academy of Sciences had a committee appointed to investigate the claims of mesmerism, with Benjamin Franklin as a member of it, and they reported that it was a delusion.

MR. GRIMES.—I suppose the gentleman referred to it with reference to my being somewhat acquainted with the subject; and I suppose I have experimented upon it with as much interest as any one. Now, let me stand up, here, and give my testimony that Franklin *was* right,—that the report of that committee, signed by Franklin, was perfectly philosophical, with all the lights he had. And all the pretended improvements and discoveries concerning mesmerism, from that day to this, under the names of “biology,” and “psychology,” and “phreno-magnetism,” and “hypnotism,” and “spiritualism,” are humbugs. I say that all these are different names for the same thing; and that all there is of Spiritualism, that is not jugglery, is mesmerism, and all of biology, and phreno-magnetism, and hypnotism, that is not jugglery, is mesmerism. It is all the same thing; just as with all these different names of liquors, it is rum, the whole of it; just as “Schiedam

Schnappe" is only gin. No: Franklin has not had justice done him. Let that statue, yonder, stand, to show the vulgar, that such a man lived; but with those who know the story of his life and labors, he needs no monument. He brought down the lightning from heaven, and taught us that it was electricity. Talk about the "conditions"! Let them prove their assertions by experiment. When Franklin first promulgated his electrical theory, they laughed at him, in England. They did right; — let him give them the proof. I think I have made some discoveries; and if I do not give the proof, laugh at me. Some men did not "believe the testimony" of Franklin, in regard to lightning; and many men tried it; — and one received 'a stroke of lightning and was killed — he got a physical manifestation. Franklin was the first man who sounded the ocean currents; for he was the first that taught that by letting down a thermometer it could be ascertained when the current was cold and when warm. When mesmerism was brought before him, he said such and such was the case, as was claimed, but they did not explain it rightly, — nine-tenths of it was imagination. He didn't tell what imagination was; he left that out. I tell you that ninety-nine hundredths of all mesmerism is imagination. Your nonsense about fluids, and all that, is humbug.

MR. MILLER.

I shall define, to-morrow evening, the great difference between experiments with the physical elements of nature and experiments with the mind. When my brother says they are analogous, he is mistaken. We may bring physical elements under our power; but when experiments depend upon the state of a mind, we cannot control them at our will.

FOURTH EVENING.

THURSDAY, MARCH 8TH.

MR. MILLER.

Mr. Moderator, and Ladies and Gentlemen: My opponent, in the course of this debate, has declared that the production of the manifestations claimed by modern Spiritualism is an occupation too insignificant for spirits to be engaged in.

MR. GRIMES. — I beg the gentleman's pardon. I have said no such thing.

MR. MILLER. — Has not the gentleman ridiculed the idea that departed spirits tied knots in Judge Edmonds' pocket handkerchief?

MR. GRIMES. — I read the judge's own story.

MR. MILLER. — Did you not ridicule the tying of the knots in his handkerchief?

MR. GRIMES. — I merely read the gentleman's own story.

MR. MILLER. — Then let my brother say, to this audience, that it is laudable for spirits to return to earth and tie knots in a man's handkerchief.

MR. GRIMES. — I don't think it is; but I said nothing about it.

MR. MILLER. — My brother has not been in the least explicit, I will acknowledge. Every one present has been left to draw his own inferences. And that inference, is, that he impeaches the testimony of every witness that has been presented.

My brother acknowledged, last night, the fact of the execution of that painting, in the following doubtful style. He says, of me, that he cannot attack me, he will not attack me, — oh, no, for I state the circumstance upon my honor, — I hold a pistol to his breast, and say, "Upon my honor, it was executed thus." "No, no," he says; "I am not going to face the muzzle of that revolver." He leaves you to infer that Leo Miller has fabricated the story, or is a party in the deception. Now, my brother has ridiculed the mode of spirit-manifestation. The question is, "Do spirits communicate with men on earth, as claimed by the modern Spiritualists?" On almost every occasion when speaking of every single fact, that I have introduced, — or many of them, — the gentleman has seemed to look upon them as if the mode of manifestation was insignificant. I have asked the gentleman a straightforward question, — are they insignificant, or are they not?

MR. GRIMES. — I answered, I don't care how insignificant; I deny that any manifestations have been made. I will accept the smallest thing, if you will give it. Let us have any thing.

MR. MILLER. — Here, my friend rejects all the testimony and facts which have been adduced. I say to you, upon my word, before God and his angels, that I have made to you a truthful statement in regard to that painting. My brother will not receive it; he

will not believe it, but leaves you to infer that he impeaches my testimony; and yet he turns right around and calls God to witness that he is not a Spiritualist! If he cannot receive your testimony and my testimony, how can he expect us to receive his?

MR. GRIMES. — I don't want you to.

MR. MILLER. — No; he has already acknowledged that he does not wish you to receive any of his statements. I desire, friends, that you receive this testimony, and weigh it carefully in your minds, and, just so far as conviction is carried to your souls, treasure it up in good and honest hearts.

There is nothing insignificant in the mode of spirit-intercourse, that I can see. I cannot see so much insignificance in this universe, perhaps, as my brother does. That spirits should employ mediums, and produce raps, and move physical, ponderable bodies, is nothing insignificant. We employ raps in communicating with each other. A little more than a year ago, bonfires were made in your city, bells were rung, cannon fired, — for what? a few raps which were heard in a telegraph office? No, but because Queen Victoria, sitting upon the throne of the British dominions, could transmit her thoughts across the great waters, in an instant of time. Yet, that has never been repeated; that phenomenon has never taken place since then; but there stands the fact; and if another one never takes place, that fact is so stubborn, itself, that the infinite God cannot make it as if it had never been. Facts are stubborn things. My brother may stand here and deny them; it affects not the truth, in the least. When a phenomenon is past, it is irrevocable.

There is nothing insignificant in the fact, if we look at the principle that underlies it. If we look at Judge Edmonds, with half a dozen knots tied in his handkerchief, supporting three violas, and look at the fact alone, it is insignificant; but if we look at the principle which underlies the phenomenon, then there is in it, something great, and magnanimous. My friend said to me, here, — Would spirits come and produce such manifestations — move tables, and so forth? Does not God make the vermin? Why does God make the viper? It would seem to be simple business for God to be engaged in, — looking at it as a mere fact, — to make the mosquito. In that light it appears to be small business. But when we consider the principles that underlie these creative acts, — when we understand that these creatures are links in the great chain of existence in universal nature, then there is no insignificance. It is an insignificant fact that an apple should fall from a tree upon the head of Newton. It is of little importance. Underlying that, however, there is the great principle of gravitation, which led to the philosopher's wonderful discoveries. If we will look beyond the fact, and examine the principle which underlies it, and the instruction it may impart, it is not so insignificant. It was considered a great achievement, a great triumph of mind, that we could overcome the Atlantic Ocean, that we could speak face to face, while standing on the opposite sides of this mighty sea. But who shall say that the obstacles which spirits are obliged to overcome, in communicating with us, are not a thousand times greater than those which we have conquered. Do you know the nature of that veil which hides the future from our eyes? Do you understand it so well that you can say that spirits may do this or that? No, we do not understand the conditions.

My brother says, — "If you have produced these manifestations once, produce them again." Does not all the world believe that a telegraphic despatch was sent across the Atlantic Ocean? My brother might deny it because it could not be repeated. It is said that Daguerre by mere chance produced the art of daguerrotyping while trying other chemical experiments. It was a long time before he could combine the chemicals in

such a manner as to insure the successful repetition of the effect; yet he discovered the principle underlying the process. My brother has been in a state of mind which he cannot reproduce. I am credibly informed that STARR KING has said that one of the greatest efforts which he ever made, in sermon-writing, was at a time when he was lying upon his bed, in a dreamy state. His interior mind seemed to be opened; at once he arose from his couch, and, in an incredibly short time, wrote the best sermon that he ever delivered. And yet, he says that since then he cannot obtain that condition of mind again. Now, will my brother deny the fact, because that condition of mind cannot be again produced? Yet, that is the position which he has taken, here, to-night. He has said that he would put his name in an envelope, and seal it up, and if the spirits would give him the name there enclosed, he would forfeit five hundred dollars. Under circumstances and conditions favorable, I have not the least question that it could be done. I aver to you that I have demonstrated that fact, to-day, for myself. In my own room, I carefully wrote eight or ten names, and folded them in a dozen thicknesses of paper, carefully put them together, and laid them upon the table, and neither I nor any man upon God's earth knew what was in a particular ballot: and yet, two or three names were given. Admitting that some one else is honest as well as yourself, how can you account for these facts? I will say to my brother, — knowing his proclivities to meet, with all the opposition, with all the determined persistence, in the world, every effort on the part of the medium, — I say that our mediums will not be permitted thus to have him come before them, and, perhaps, go away to misrepresent them. At least, they fear that he will misrepresent them, as he has begun his criticism here, of Mrs. Currier. I produced the name of Mrs. Willard Tripp, as excellent a lady as lives in Taunton. Had she been the wife of some professor, he would have mentioned her name more respectfully. Now, I say to him that if he will write down the names of twenty deceased persons of his own acquaintances, the papers, containing the names, to be sealed in envelopes, put upon them his own private seal, hand them to any three gentlemen in this audience, in whom he may have confidence, — save his own son, — they may take the papers, thus secured, to a medium in this city, and I will guarantee, — that is, I will venture, at least, — I will not promise, — that the names within the envelopes shall be given. I say I will make the effort, not here, upon the public stage, but through three men selected from the audience, who shall go to a sitting-room, where all is quiet, and, though I will not promise success, I am willing to experiment. This shows my own candor; for, if I thought there was deception, I would not volunteer this much. Has my brother confidence in three men in this audience?

MR. GRIMES. — Yes, sir.

MR. MILLER. — Will you select them?

MR. GRIMES. — Yes, sir. And will you hold to that proposition?

MR. MILLER. — Yes, sir.

MR. GRIMES. — What day? What hour?

MR. MILLER. — To-morrow. I cannot say, now, at what hour; I have to consult the convenience of others.

MR. GRIMES. — We will do it: that is good.

MR. MILLER. — I am glad that my brother accepts my proposal. He must comply with the conditions. He must write the names of twenty of his acquaintances, whom he knows to have passed into the spirit-world.

MR. GRIMES.—I thought it was three of them.

MR. MILLER.—No. Put in enough of them. Do not write the name of Henry Clay, or some other distinguished man who has passed away. Put in the name of a mother, a sister, or a brother.

MR. GRIMES.—No: I will leave them out, if you please.

MR. MILLER.—There is to be no chance, here, for deception. Let none but yourself number them; so that the medium cannot know whose name there is in a particular envelope. And if you will have the name of a sainted mother, or a child, or brother, or father,—once, for your own soul's sake, say, "I will put down their names." I do not require it.

MR. GRIMES.—For that very reason I would leave them out.

MR. MILLER.—I do not insist that they shall be any particular names,—only that they shall be those of personal acquaintances.

MR. GRIMES.

The gentleman opened his remarks by saying that he would sum up; and in summing up, he passed over the whole of what he had spoken. He said he would answer some of the objections I had raised, and answered an objection that I never had raised and never would raise. Anybody must know that I would never raise such an objection as that which he mentioned, in regard to the insignificance of the manifestations. Every man who studies nature knows that the most mighty things are made up of the insignificant. The very planets are made of atoms, and it requires as much of miracle to raise the smallest object you can see, as to raise a planet, if it is to be done in violation of the laws of nature. I did not speak as I did, in the matter of Judge Edmonds, because the affair was small. The Spiritualists say of me,—“He cannot reason; he only ridicules.” If I bring forward the most reasonable argument, they say I only ridicule. If I show that their positions are so absurd that any man with the slightest common sense cannot hear them without a smile, they say I ridicule. For that very purpose, I read Judge Edmonds' own statement,—to show that it was ridiculous, not to show that it was untrue. I did as the prophet Elijah did when he challenged the priests of Baal to call upon their God for fire from heaven to burn the sacrifice, and, when, after they had called on Baal, from morning to noon, in vain, and no answer came, he said,—“Cry aloud, for he is a god; either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked.” I did the same thing. If you call that belittling them, I belittled these alleged manifestations. I ridiculed falsehood, by showing it as it is. I spoke contemptuously—I always do—of Spiritualism. The Spiritualists complain that I do not treat it respectfully. Why, in the name of heaven and earth, should any lover of truth treat falsehood respectfully?

MR. MILLER.—Is this falsehood? Do I lie, in regard to this painting? You need not spare my feelings.

MR. GRIMES.—The gentleman wants me to abuse his sister; and then the Spiritualists will have something to talk about. He dragged in that picture of his sister, I really fear, by the advice of some of these Spiritualists. I have a reputation for ridiculing, and last night, when I read the words of their own advocate, I was accused of ridiculing the subject. But why did the gentleman bring in the name of any woman, here?

A VOICE IN THE AUDIENCE. — An evidence.

MR. GRIMES. — It was no evidence at all. He says Mrs. Tripp says that somebody else says that somebody else says.

MR. MILLER. — I don't see in what way a sister who passed into the spirit-world six years ago could, by any possible means, be implicated in the execution of that painting two years ago. I cannot see how he is to implicate her, to account for that painting. It is inconceivable. If it is a matter of fraud, I am a party to it; and I am willing the gentleman should suppose how it could be done.

MR. GRIMES. — According to my ideas of courtesy and propriety — I don't know what the gentleman's are — the name of a sister is not a proper subject to be bandied about, here — that of a sister living is not, and, certainly, not of one who is dead.

MR. MILLER. — Tell me how I introduced my sister's name in such a way as could lead to her being implicated in this controversy, or the painting.

MR. GRIMES. — Did he not bring in his mother and his sister, and how he loved them, and how they had appeared, to mediums, since they had passed into the spirit-world. But I did not answer it, because I considered that a subject not to be talked of. If I ridicule, I at least spare those feelings. I brought in the name of a quack doctor.

MR. MILLER. — Didn't you bring in the name of Jesus Christ?

MR. GRIMES. — Indeed I did; but, I hope, in a manner different from that of the Spiritualists. They bring in the spirit of Jesus Christ, to rap Yankee Doodle upon the table — I have been present when they did it. They speak of him as inferior to Davis, or the Coon boys, or the Davenport boys. If I spoke irreverently of Jesus Christ, I did not mean to do so. I don't think I did.

I passed by the subject of the gentleman's painting; for the reason that it is no evidence. I will attend to the paintings, in good time. But I was saying that I do not care how insignificant a fact is: if it is only a fact, that is enough. That is my point. Now, in regard to this charge of ridicule, made by some of the Spiritualists — not this gentleman alone — the very air of this room is full of the accusation. Who is there that does not ridicule Spiritualism, except those who believe in it? Who can speak of it, without ridicule? Didn't they charge Everett with ridiculing it, in a speech at Plymouth; and was not Judge Edmonds angry because he ridiculed it? Did not the present president of Harvard College write a letter, — when you said he was a Spiritualist, and he was obliged in that mode to publish his denial, — in which he spoke of Spiritualism with such utter contempt that the Spiritualists fairly writhed? I haven't it here, but I warrant the Spiritualists have not forgotten it. He treated Spiritualism with not so much respect as I did. They brought their nonsense to Professor Agassiz; and I have heard the Spiritualists, in a private house, here, complaining that Professor Agassiz didn't treat them decently and respectfully. You see I am not the only man who fails to be respectful. Professor Pierce and Professor Faraday were not respectful; — of course they were not. I do not hesitate to declare to the world that I do look upon those evidences and manifestations, with the most perfect contempt. And if I should get up and say, "I have a great respect," — and "I presume," — and "I have no doubt," — I should belie myself, for in my heart of hearts I believe it is false. It is not true, as a matter of fact. I ridicule falsehood; I sneer at the attempt to pass it off for truth: and when you present it for truth, I pull off the mask and say it is a lie.

MR. MILLER.—I hope my brother will not correct these remarks, when he comes to revise the Report.

MR. GRIMES.—I hope that gentleman will do it himself. If I am in error, I am happy to be corrected on the spot. Let me say, here, that if I anywhere commit an error, — though I may be combative, though I may be earnest in my beliefs, yet show me that I am wrong, and I am humble as a man can be. I reverence truth, and before that I bend. I am willing to do what the Spiritualists do not, and that is, ask forgiveness when I do wrong. And this leads me to speak of the position which the gentleman, last night, controverted, — the charge that the Spiritualists do not believe in the need of forgiveness. I repeat that this is their doctrine. I heard a medium declare here, last Sunday, in very eloquent terms, that the Spiritualists obey law and do not ask God's forgiveness. And she took much more consistent ground than does the gentleman. For, observe, the Spiritualists say that law governs the universe, law which God himself does not and cannot alter. That is their doctrine, — that every thing is done by law, — that there is no God with discretionary power to arrest the operation of a law, however cruelly it may, in any case, seem to act. And, therefore I ask, here, was not that lady, last Sunday, consistent? There being a law to every thing, why pray to God for its alteration, who cannot change the law which binds him as it does you? Why pray to God, who is the slave of his own laws? Why ask him to forgive, when there is no forgiveness? My friends, this is an important and vital point. Christianity is founded upon the doctrine of the mercy of God through Christ, capable as God is of dispensing with law, and showing mercy. For there is no mercy in nature: the lightning strikes without mercy; the ocean swells without mercy; the hurricane sweeps without mercy; and there is no forgiveness for sin, unless God has the power to dispense with law, as our governors have to pardon. That is the basis of Christianity, and that the Spiritualists deny. The mercy of God is itself a miracle, and Christianity is founded upon it. So much for that point.

Do the spirits of departed human beings return and manifest themselves in the way the Spiritualists claim? I say, No. The Spiritualists say they do, and the burden of proof is on them. It belongs to them, as I have shown, to prove these manifestations. The best evidence must be brought in, here. The gentleman acknowledged that they could not do it. I stated, and he admitted, that in every court of justice, on a trial like this, they would be bound to bring it; — a court would not hang a dog, on the evidence they have produced. If there is a lawyer here, he would say so. They must bring the best evidence, and the best evidence is, the thing itself. It is so not only in court, but among scientific men. Perhaps Galileo did see the four moons of Jupiter, but if he cannot see them again and show them to another, the presumption is, he is mistaken. Now, these modern spiritualistic manifestations come under the head of experimental science. The Spiritualists say they take place under a law of nature, as much as thunder and lightning, or any operation of nature. What are the conditions? Credulity. You must, indeed, have enough of that! What scientific man ever made that a condition? In the New Testament times, they say, faith was necessary, and it is necessary now. Suppose a witness is brought into court, to prove any thing. Does not everybody know that not only in a court of justice, but in experimental science, and everywhere else, the witness must be examined? The gentleman brought in a picture, and swore in his own case. Why, who cannot gain his case in court if he can swear to it himself? I have heard pretty hard swearing, in court, and in some cases a man can himself testify. But it is pretty well understood among lawyers, that

a man conducting a case in court, does not swear it through. Now, imagine a lawyer conducting the gentleman's case, in court, and depending, for proof of his entire case, upon his own testimony. Again, when a case comes in court, no matter who swears to it, you may demand subpoenas, and call in the other witnesses who saw the occurrence in question; you can submit them to the severest examination, — whether they were drunk at the time, whether they are in the habit of drinking, whether they were ever in state prison, whether their character is wanton. You can examine them on the minutest point, — to prove that they cannot be believed. Now, if you can do this, where not twenty dollars is pending, in court, can you not do it in a case where every thing valuable, in heaven and earth, is pending? Here are thousands taken from their homes, from their religion, from their politics, from every thing that made up the excellence of life —

[The speaker's time here expired.]

MR. MILLER.

I would ask my brother what Spiritualist paper has put Andrew Jackson Davis so much above Jesus Christ.

MR. GRIMES. — I didn't say a Spiritualist paper.

MR. MILLER. — What Spiritualist literature, then?

MR. GRIMES. — It is the doctrine of all the Spiritualists. The Spiritualists take this ground, and only this, — that Jesus Christ was a medium, and only a medium.

MR. MILLER. — I would also ask my brother which one of the Spiritualist journals, or what work of Spiritualist literature, has advocated the idea that man need not ask forgiveness.

MR. GRIMES. — I didn't mention any journal, and I didn't say there was any, but said it was the doctrine of the Spiritualists. If I have made a wrong statement let me be corrected.

MR. MILLER. — Are not the doctrines of Spiritualists to be found in their books and papers.

MR. GRIMES. — If you will take their books and papers and make out any regular system of doctrine, you are smarter than I am.

MR. MILLER. — What does the gentleman consider Spiritualist doctrine?

MR. GRIMES. — Faith, you have all sorts!

MR. MILLER. — The gentleman has made a statement in regard to the belief of Spiritualists, and has not brought in a single one of the twenty Spiritualist papers in the United States, to support it. I take all the gentleman has said, as mere statements, unauthorized.

MR. GRIMES. — If I am wrong, let me be corrected. If I am wrong, I am sincerely wrong.

MR. MILLER. — It is most emphatically denied that the Spiritualists deny our need of forgiveness. I think we ought to ask the forgiveness of our neighbors, and ask God to forgive us, for not supplying their wants.

And I offer, here, a solemn protest against the assertions which the gentleman has

made. This has been the entire tone of his argument, from the outset, — assertion without proof or evidence. There are hundreds, in this place, who have gone to the house of Mr. ———, of the ——— Express Company, and have there witnessed intelligent spiritual manifestations. They have seen a heavy piano raised, when the only person, who touched it was a light, spare man and he playing on it, in daylight, or when bright gaslight was burning. And yet, all this testimony amounts to nothing! Are there any here, who have visited the house of the gentleman I have named, and have seen this heavy piano raised from the floor under the circumstances I have described?

[Three persons arose, in the audience, in response to this question.]

Here are three witnesses. One is a gentleman of this city, well-known to almost every person in Boston, who gives in his testimony. [MR. MILLER referred to the persons rising.] I am not to any extent personally acquainted with the gentleman, yet I have met him. Here is another, who my brother says is a truthful man. The whole Christian world brand me as an infidel, if I do not receive the testimony of a drunken king, who lived three thousand years ago, who, while drinking in his banquet-room, saw a hand write upon the wall "MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN" — "Thou art weighed in the balances and art found wanting." And here are two or three, — and I can produce hundreds more, in this community, who have seen this manifestation; and yet my brother says it is no evidence! He heaps contempt and scorn upon every one who dares to speak out his honest sentiments in this matter. Is this the course of debate? Is this fairness in argument? Let me say to you, when he says that nearly every opponent of Spiritualism has pursued the same course that he has, I will acknowledge that it is lamentably true. Too often have our opponents wielded only that argument, or miserable attempt at argument, — the wretched weapon of ridicule. My brother boasts of it; and he has, for his companion, a professor at Harvard. I wish I had, here, the number of the *New York Ledger*, in which the editor speaks of that distinguished man as falling, from his high station, to low, pothouse abuse. Such talk affects the low and vulgar-minded, but nobody else. Our respectable opponents have abandoned this mode of attack. President Mahan, of Oberlin, comes out and acknowledges the facts of Spiritualism. He acknowledges the production of these paintings, through Rodgers. In the city of Cleveland, they have appointed a committee, taken a darkened room, divested the medium of every thing that might possibly serve as a means of deception; and after having his person examined to see that he had no painting previously in his possession, he has, in a few minutes, from that darkened room, which contained not a single piece of furniture, come out with a finely executed painting. President Mahan will not deny the facts. His theory is this, as I have been informed: that Mr. Rodgers is a clairvoyant, that he goes into a clairvoyant state, and looks into my mind, and there sees an image of my sister; all the vital forces of the system become concentrated in the artistic faculties of the medium, rendering him an intuitive, instinctive artist, and then he paints. President Mahan gives us instances of persons executing needlework, and paintings, while in a somnambulant sleep. But there are great obstacles in the way of this theory. There is a wreath of flowers about my sister's head, in this painting, which she never wore here. She tells me these are spirit-flowers, which she had gathered and placed about her head. If merely an intuitive artist, as President Mahan claims, Rodgers would not have placed them there.

But I am not arguing with President Mahan, but with my brother here. When he makes such statements, as these which he has given, I want, at least, the evidence of a newspaper. Yet he finds fault with the evidence which I present. Is not the handwriting of a man good evidence of his identity? Is not identity proved in courts by the

exhibition of letters? He says our testimony would not hang a dog. And yet, men have been hung on such testimony as this. I have offered to go with him to the telegraph office, and send to my witnesses for a corroboration of their statements. Does he not rely upon any thing that he receives in the telegraph office? Friends, when you get a letter, do you throw it away and say there is no proof that such a person wrote it as purports to have signed it? There are tens of thousands of facts, in support of Spiritualism, which I have not time to cite. I have recently been looking over "Footfalls on the Boundary of the Spirit World," by Owen; and, from all the press come forth eulogies of the candor and intelligence shown in the collection of the facts which he relates. And I have just read the following extraordinary fact, which is said to have taken place in the old country. A man was sick, and was told, by a spirit, that he should recover, and live, and was further informed that he should have the strongest evidence of the spirit's power to cure him; namely, that a large ponderable body should be moved, to convince him. And a large rock, weighing several tons, *was* moved, more than half a mile. I cannot vouch for this fact, or say how well founded it may be—it may hereafter be better confirmed; but, I ask, admitting it to be true, how do you get rid of this testimony?

Never, in the annals of time, has the Christian Church tried their Bible before a court of justice. They have indeed appealed to the reasoning faculties. But never has it been tried before a court. Why should the gentleman wish to require, here, the proofs which a court would demand? Why should he say, unless this evidence comes in the shape of the technicalities of law, it amounts to nothing? Ministers go into the pulpit, and, sabbath after sabbath, reiterate that in ancient times these manifestations took place.

I did intend to reply to my brother in regard to some statements which he made last night, denying that cures were effected by healing mediums.

MR. GRIMES. — I beg your pardon. I think I did not say so.

MR. MILLER. — Did you not say that our mediums could not produce cures?

MR. GRIMES. — I did not deny that cures are produced, but only that they are produced by Spiritualism.

MR. MILLER. — I will give you a fact. Captain Knight, of the steamer *Lewiston*, which runs between your city and Portland, had, some time ago, a passenger upon his boat, who had been sent to this city to have a palsied arm amputated. The captain suggested to this man that he should visit Dr. Greenwood, a healing medium. He did so, and in one hour's time, that withered, palsied arm, which had become diseased, and which eight learned physicians had declared must be amputated, *was* made whole by simply laying on of hands, and the man used it, and it was as strong as ever. Dr. Greenwood is at No. 15 Tremont Street; and within a stone's throw of this building are men who can come in and testify that, by simply laying on of his hands, they have got up from sick-beds where they were prostrated. Go to the *Traveller* office and make inquiry there, of some of these cures. Are not these facts before the world?

The gentleman asked, last evening, why did not the spirits communicate the fact of the existence of the New World, and why do they not make some great discoveries? My friends, why did not Jesus Christ tell us that the world was round? No: he let it pass, with the rest of mankind, that it was as flat as your hand. Why didn't he make that simple revelation? Hundreds of years passed by before we knew it. Why did not he reveal the Copernican system,—and tell mankind that beyond the great waters there was a new country?

What do you expect of the spirit-world? Here are the heathen nations, to-day:

they have not our colleges, our schools, our railroads. Why do they not have them? We can sail to their homes in a few days; — why do we not give to them all these fruits of civilization? Ah, it is hard, — there is an impenetrable veil between the Bushman and the Anglo-Saxon. May there not be the same difference between ourselves and spiritual beings, and the same difficulty in the communication between them and us, as between us and the savage of the wilderness, or the Hottentots? The Christian world has been trying to civilize the Indian race. When Columbus landed here, there were millions of them. Have they been Christianized? No: they have been almost exterminated, and are fast disappearing. With all our virtue and goodness and all our higher aims, these great ends are not accomplished, — and we have been in the land of the Pilgrim Fathers for two hundred and forty years. Yet because in the last ten years the spirit-world has not caused man to grow spontaneously, and grapple the great principles of the spiritual universe, there is no truth in the doctrine of spirit-manifestation! I ask, again, will my brother meet these facts? — and particularly the testimony in the case of the sick man whom I have mentioned? Does the Christian world expect that I am to receive the testimony of a drunken king, and yet reject the testimony of my neighbor? Am I to receive the testimony of men who lived thousands of years ago, and yet reject that of the neighbors around me? If he will show that the testimony of the former has any better foundation in truth, then I will grant it. Then where is the force of all this talk that these were miracles, and the present cases are not analogous? Christ healed a withered arm. So did Dr. Greenwood. Will you show the difference? Dr. Greenwood cured that man's arm by laying his hands upon it, and nothing else.

[The speaker's allotted twenty minutes were here exhausted.]

MR. GRIMES.

I will attend to Mr. Greenwood's case when I come to it. You might pile up those cases to any extent, and I will help you. If you are going to give the history of quackery, I will give you more such cases than a long-eared horse can draw.

MR. MILLER. — I will bring in that man who was cured, and let him testify.

MR. GRIMES. — I can bring a thousand people here who can swear that they were cured by Brandreth's Pills, and Swain's Panacea. Every one knows that the newspapers are full of these "facts."

MR. MILLER. — Does that disprove the fact that a man's arm was cured eighteen hundred years ago?

MR. GRIMES. — No: the ground taken by Christians is that Jesus Christ performed what he did, by a miraculous power, suspending the laws of nature. The gentleman knows that I have said this again and again.

MR. MILLER. — Will you show me wherein one is more a miracle than another, leaving out the dogmatical assumptions of the Church?

MR. GRIMES. — The gentleman knows, a miracle cannot be explained.

MR. MILLER. — Where is the difference between the two cases?

MR. GRIMES. — The difference is this, — that in the one case we have the testimony of the Bible — and we have nothing else. The difference is that in the case of the miracles of Jesus, we have no evidence that they took place at all, excepting the Bible. That is my position. We do not pretend to have any other. If I under-

stood the gentleman's question, he wanted me to show the difference between a miracle —

MR. MILLER. — No: show where there is a difference in the phenomena of the present day and the ancient day. One man lays his hand upon a palsied arm and it is cured; another does the same, no more, no less, and it is cured. If both cases are precisely alike, the same laws must govern them.

MR. GRIMES. — I don't know that I need to argue that. If both cases are alike, they are alike; — I have no more to say.

MR. MILLER. — That is it, brother; they are just alike.

MR. GRIMES. — Well, that is enough. And I would like to know, while the gentleman is in the mood for explanation, by what law of nature his big rock is carried a half-mile. I would like to have him call up the spirit of Isaac Newton, and ascertain by what law that rock is moved so far, just to convince a common sort of man that he was going to be healed. A most obliging sort of spirit that! Now, here, in Boston, the gentleman and all his spirit-friends, cannot move half an ounce! But there, off in Ohio, —

MR. MILLER. — I said, the old country.

MR. GRIMES. — I beg your pardon. That is very essential. I would not like to get it wrong. I beg your pardon. I stand corrected.

The gentleman says that ministers ask you to believe. What *do* ministers say? Let me justify them, though that is not my business here. I am under no necessity, in this argument, of defending the Bible at all, or of defending ministers. The real question is, — Do these phenomena take place? And if I acknowledged the Bible was false, it would not help the gentleman, at all. The question is, — Do spirits communicate as the Spiritualists claim? But a minister affirms the truth of these miracles recorded in the Bible. Christ was raised from the dead; the world was made thus and so; water was turned into wine; Christ was crucified; repent, and believe. You turn to him and say, — "I do not believe the Bible. What evidence have you that all these things took place?" The minister says, — "You have the Bible." "Well, I do not believe the Bible; I want more proof." He says, — "My friends, all the evidence that I have had, I give you. I keep nothing back. I have no more. If you do not believe the Bible after all I have said, the responsibility of rejecting it is on your own soul:" and there is an end — there he stops. Does the Spiritualist do the same? No; he says, — "I have seen a rock moved, or somebody else did; I had a portrait painted, when there was no humbug; I have seen a piano raised right up." "Can I see it?" "No." The gentleman brought a letter, and gives a list of names of witnesses, and wants you to believe the story. The letter says, — "I wouldn't believe it if I had not seen it." I want to believe it; and he will not let me see it.

MR. MILLER. — What is the relevancy, to the question before us, of the gentleman's remarks on ministers and the Bible?

MR. GRIMES. — Why, ministers, and churches, and Christianity, and the Bible, are trampled under foot every night, so that Christians do not want to go and hear such blasphemy; and most of those who do come are Spiritualists. I have asked, and heard the reason of this, and I want to answer, if it does make the gentleman wince.

Now, as to Mr. Rodgers. This gentleman has risen, here, and told a story about his sister's portrait. No chance to call in witnesses. In a trial, the neighbors are called in, to find out if there is not some falsehood, somewhere. But here there is no chance

to do this. "Believe this," they say, in substance, "or tell some one he lies,"—seeking in that way to draw you into a personal quarrel. Now, a gentleman who is a Spiritualist, well known in this city, told me, and he also told a most respectable physician, that this Mr. Rodgers painted two spirit-portraits for two different persons, and that when you bring them together,—one having been executed in one place, and another in another,—they are just alike. Mr. Rodgers painted a portrait for Mr. A., of his friend, and in another place Mr. B. got one of his departed friend; and when you come to examine them, they are the same thing, copied. Mr. Mansfield traded in these things; and when I was in this city, at the time when he was in all his glory, and I said it was a humbug, I was called upon to prove it,—as if a juggler who should play a trick, should call upon you to prove it was a trick. It needs only common sense. Are there not things which your common sense refuses to permit you to believe, even without trying them? What should you think, if a man should swear that he saw the sun rise in the West? You would hear a great many men swear, before you believed that. How many men will you believe, when they swear that a rock starts off for half a mile, to convince some one that he was going to recover from a sickness. Christians believe, indeed, that a rock was rolled from the sepulchre of Christ, by a miracle. Heavens and earth! if there was a law of nature by which rocks were rolled off in that way, shouldn't we have trouble with our paving stones? Am I to blame, if I ridicule that? I am so constituted that, as Martin Luther said when he stood before the Council, charged with promulgating his doctrines of heresy, "I cannot help it." When I heard that story, I couldn't help thinking it was just a little enlarged. The Spiritualists will pardon me. I believe Mr. Mansfield humbugged; and I believe Mr. Rodgers humbugged my friend, a little. I don't doubt that he is sincere. The painting looks enough like him to resemble his sister. A great many have said that it was so much like him that it is only putting a little femininity upon it, and it is he.

The gentleman speaks much of these mediums. I have said little about their contradicting one another. Do they agree? Is it not a rule, everywhere, that where witnesses differ they destroy each other's evidence? Mr. Bly was a Spiritualist, and performed their wonders, and was cried up as one of their wonderful men. He came out and showed that he had humbugged, and showed how the rest did it. So much for Mr. Bly. No matter whether he lied in the first place or the second. Mr. VonVleck, who was a Spiritualist—and, indeed, I believe he is something of a Spiritualist yet—after having humbugged many people by these manifestations, came out and showed that the manifestations were a trick, and showed how he did it; and he does us the honor to be present, to-night, to hear me. There is another of your apostles—perhaps you think he is Judas—there is Mr. Cole, who is said to be a pretty likely man—and, whether his statements are true or not, Mr. Cole was with Miss Coan, and accompanied her in her public test exhibitions. I was often met, by them, with a "How do you explain that?—do you mean to say they lie?" And in New York, the other day, my friend Dr. Hallett asked me to speak, at a Spiritualist meeting where I was present, and I rose and said the whole thing was a humbug,—and there was quite an excitement. Up stepped Mr. Cole, and said,—“Mr. Grimes is right.” Some of them charged me with lying. He said,—“It is not true. I have followed Mr. Grimes, upon his track, again and again, and I am bound, in honor, to say he is right.” So much for Miss Coan and Mr. Cole. And he believes in Spiritualism; only he explained these phenomena—there was a little humbug in it. Then, there were the Coons. Who does not remember the wonderful haunted house in Ohio? And I was then called upon to account for it. I said it was humbug and trickery. And, sure enough,

the Coons went to New York, and there gave their performances. The music went around the room, in a very wonderful manner, till a gentleman went there with a dark lantern —

A VOICE IN THE AUDIENCE. — That was in the case of the Davenport boys.

MR. GRIMES. — If I make any error, I will thank any gentleman to correct me. I only catch these things from the Spiritualists.

Then, there was Mr. —. And they state — I don't know whether it was so — that they caught him cutting up a miracle in the wrong way — a little over the left. Then, there was Mr. —, who spoke all night, — and they said he was inspired by spirits. When I was there, he became convinced that the whole thing was a humbug, and rose up, and publicly said that though he had been honest, when he experienced these things, he was convinced that he was wrong. Then, there was Mr. Sunderland. Don't you remember the manifestation he had, — that he was going to reform the whole world? And then Mr. Sunderland came out, and, though still a Spiritualist, said that instead of Spiritualism doing so much good, it all comes from a herd of devils, — and advised people to let it alone. Here was the testimony of one of your own followers. I hope these "facts" will be "attended to." Then, there was Mr. Hatch, who married a beautiful woman who was inspired and went all over the country, speaking. She went down to Lynn, and asked scientific men to discuss with her; and when she appeared, she simply showed that she couldn't discuss at all. Then, there is Mr. Harris, the very St. Paul of your Church, has come out, lately, in London, and instead of finding Spiritualism inaugurating such a new era and causing such a wonderful enlightenment, he warns all honest men from dipping into such a filthy pool as this is. I have here, his letter, and it is a good long one; and if you are fond of hearing such, I hope the reporter will get it and put it in, for the edification of my Spiritualist friends.

MR. MILLER.

Again and again, my brother proceeds to heap contempt upon my facts. I alluded to a case — and did not say whether it was so, but only that in the future it might be better confirmed; but I had recently read a case which is said to have happened in the old country. He says that none but a crazy-headed Spiritualist would believe it. He says you must pardon him if he does look upon it with contempt — if he does ridicule it. Is the brother aware what he is doing? Really, I am surprised to find that my brother has so soon turned infidel, and has gone to ridiculing the Bible! For the case I mentioned, I read in the twentieth chapter of Second Kings.

MR. GRIMES. — I beg the gentleman's pardon. I referred, in the first part of my remarks, — fortunately for me, for it seems he was cunning, — to the Bible, and said the wonders there recorded were done by miracle, and not by a law of nature. He says the stone moved by a law of nature.

MR. MILLER. — My brother must be cautious how he ridicules my facts. I was speaking of the fact, — not of how it was done.

MR. GRIMES. — I beg the gentleman's pardon. The gentleman did say that these facts — and that is the understood rule — took place by a law of nature; — and that is what I was controverting.

MR. MILLER. — I was talking of the phenomenon, without saying how it happened. But my brother need not be sensitive — I shall not take his hat if he offers it to me.

Yes; in the twentieth chapter of Second Kings is a story which the gentleman thought a little exaggerated. But, friends, I have not begun to tell the whole. Hezekiah had a pain about him—in the stomach, perhaps,—and wanted to know if he should get well. The Great Spirit told him he should; the infinite Jehovah assured him! Hezekiah would not take the word of the Lord. “Bring in your evidence,” he said. “What proof will you give that I shall recover?” And God said,—“Shall the shadow on the dial go forward, ten degrees, or back ten degrees?” Hezekiah was about as smart as my friend. He said it would go forward, ten degrees, of itself; anybody knows that; “but if you will turn it back ten degrees, I will believe.” And the infinite Spirit is said to have been so accommodating as to do it! This could have been done in no other way than by stopping the earth in its revolution, and rolling it back ten degrees, which would have moved all the rocks and mountains weighing “several tons,” more or less, thousands of miles, instead of half a mile. I hope the reporter will put this down; and I hope too, if the *Courier* printing office has any type that will tell the truth, they will come out and say that Professor Grimes has ridiculed the facts of the Bible. My brother must be cautious about ridiculing my facts, hereafter.

My friend has said that because we cannot bring forward evidence here, the house is not full,—that the opposition will not come out. The opposition do not come out, because they cannot see these facts met. They go away, and error hides itself in shame. O my friends, had I, as he says, heaped contempt upon the Bible, had I trampled it under my feet, had I spoken sneeringly of Jesus of Nazareth, I guess some of your daily papers would have taken advantage of it. Since they could not say any thing against us, they have wisely kept silent. Had I taken the position my brother has tried to represent me as occupying, there would have been enough said. I stated the course I was to pursue. I entered into this discussion, not for the purpose of a personal contest, not to curry the favors of the press, or to obtain renown; but, believing and knowing Spiritualism to be true, I have come forward, here, and presented these facts: and, indiscriminately, Bible facts and all are ridiculed, provided my brother doesn't happen to know that they are in the “big book.”

Friends, this is my last speech upon this question. I have now presented the evidence. I have shown, from the universal testimony of humanity in every age of the world, that they have believed in a system of guardian angels, they have believed in the presence of invisible intelligences. I have shown, from the Bible, that through a period of four out of six thousand years of the history of humanity, spiritual beings were daily in the habit of visiting men. My brother has not shown that the conditions whereby they did so, have ever been revoked. He has talked about the former manifestations being miracles, and the present not so. The Christian Church has assumed that they were miracles. The Bible does not declare they were in opposition to the laws of nature; they have assumed it. And the gentleman has not given a single argument to prove it. Many of those manifestations are above our comprehension. But whether miracles or not, they are precisely analogous with cases in our day; and spiritual beings accomplished the work. Was it a miracle to move away the stone from the sepulchre? If so, why did an angel come there to do it? Is it a miracle for me to take up a stone weighing fifty pounds? No. Why, then, is it a miracle, in the case of a spiritual being? The Bible does not say that its wonders were miracles. I have produced evidence of my facts; I have brought in witnesses, to testify to them. I well know that the fact at which my brother sneered, is not well authenticated. We do not know, even, who wrote the account: ministers think Samuel, or some one, wrote it, but we have not the positive proof.

My brother has proceeded to cast reflections upon the character of mediums. That all mediums are honest, I do not believe. It would be strange if all were honest among so many thousands. There was dishonesty in olden times. There was a Peter to deny, and a Judas to betray. He has spoken of the character of these mediums. Friends, I might read you, here, a chapter of clerical delinquencies, that would make your ears tingle and your cheeks mantle with shame — and not a thousand miles from Boston, either. But does this discredit the pure and holy religion which Jesus Christ taught, and which I love? Not in the least. Is not the testimony of the witnesses I have named, good? If we pass to their character, it is equally good with that of the witnesses of the wonders of olden time. I am willing to receive the testimony of those witnesses. If I open the Bible and read, I find that Moses saw an angel. And yet, the Bible tells us that Moses committed murder. He saw an Egyptian striking a Hebrew; and, looking around him to see that there was no one in sight, he slew the Egyptian, and hid him in the sand. I believe him notwithstanding that he committed murder. Abraham saw three spirits. He lifted up his eyes, and three men stood before him — they are afterward called ministering spirits. Yet, did he not commit incest, by marrying his sister? Did he not turn his own son, and that son's mother, into the wilderness, to perish? And yet I believe his testimony; for I can see no motive for his testifying dishonestly. The gentleman says these witnesses must be dishonest. Where is the motive? If he had brought in a negative argument, and shown the motive which would induce it, his assumptions and assertions might have some weight. I am told I must believe Jacob, when he says that he saw a ladder reaching from earth to heaven, and angels ascending and descending upon it; and again, when he declares that he wrestled with an angel, all night, and had his thigh put out of joint. And yet, did not Jacob rob his own brother of his birthright? When Esau was faint with hunger, Jacob offered him a mess of pottage, and demanded, as the price, the birthright of his starving brother. In this way, by this mean act, he robbed him of his inheritance. Surely, if a Spiritualist in this community thus defrauded his brother, I would never quote his testimony, to support Spiritualism. Other Bible personages give their testimony. David gives his; yet David committed murder and adultery, in the case of Uriah the Hittite. Solomon gives his; yet Solomon was the greatest Mormon the world ever knew, and the greatest idiot for it. Paul gives in his testimony; yet was not Paul accessory to murder, in the case of Stephen? — did he not consent to his death, and hold his clothes? Peter while asleep, in a trance, saw a spirit; yet did not Peter perjure his own soul, before God and heaven, in denying his Lord and Master, and swearing to the denial? I do not introduce this, here, to impeach their testimony. This was away back in the days of ignorance and darkness. I believe their testimony; yet what I have stated in regard to the private character of these men is to be found in the Bible. Now, my friend, I ask you, is not the testimony of the witnesses whom I have introduced, as good? yes, better? — for they live, and may be interrogated, and you cannot throw so much doubt around it as around that of witnesses living thousands of years ago. I have witnessed these facts, myself, and have given my testimony. And now, will my brother not show some motive that will induce so many thus to offer their testimony, where we know it will be protested against. I, as a lecturer, may be induced to obtain this painting in some dishonest way. But what will induce this man whose letter I have read, Mr. —, of New York, thus to impose upon his own companion? He must have been a party to the fraud. It was the painting of a little child. In my own case I did not mention to Mr. Rodgers, as I remember, that I had a sister in the spirit-world. I told him I could not resist conviction, if he

would paint a portrait of my mother. My mother had been in the spirit-world one year, my sister four years. It was just as unexpected as if some one should come out of *that* room there, and hand me a likeness of my mother. He says somebody told him that somebody said that two pictures by this Mr. Rodgers look much alike. He knows that there is a resemblance in the works of every artist. I have seen scores of his paintings, and know there is as much likeness as is usually visible in the works of the same artist, and no more. Go to my brother, in Mt. Morris, New York. He will tell you it is a likeness of our sister. He is a member of the Baptist Church in that place. He will give you the testimony of many in that town, to avouch for the correctness of the portrait. Now, because my sister's face and mine wear a family likeness, and are of nearly the same complexion, and we have similar features, my friend would tell us that the resemblance indicates that the portrait was gathered from my face. His argument shows a weak cause—weak indeed. I would have had my brother meet more of these facts. He has had my sympathy and pity; and I have pity for him still, struggling, as he is under the burden of opposition to the truth, and when he shall take up the next question to be discussed it will be harder still. I say he cannot meet these facts, to the satisfaction of the public. And if his friends are not here, he cannot charge it upon me: it is because he has not faithfully aided them out of this inextricable difficulty. They have, one by one, left; because he cannot account for these facts which I have presented.

The entire Christian world believe that we are surrounded by spiritual beings; and the Christian Church recognize, and have ever heartily recognized, the fact that our spirit friends are not far away. I well remember, in former days, while young,—or before the days of Spiritualism,—particularly on funeral occasions, our minister would say to the bereaved mourners,—“Oh, cheer up; your dear one, your mother, brother, or sister, is not dead, but the spirit has only taken its flight into another state, and will unquestionably become your guardian angel—your ministering spirit.” Why have they abandoned this position which they formerly assumed?

MR. GRIMES.

In regard to the miracle, I must give the gentleman credit for having been exceedingly cunning. He put a good joke on me—there is no doubt of it. I was pleased to see it. I am glad that he begins to appreciate fun, and that he has dropped a little of that solemn style of dealing. He begins to appreciate, really, the dignity of his subject, and adopts the style that is adapted to it, and well worthy of it. Now, allow me a remark. I love a joke, myself, and I don't lose an opportunity to make one; though I keep back, in this discussion, a great many, and have not made my remarks nearly as amusing as I otherwise should. The gentleman complained, and felt badly, about it; and I have, therefore, kept a great deal of it out. Now, seriously, in regard to those miracles, the real question was, whether these things were done by a law of nature or not. He says I have ridiculed the idea of a stone being moved, and, therefore, ridiculed my own fact. Let me say, candidly, that if these miracles recorded in the Bible are to be explained only by a law of nature, I should ridicule them in a moment. If the rolling of the stone, if the raising of Christ, of Lazarus, were not miracles; if they are to be explained by a law of nature; just as these phenomena, then, indeed, are they most ridiculous. When Christians speak of a man being an infidel, we mean a man who explains the miracles of the Bible as being produced by a law of nature. And all the doctrine of the modern Spiritualists is infidelity. It is infidelity with a ghost in it—just leave the ghost out, and it is mere stark atheism.

Let us assume, now, that Spiritualism is true. There is a rule of argument known among logicians, as the *reductio ad absurdum*. Now, suppose that Spiritualism is true,—that when anybody dies, he has the power of coming back and moving tables,—I ask them, why does not the slave mother, when she dies, as that slave mother did in Ohio, who tried to kill—and, I believe, did kill—her child; and as in many cases where they perish in the attempt to gain their liberty,—why don't they return and haunt the masters who hold their children in slavery? Why, what a rapping would there be, if these slaves could come, as he says they could,—all around their homes, their mothers, and children, and masters! Would they not do this if they could? Is not the fact that they do not, sufficient to show there is not the slightest probability they can do it? Yes, though one and another might not get the conditions right, some of them surely would.

Again, still assuming the truth of Spiritualism—what a condition one is in! If you are a little off your guard, the air is full of spirits, ready to pounce upon your mind. A man stands here, sound and sane, and in a moment he is a little sleepy, or something, and the mind is pushed from its throne, and it is not your own. It is a heavy crime to carry a man from the country, but here they kidnap a man, before he knows it, and carry him where they will. And of the spirits, too, the meanest, lowest, most villainous rascals that ever left the world, are, according to their own acknowledgment, the most likely to pounce upon you. Nobody is safe. And then the gentleman talks about the probability of the thing. If a man is in jail, you get a writ of *habeas corpus*. But when a spirit carries a fellow off, to take him into mischief, you can't have a *habeas corpus*—you have got to have a *habeas spiritus*, to fetch him.

MR. MILLER.—That's true.

MR. GRIMES.—Do you hear that? They can seize upon you, and you are never safe,—if this doctrine is true. Surely, we should pray God to protect us against them. But, according to his doctrine, they are around like mosquitos, and you never know when they will bite, or where. Again, who would dare to commit a crime?—the spirits are there. A police officer is there, and he will tell,—he will tell the chief of police. There could be no treason—Washington, Marion, Putnam, Warren, are all here to guard their country. Nobody could steal; nobody could commit a crime,—it would be told of at once—the spirits would rap and rap and write, and tell it all. And yet, these mediums do things as bad as others—almost as bad as others.

MR. MILLER.—They don't have a thousand wives, or perjure their souls, or commit murder.

MR. GRIMES.—I am very glad to hear what they *don't*, for we all know what they *do*.

But I wish to show you, if you carry your doctrine out, where it leads you. Assume it to be true, and how could science move? The gentleman says the Atlantic telegraph gave no more than one message. Why not? It was broken, then. Where, was the spirit of Franklin, when that wire was severed? Why did not the spirit of that great philosopher tell where it was broken. Franklin has come and rapped, and told all sorts of things,—but of that telegraph, not a word. Who believes it? Carry that doctrine out, and see where you arrive. Lord Bacon, the great philosopher, inspires Judge Edmonds,—he and Swedenborg. Now, Swedenborg was one of the greatest men that ever lived. His brain may have been a little hurt by disease; but, notwithstanding that, no man ever surpassed him in learning. No more extraordinary man ever lived. He is inspiring Edmonds,—he and Lord Bacon! Now, why does not

Lord Bacon, who so much loved improvements in science, communicate a few scientific discoveries? It was said—I don't know how true it was—that when Edmonds made his judicial decisions, he consulted Lord Bacon. I do not believe it; but, certainly, that story has gone the rounds, and, certainly, Judge Edmonds would have been consistent had he acted as the story has it. If I were a Spiritualist, and believed I could obtain the opinion of Lord Bacon, upon a point of law, with which I had to deal, I should do so. I don't speak disrespectfully of him if he did.

MR. MILLER.—He denies it.

MR. GRIMES.—It is well if he did; for that great philosopher was a great villain. Pope describes him as

“The greatest, wisest, meanest, of mankind.”

Now, why do not he and Swedenborg, tell us something new about science, if they can? We are told that a new kind of gas has been discovered by the Spiritualists, which can be made for twelve and a half cents a thousand feet. A friend of mine came to me, and said,—“Grimes, you are a kind of scientific expert, and know several things. Come and find out about this.” I found it a humbug. I understand they are getting out a patent, in England, with a view to try to sell it. And I ascertained that it is a perfect humbug. And yet, if it is true that these spirits can come, it is perfectly reasonable and natural to suppose that they can tell these things. Professor Hare, who, before he was a Spiritualist, was a scientific man, and improved the blow-pipe, and knew about oxygen, and hydrogen, and every kind of gas, might, surely, have had the revelation made to him. Why does not the spirit of Herschel tell astronomers the secrets of the skies? The planet Uranus was discovered by him, while he was on this earth; why didn't he tell his son that there was another planet beyond that? He could have done it. The law of nature made the perturbation, which directed to the new planet the eye of its discoverer. The spirit of the father was around his son; yet what said it? it waited all this time, till the Fox girls and Davenport boys were honored with what these great philosophers could not have. Isn't that likely? Isn't that reasonable? Isn't that beautiful? Isn't that contemptible? Isn't that ridiculous?—If it is not, my brains, surely, are deficient. The cholera,—what is its cause? The potato rot, that did so much terrible mischief in Ireland, and caused the starvation of so many persons,—what is the cause of it? Where are the spirits of Hunter, Rush, and all the great physicians? They surely knew something. They have progressed—for, according to your story, progression is still going on, there—they have nothing else to do but to progress. The races of men—whence sprang the negroes?—whence the Australians? Why has not Gliddon, who recently died,—why has not the great Darwin, who wrote so well about the Pacific Islands, inspired his son, who has just written a half-Spiritualistic book?—why, when philosophers are so puzzled about races, do we get no light from this source? Andrew Jackson Davis, the great seer, in Poughkeepsie, was inspired, and made to pour forth an overwhelming flood of nonsense—and not one new idea. Tell me, my Spiritualist friend, one new idea in science revealed by your spirits. Tell me one crime detected and exposed, amid all those patriotic, moral, and religious spirits, looking on, and seeing these crimes,—full of benevolence, yet communicating only such silly stuff and nonsense? Who doubts the existence of the sun? Who doubts the existence of the satellites of Jupiter? And yet, they tell us they have such an amount of evidence. Here are the best, the very ablest men we have, the very professors of Harvard College, at whom you sneer so much, who, after examining it with all their ability, solemnly tell you it is contemptible and ridiculous.

MR. MILLER.

Will my brother allow me to ask him a single question? Why it is that when a professor is teaching in college, and gives the student a problem in Euclid, he does not sit down and work it out himself?

MR. GRIMES. — No: the student would ask that, himself. It would be a very benevolent act, if they did, especially if the student who received the assistance, was a blunderhead.

MR. MILLER. — I asked a mere question.

MR. GRIMES. — It seems to me a very trifling question, and does not belong to me.

MR. MILLER. — I asked a question, if I had a child ten years old, who could not answer which, I would send him to bed supperless; and my brother doesn't answer it, because he knows it would overthrow all he has said. Every child, and every hod-carrier, ought to know that the professor does not solve the problem, for the reason that he wants the student to develop his own intellectual powers. Why do not the spirits come and talk for you? Because if they did, you would never learn to talk yourself.

And I will submit it to this audience, if my brother has not waited till the last twenty minutes of the last evening of the discussion upon this question, to put important questions. 'I feel prepared to answer them. Will my brother give me time to answer them?

MR. GRIMES. — If my brother will go on for an hour or two, I will not make any objections.

MR. MILLER. — I will answer that question which my brother does not want answered — why he failed to ask these important questions until the last moment? Now, if the audience is willing that I should proceed, or if it can be deferred till to-morrow night —

MR. GRIMES. — I have no objection. If the gentleman answers, I must have a speech, also.

MR. MILLER. — I have my five minutes; and these questions shall be answered. Let me say to you, friends, I am thankful, then, that we are not to sit like young birds, with our mouths open to receive every thing as infallible. I hope I am thankful that we are obliged to dig for these truths, and in that way unfold, more or less, the spiritual and intellectual faculties of our being. Exercise and labor develop the muscles of the arm and body. Should I take away your thinking, should I take away the necessity of every mental effort of yours, how soon would your minds become debilitated and enfeebled. I do not want the spirit-world to come and take away our labor. Give us a field where we can labor, and develop our intellectual muscles, and by and by the spirits will instruct us, but as our professors instruct the young — "Here, young man, is a problem, work it out, and your mind will become strengthened." The next problem the pupil takes hold of, he solves more readily, because the effort upon the first has strengthened his faculties to grapple with the second. And yet, the spirits do come as teachers to aid us. I lately talked with a gentleman who has made several inventions in machinery, and that gentleman told me that at night, while he was sleeping, a piece of machinery has been represented in a vision, before his mind, — that he has risen from his bed and made a draft of the machinery shown to him by a spirit.

MR. GRIMES. — Why did the professor do that?

MR. MILLER. — Because he saw it was important that it should be done. It was giving the pupil one stepping-stone, that he might go to another. I say to my child, that,

if he is not capable of grappling with this mathematical problem, I will give him a start and assist him, and he will be made stronger for the next by the exercise of dealing with this. Can my brother tell how much it is that spirits have aided the world in making their inventions and discoveries? Can he say that the immortal Franklin did not hover over Morse, while making his inquiries as to the laws of electricity and its phenomena? But does my brother intend to offer an argument, here, that man is abandoned to himself? Let me ask, why does not God do these things? Have you not had a great revival, here, in which God was at work? Why does he not remove evil from your community?

I am glad the field is open; I am glad we at last have something we can meet.

MR. GRIMES.

The gentleman can talk my five minutes; I do not wish to talk any more, to-night.

MR. MILLER. — I will not do so. Nor can the gentleman throw dust in the eyes of the audience by intimating that there is no reply needed.

After a word or two of good-humored conversation between the speakers,

MR. GRIMES selected from the audience, as the committee to investigate, as proposed by Mr. Miller, the power of a medium, under spiritual influence, to read the names written on slips of paper enclosed in envelopes, — Messrs. SAMUEL R. BUGBEE, C. D. KELLOGG, and J. W. JAMES. An appointment for the meeting of the committee on the following morning, was made, and the audience was then dismissed.

FIFTH EVENING.

FRIDAY, MARCH 9TH.

QUESTION FOR DISCUSSION.

Can the various phenomena known as Modern Spirit Manifestations be satisfactorily and philosophically accounted for without admitting the agency of departed human beings?

MR. GRIMES

Called for the Report of the committee appointed, upon the previous evening, and explained the circumstances under which the offer was made.

This morning (he said), I wrote on the twenty pieces of paper, folded them up in the manner described, gave it to the committee, and now, sir, I call for their Report.

SAMUEL C. BUGBEE, Esq., the chairman of the committee, came forward and presented his Report, which was read by MR. GRIMES, as follows:—

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON TEST INVESTIGATION.

"The committee selected last evening by Professor Grimes to scrutinise the experiment, proposed by Mr. Miller, to have names, securely placed in envelopes, read by the spirits through the mediumship of Mrs. Coan beg leave to report:—

"We called on Mrs. Coan, and after taking our seats at the table, placed before her twenty envelopes with twenty names enclosed, prepared, in every respect, by Professor Grimes according to details suggested by Mr. Miller. Mrs. Coan, after viewing the envelopes, at once said she could not read the names, as it was entirely out of her line, that we might as well call on a blacksmith to make a watch; and declined to make the attempt: after some further time and discussion, however, she took up each envelope separately, and calling upon the spirits, requested them to read the enclosed names; but she was unable to obtain a single response. This was repeated, but again without success. We must therefore report that Mrs. Coan failed entirely to produce the manifestations and results proposed by Mr. Miller.

"Signed,

"B. C. BUGBEE,

"C. D. KELLOGG,

"J. W. JAMES."

MR. MILLER. — I would like to ask if the committee are willing to make any further report, or to be interrogated.

MR. BUGBEE. — I have no objection.

MR. MILLER. — Do you consider that in that Report the real objection has been clearly and definitely stated, — why the medium did not succeed in getting communications?

MR. BUGBEE. — She stated it was out of her line of business, — she never did any thing of the kind.

MR. MILLER. — Do you think, my friend, that is a sufficient explanation for this audience?

MR. BUGBEE. — I think it is.

MR. MILLER. — That she never answered?

MR. BUGBEE. — Didn't answer any of them — said that she couldn't — declined trying, in the first place.

MR. MILLER. — Did you get any further communications?

MR. BUGBEE. — I did not.

MR. MILLER. — Did any member of the committee from your side?

MR. GRIMES. — I beg pardon, Mr. Chairman; I think this is out of order. Mr. Miller suggested that a certain committee be appointed, and that an experiment should be tried. It was tried, and the experiment failed. Now, these gentlemen, I understand, did something for their own amusement, and something took place. I understand that with what took place among these gentlemen without my knowledge or consent, I have nothing to do; this audience has nothing to do with it.

MR. MILLER. — I would now call upon our committee, — upon Dr. Child, who is the chairman to make his Report.

MR. GRIMES. — No; you cannot. I should like to know whether that is in order. Before that committee is called upon, I have a word to say. I will not interrupt if you are speaking.

MR. MILLER. — I will say, it was agreed upon, this morning, that I was to have a committee; and does my brother now intend to muzzle that committee, and withhold their report? Why was that committee selected? I call upon Dr. Child, the chairman of that committee to make his report.

MR. GRIMES. — Last evening, my friend, there was a certain proposition made —

MR. MILLER. — I would ask if I am in order. [*To Mr. Bugbee.*] Did the committee, on your side, open the envelopes, to see whether there were any names in them, whatever?

MR. BUGBEE. — They did not.

MR. MILLER. — Failure! How do you know there were any names there? You have reported that there were names in there, and yet you don't know whether there were any there, or not.

MR. GRIMES. — I beg leave. — The gentleman is very sharp indeed. But let us have a fair understanding of this matter. Any taking advantage, any kind of trickery or deception, in a matter like this, would be too bad. It would be contemptible. Surely, surely, no one would be guilty of it. Now, an objection has just been started. Let us look at this, a moment. What was the original proposition? It was this, and the audience remember that last night I accepted it. Mr. Miller, my friend and my opponent, here, with, I really thought, a great deal of manliness, — it indicated a degree of honesty that delighted me — it showed a confidence in his cause, worthy of him, — when he saw me so sceptical, since I doubted that these things could be really done, and intimated that when they were done, there was always some weakness, — said that the experiment was not fairly tried. — "Now," said he, "is there not anybody in the audience, whom you can trust?" Dr. Gardner suggested, — and I admired his sagacity, — that among the three I must not be one, — I must not be there, — my son must not be there. I did not then see why that gentleman, my son, was excluded; but I see, now, and at some other time I will give you the reason. But Dr. Gardner did see fit to leave me out. Yet, there was an investigation, going on, in which I was deeply interested.

But three other persons must be selected, and I had to take them immediately out of the audience. I saw one gentleman whom I knew, and another, and I was trying to think of a third, when some one was named in the gallery. It was some one whom I knew, and I said, Very well. They went. Mr. Miller said there were to be three names put in envelopes. Very well. Then I was told to write twenty names; and I said, twenty names.

MR. MILLER. — I did not say three.

[Some little controversy ensued as to the details of Mr. Miller's proposition, upon this point. See report of the previous evening's discussion, page 60.]

MR. GRIMES *continued*. Now, after that committee was appointed, I prepared these envelopes. The proposition was, that I might write on paper, and fold it, as carefully as I pleased, in these envelopes so that no human being but myself should know what was in there, seal it up, and take it to a person, or send it to a person, whom I should name, who should look it over and write a name on the outside, and open it to see if it is right. The committee, therefore, had no right to open it, until the spirit had told what name was in there. Then, and not before, had they a right to open it. And when the medium said she would not try it, it was out of her line, it seems to me they had no more to do but to turn around again, and come home. And then, when they proceeded, afterward, to "Is it this"—and "this,"—and "this,"—and "this," they got no response whatever,—I ask, whether there was any thing in there, or not, what was there to find out by opening the letter? Furthermore, that committee is still in existence. That committee has still the twenty envelopes. And if you want them opened, you can have it, now.

MR. MILLER. — I would ask my brother what evidence he can give us that they have the same envelopes. Remember I had a committee on my side. I had a committee, there, in the hall, to see that all was right. It was expected, on the part of your committee, that they should open the envelopes to see whether or not there were names in them,—that they should be opened there, in the presence of my committee. The gentleman says, if there were any names given, by the medium, the envelopes were to be opened. Of course, if there were no names in the envelope, there could be no name given, and the gentleman had a sure thing of it. If he had felt disposed to leave names out, then would he certainly have a victory. This is plain to every one here. He knew, beforehand, that if he did not put a name in, there would be no opening of the envelopes. And now, since the envelopes were not opened there, in the presence of the committee, what evidence has he, to show, beyond taking human testimony, that he has the same envelopes? And what evidence have you, to show that there was a single name in them, except your own word for it?

MR. GRIMES. — The gentleman says he had a committee of three. This audience may wonder where that committee came from; for when the proposition was made, last night, that a committee of three should go to the medium, nothing was said about any committee of his. But this morning, when the committee were proceeding to their duty, they were informed by Mr. Miller that he was not satisfied yet. He had had every thing his own way; I had submitted to every thing he said, to all his conditions. But "Here," said he, "is a committee, three of Grimes' friends: I want three Spiritualists." It was reported to me; and some of my friends said,— "It is unfair; don't have Dr. Gardner there." Said I,— "Let him have every thing he asks; submit to

every thing; and if you get cheated, it is your fault. Go and transact the affair just according to the letter of his statement; that is all; do no more, no less." Now, I want to ask my friend a question. He said, in the course of his remarks, just now, that he had a committee there, to see that things were properly done. When the lady declined, did not his committee ask to have the envelopes opened?

MR. MILLER. — I admit, friends, I did not state, last evening, all the conditions of that investigation. The principal thing that my friend required was the privilege of sealing up a name, so that by ordinary means it could not be broken without his knowledge. I consented to that part of it; but I had not time, neither did I consider it the place, to state all the conditions. So far as that was concerned, which was the essential point, it must be settled here. But, as gentlemen dealing with gentlemen, with a name, and a desire for truth, all these collateral conditions, it seems to me it must be plain to every one, must be had, and I must not allow him to select three gentlemen, and have them bring in their Report, without having a committee to see that the investigation was properly conducted.

MR. GRIMES. — I didn't object to that. Why did not your committee open the envelope?

MR. MILLER. — Our committee had nothing further to do than to see what your committee did. My committee was not after the envelopes. They were in the hands of your committee, and I expressly requested of your committee that they should open those envelopes there, in the presence of my committee, to see if there were names; and then I intended, if you were willing, to ask who the individuals were, where, and under what circumstances, you were acquainted with them. Our committee was there, perhaps, in part, to protect the lady should there be insult offered. For I offered the gentleman, last night, the opportunity of selecting *any* three men in this audience. My committee was there to see that courtesy and candor were manifested, — that the envelopes were opened in their presence. Now, I say the gentleman has not given us one particle of evidence that his committee have the same envelopes that they had before, or that they had there, in the presence of the lady. And further, what evidence have you that any names, whatever, were in there?

MR. GRIMES. — My friend has confidence in human testimony.

MR. MILLER. — Yes, sir; but when you repudiate it —

MR. GRIMES. — My friend has confidence in human testimony. But enough. There are the envelopes, in the hands of the man to whom I gave them; and I have not seen them since I saw him hold them up in his hand, just now. Who are the gentlemen of this committee? One is Mr. Kellogg, a merchant well known in this city. I was but little acquainted with him; but any one acquainted in Troy, who knows his family, and his father, who was the intimate friend of Fillmore, knows that Mr. Kellogg is one of the best men in Troy. He is the man to protect against whose assaults they have had a committee. Another is Mr. James, a gentleman known to every man in this city who knows any thing of business and of integrity. That is the committee that is not to be believed, not to be trusted, at all! And all the stories my friend repeats are to be swallowed down at a gulp! Another is a gentleman, an intimate friend of mine, with whom I board; and therefore I will not speak of him more particularly; but his name is written on many a splendid palace, in this vicinity, raised by his genius. These are the men against whose insults you are obliged to have three persons to protect the medium, and to see that they were candid met! And here they are: they

have the envelopes in their possession; I have not seen them,—and who, in Heaven's name, thought of guarding against a trick? For my part, I am satisfied; if the gentleman wants any thing more,—I am satisfied.

MR. MILLER.

I would say to my brother, I met his committee, this morning, and at a glance I saw integrity, honesty, and fairness in their faces. I did not know the gentlemen before; I did not know whom you would select. I did not care, particularly, whom you should select, if you would select candid, honest men. Yet, this was not to be supposed, in this matter, if we proceed to reflect upon it, under all these conditions. I cast no reflections upon your committee. Should one of your committee men stand up and say that he had the same envelopes he had there, I am willing to receive that testimony. Yet, the gentleman has forced it upon us, when he might have had them opened there.

MR. GRIMES. — Why did not your committee ask it there?

MR. MILLER. — It was not their duty. I am willing to drop the matter here, as far as those envelopes are concerned. I would have been glad if this committee had opened them at the time, which would bring the matter more fully before the public. Their Report would seem to imply that Mrs. Coan never reads names in any way. I would call upon Dr. Child for his Report.

MR. BUGBEE. — I would ask Dr. Child if the Report of the committee is not correct.

MR. MILLER. — I cannot see wherein any thing of that kind is in order. Let him make his Report: you can judge. You may have reported a part of the truth. So far as you have reported, it may be all true.

MR. GRIMES. — I would suggest that Dr. Child can answer the question, himself.

MR. MILLER. — Will Dr. Child be kind enough to come forward?

DR. CHILD. — Mr. President: I shall be very happy to answer Mr. Bugbee's question, if he will answer the similar question, which I will put to him. I will answer his question. His Report, so far as it goes, is correct; but it does not tell half the story.

MR. BUGBEE. — I tell the story so far as relates to all that we were appointed for.

MR. CHILD. — It does not give a full statement of what took place in the interview the committee had with Mrs. Coan, this afternoon.

But, Mr. President, I will read:—

[REPORT OF MR. MILLER'S COMMITTEE.]

"At half-past two o'clock this P.M., a committee of six gentlemen met at the rooms of Mrs. Ada L. Coan, for the purpose of getting answers to writing contained in twenty sealed envelopes, according to purport. The committee consisted of C. D. Kellogg, John W. James, and S. C. Bugbee, chosen by Mr. Grimes—and John W. Wetherbee, Daniel Farrar, and A. B. Child, chosen by Mr. Miller. When the object of the meeting was stated to Mrs. Coan, she immediately said that answers to sealed letters were not given through her medium powers; that she did not understand from Mr. Miller, when she made the appointment to sit for this committee, that such manifestations were expected, but expected such manifestations of spirits would be made, and only such would be expected, as had been before made through her mediumship; that she had no evidence of possessing that peculiar phase of mediumship through which spirits could answer sealed letters. She also stated that had she known that the object of the committee was to get answers to sealed letters, she should have positively declined meeting it for that purpose. Mrs. Coan invited the committee to write one or more names of their deceased friends, *secretly*, on separate pieces of paper, and fold *closely* so that it would be impossible for any person to read the name when the paper was folded, and her hand would be moved and write the name contained in the folded paper.

"After some slight demurring, the whole committee consented to witness what might be given in this way.

"Twenty-five pieces of paper were privately written upon by the committee, closely folded, and laid upon the table before the medium, under the direct inspection of every member of the committee. Mrs. Coan then asked if any spirit was present whose name was written on any of those pieces of paper; and if so, requested the spirit to write the name through her hand, and then select the paper on which was written the same name. Her hand was then seized, apparently by some invisible power, and rapidly wrote, wrong side up: "*I will do all I can to aid you. — Jonathan L. —*" Then Mrs. Coan touched her finger on one of the pieces of paper which was folded up, and said, Is this the name? The raps came under the table in answer, — a single rap, which means *no*. Then she touched another and another, in the same way, until three raps indicated that the same name that had been written through her hand, was in that piece of paper. This she handed to Mr. James, and in the presence of all the committee he unfolded it and on it was written, "*Jonathan Low.*" Mr. James said that he wrote this name himself, but asked, Why is not *Low* written in full, instead of only the letter *L* after *Jonathan*? Mrs. Coan said that so far as the name is written it was literally correct; said that she could not tell why the two last letters, *ow*, were omitted.

"Again, Mrs. Coan's hand was moved, and wrote — "*Mary Collins.*" And after the same manner as before, another piece of folded paper was selected on which the raps said was written the name, Mary Collins. This folded paper was handed to, and opened by, Mr. C. D. Kellogg, and Mary Collins was written in the folded paper. The question was then asked, who wrote this name? No one answered; no one appeared to know. Mr. Bugbee remarked that the writing looked like that of Mr. Kellogg; when Mr. Kellogg looked again at it and then he remembered that he had written it; and said that he wrote it, and folded it so that no one could read it without unfolding it.

"These two names that were answered, were written, one by each of two members of the committee who do not believe in Spiritualism, and they said that they could not see, or understand, how it was done. They knew no law by which these names could be thus read.

"We affirm that this is a correct and true report of the manifestations we witnessed in the presence of Mrs. Coan, this afternoon.

"Friday, March 9, 1880.

"J. W. WETHERBEE,
"DANIEL FARRAR,
"A. B. CHILD."

I wish to ask Mr. Bugbee if he could subscribe to this.

MR. BUGBEE. — No, sir; I cannot.

I will give my reasons. In the first place, he has not gone quite far enough. The ballot with "*Mary Collins*" on it was handed to me, and I read it, and passed it to Mr. K. Perhaps that is an error of Mr. Child's. And after Mr. Jonathan Low was called, Mr. James said that was an old servant of the family, who died forty years ago. "Now," said Mrs. Coan, "Mr. James, would you not like to have some test?" "Why, yes," said he; "what shall I do?" "Why," said she, "where was he born?" "In Boston." "But you must not tell me that he was born in Boston: I want the spirits to tell me that." "Why," said Mr. James, "what questions can I ask? I will ask if he was a friend, and the name of a person at whose death-bed he was present. "You must write," said Mrs. Coan, "the names of several persons, and place your pencil successively on the names." Mr. James wrote a list of names, among which, I remember, was that of William Carroll. There was, throughout, a jumbled sort of rap. Then, at Mrs. Coan's request, he went back to the first name, and three raps were given, meaning, as we were told, *Yes*. This was not correct. He proceeded, getting the raps again, at the name of Mr. Ellis, which was again wrong; the third one also was wrong. When Mr. James came to the name of his father, there were no raps. He told me, afterwards, that Jonathan Low was present at the death of his father, and went for the doctor, but that he did not get there quite soon enough; and Mr. James thought that might call the circumstance to mind; but he did not rap right, once. Then Mr. Kellogg tried.

I would state that I saw nothing, there, unfair, in the matter, at all. But I went to the window and wrote the names of four persons in the spirit-land, — wrote them very plainly indeed, — and folded them up, three times, and made a little round ball of them. Mrs. Coan tried two or three times, but could not read any of them.

Mr. Wetherbee said he thought I had no friends in the spirit-land. I told him, perhaps that was the case; but I could get no raps. My names were written at the window, so that no one could see them. If she had told me them I certainly should have thought it something remarkable.

MR. GRIMES. — I wish to ask the question, whether, when the committee had got through with those envelopes, they stated, in the presence of the whole of the committee, that their functions, as a committee, were ended.

MR. BUGBEE. — Mr. James and Mr. Kellogg both said all we had to do was to get the names in those envelopes, and their duty was ended. Mrs. Coan replied that she would try in her way, and, perhaps, some spirits would come and give the names in those envelopes. We consented, after some little demurring, to try it.

MR. GRIMES. — I want to ask you one more question. Did you see any thing that gave you any idea of the reason why you didn't get any answer to your question, while Mr. Kellogg and Mr. James received answers to theirs? Did you see any difference in the proceeding?

MR. BUGBEE. — The difference was that when I went to the window, to write my ballots, and enclosed them in papers, at the window, which was about ten feet distant, Mr. Kellogg sat on one side, and Mr. Child on the other; Mr. Kellogg sitting next to Mr. Wetherbee, and Mr. James next to Mr. Child. They wrote theirs on their hand.

MR. GRIMES. — Could she see them?

MR. BUGBEE. — No, sir.

MR. GRIMES. — Could she see the pencil move?

MR. BUGBEE. — She couldn't see the writing.

MR. GRIMES. — When you wrote this, Mr. Kellogg, did you write in such a way that she might have seen the top of the pencil?

MR. KELLOGG. — I had a long, black pencil.

MR. GRIMES. — Could she see the top move?

MR. KELLOGG. — I don't know that she did.

MR. CHILD. — Mr. Bugbee urged the medium to answer his four ballots, which he selected, himself, after it had been written, through the medium's hand, — "We can do no more for you to-day." It was after it was considered that the manifestations were closed, that he urged this upon the medium.

MR. MILLER. — I would here state, ladies and gentlemen, very briefly — I will endeavor to be brief, for I do not wish to occupy our precious time — that, yesterday morning, in my room, while alone, I wrote the names of ten individuals. I rolled them up, I should think, in eight or ten thicknesses, round and round. I placed them in a piece of paper, all together. I called upon Mrs. Coan, and laid them upon the table. I could not see a single mark inside. I know that no human being could, with the natural organ of sight, see any thing I had written, inside. I wrote, upon one, the name "Rufus," my eldest brother, who passed away more than forty years ago. Upon another piece of paper, I wrote the name of a former schoolmate; I wrote it "Catherine Smith or Harriet Smith" — I had forgotten whether her name was Catherine or Harriet. I

rolled that up. Before this had been opened, where I know it was impossible for her to see, or to have seen me write the names—indeed, I had no pencil—I wrote them with a pen, in my room,—raps were made, indicating that the spirit of the name written in a given ballot was present. She shoved the others back, laid that aside, and wrote out “Rufus.” I unrolled it, and found the name *Rufus* in it. She wrote out another,—“Harriet Smith.” I opened the ballot and found it to be that on which I had written “Catherine Smith, or Harriet Smith.” I know that it was not in the power of man ordinarily to have seen the contents of those ballots. Therefore, I came forward, last night, willing to give my brother every opportunity of knowing the truth. I felt that I was staking nothing. Truth cannot suffer. I am willing to give a fair opportunity to every man, to investigate the subject. And when I stated that the gentleman might seal the papers in envelopes, I took a liberty which the spirits never granted, a fact which I have since learned, though only to-night. When communications are received, names are written on slips of paper, which are rolled round and round, and then laid upon a table. It is not necessary that they should be written in the presence of Mrs. Coan, as neither of mine were. Go there earnestly desirous to learn the truth. You may write the names at home. But do not write the name of an obscure servant, one whom you think so little of that after writing it you forget it in a moment. Do not insult the spirit of the poor servant with such slight respect; because, it is offering an insult to the spirit which it would feel as keenly as you or I. My brother said, last night, he would not write the name of a mother, a father, a brother, or a sister, because it is too sacred. Now, he writes the names of some spirits for whom he cares nothing. “Here is a low and dirty business,” he says, “and I will get a spirit I care nothing about, to test it.” I say, if you go there, go desiring to find the truth; and do not treat the subject with such a feeling that you will not introduce the name of one who might be likely to respond to you. I say I made a fair offer. I am glad I have done so; it has elicited facts, there, which shall tell upon the community. The chairman of the committee went back to the papers, and, desiring still more proof, took four names, after the spirits had said they would communicate no longer. If I say, to-night, I will speak no longer, you cannot expect me to speak. And allow me to say, further, that ninety-nine failures never disprove one positive fact.

And now, I would suggest to my brother, that we occupy but fifteen minutes each, in our remarks, as the evening is far spent.

[After some conversation in relation to the time to be allotted to the evening’s discussion, the question was read, by the chairman, as follows:—]

Can the various phenomena known as modern Spirit Manifestations be satisfactorily and philosophically accounted for without admitting the agency of departed human beings?

MR. GRIMES.

Anybody would suppose, Mr. Chairman, from the remarks of my friend, here, that the committee had reported that the experiment which he proposed, had succeeded. You have not heard him say one word about any failure; on the contrary, it is a positive success! If the committee had reported that the medium had answered every word, the gentleman’s tone could not have been more triumphant. He is delighted at the result! Splendid success! It reminds me of some newspapers we read, sometimes, after an election:—“Glorious triumph!” and all that. Now, I state, in justice to that committee, which my friend has slurred, every time he has spoken—talking about their “servant,” and their doing this and that—in justice to them, I will say that, about a

year ago, I think it was, I called at the house of one member of the committee, and, in a conversation, I spoke, severely, against Spiritualism, and I was rebuffed. So far was he from being prejudiced against Spiritualism, that, though he was not a Spiritualist, when I said that this very experiment we have been trying could not be performed, he thought I was wrong. I mean the chairman of the committee. He said to me that if I would go to Mansfield, and try it, it would be refuted. I said I would give five hundred dollars if Mansfield could tell the contents of the envelope. We went; and the medium looked at me and concluded not to try it—he didn't like my looks. I don't think Mr. Mansfield knew me. I never saw Mr. Mansfield before. I mention this to show how free from prejudice that man was, on that side, and that the prejudice was the other way.

MR. MILLER. — Is my brother discussing the question now?

MR. GRIMES. — I will thank you, sir, to allow me to speak. I have not a master here, I hope. There is one chairman, and there are two speakers.

In regard to another member of the committee, I will say that in a conversation I had with him, two or three days ago, which I cite to show how far he is from being prejudiced, — he and I divided on that question. He told me that he believed certain of these manifestations were produced, — not by spiritual agency, but manifestations that might be otherwise accounted for. I told him that they were all either a humbug or a delusion, and he had scarcely the patience to hear me. "Why," said he, "you don't mean to say that those people are all mistaken?" "I do mean to say so," said I. "But here are the books and authorities." "Why," said I, "what have books and authorities to do with facts? If a thing can be done, it can be done; a book has nothing to do with it." It is my opinion that if that woman had answered the questions, he would not have been much surprised. I believe he told me he knew nothing about it. I am inclined to think he was entirely new to the whole subject — I do not think he ever spoke to a medium before, in his life. Now, my ground is this — and I took it with the utmost sincerity. Let nobody think that I stand like a man arguing a bad case, and trying to twist things and make them come right. I stand here, arguing in favor of that which I believe to be true. And when the gentleman proposed an experiment, last night, I objected to nothing; you must have observed the confidence with which I trusted to the experiment. If there was any thing in this doctrine, if there was a possibility of the thing being fairly done, did I not expose myself to an utter defeat? What more could I have done? And now, the medium says she doesn't read sealed envelopes, — they are to be rolled up — I will submit to that; bring them in, here, and try it; and if she can tell what is written in them, they may crucify me, — if she can do it, I will give her all the money I have got, and all I can borrow. Do you hear that? According to her own promise, as stated here, let me try the experiment, and *she cannot do it*. That committee, when they tried the experiments described by Dr. Child, were not acting with any consent of mine, or in their capacity as a committee, and I repudiate it. They didn't know how to try the experiments. There was but one, the chairman, who knew any thing about the matter. The other gentlemen had examined the facts only in books and therefore were not fitted for trying the experiment — they didn't pretend to be skilful in tricking.

Now, I take this ground, and speak out most conscientiously. They say I make sport, and am not serious enough. Those who talk of me in that way do not know me. My sport is in manner only. I never read an amusing book. I have not for five years read, in my studies, a novel or an amusing book of any kind. Those who know me, know that

my employments are of the most serious kind. Now, then, I say I have no idea that any of these things can be done. I believe every one of those physical manifestations really performed, is done by jugglery and deception. Do not charge me with insulting and abusing people: if it is ignorance, have charity, and ridicule my ignorance by one successful experiment. Do not give me words, *word-facts*, assertions, talk, but something tangible. The gentleman has seen these things, every day, and yesterday he had a new proof, and I cannot see how it is otherwise than that it should have convinced his mind. I confess that had I been favored with such a proof, the influence would have been tremendous upon me. For myself, I never have had a successful experiment of that kind, and I have tried more than any man I know. I have been in an investigation of Spiritualism ever since it began. This modern Spiritualism began with me, in my lectures, at Poughkeepsie. The very first medium sprang out of my lectures. I do not mean to say I had any thing to do, intentionally, with the matter. The fact is, I went there—in 1845, I think it was—to lecture on mesmerism and the nervous system. I thought I had discovered something about the subject, and was delivering lectures upon it. A boy named Andrew Jackson Davis became interested in it; and out of that excitement sprang the whole thing. Davis was mesmerized by several persons, particularly by a man named Livingston. I will not give the details of the matter, at this time; but the result was that he became a healing medium, and went through Connecticut, healing diseases. I denounced it at the time. I said it was a fraud upon the public. And I say, now, of every one of your healing mediums, the House of Correction is the proper place for them. They can't do more than any quack. I will test it. Bring into the presence of any of them a number of sick and well persons, with a cloth over their faces, and I will engage they cannot tell the sick from the well. Now, if the spirit can't tell which has the rheumatism, and which the broken leg, they cannot tell what the diseases are, much less cure them. And yet they pretend to tell about the liver and lights—and a poor doctor in Ohio, who spent his whole life in earning money, now that he is dead has to earn money for these people who don't know any thing. I tell you, again, I am honest in this matter. If you dare try it, I will try it. I tried that experiment with a great deal of confidence that it would fail. Had it succeeded, I should have begged permission to try it again; because, in science, the rule is this. You try a certain experiment, and it has succeeded. "I don't believe that. Are you sure you left the errors all out?" I say, "Yes," "Surely, it cannot be possible,"—you have a right to say,—“let me try it.” Now in trying experiments, there are, as these people say, many conditions. Put them all in, and the experiment succeeds. One man suggests that in some of these indispensable conditions lies the secret of the success. You leave that out, and the experiment fails. That, then, is the thing. If not, why will the experiment fail if you omit this? It is a parallel case, here. You try the experiment, and it succeeds. Will you say it is a spirit? "No; it is a cheat." "Oh, no; it is not a cheat." "Just try it and leave the cheat out." "Oh, no; there is no cheat there." I insist that you try the experiment and let me leave the cheat out. It fails every time. *Every time.* I beg you once more not to understand me as charging anybody with any crime or wrong; I only speak my experience. I deal with these mediums just as with a juggler. "You see this ball," the juggler says, "in my hand: now, will the spirit carry that off?"—and it is gone. "Will you let me tie a bag around your hand?" "No," he says, "I can't do it unless you fulfil the conditions." And he tells you of the many respectable friends he has. I say he cheats.

The question before us this evening, is this: *Can the various phenomena known as*

modern Spirit Manifestations be satisfactorily and philosophically accounted for without admitting the agency of departed human beings?

"The phenomena known," — not these phenomena that they say take place — I say there are no such phenomena, and I have been taking that ground throughout. There are some. The phenomena known as "Spiritualism" may be divided into two classes, the mental and the physical. The mental are nearly all true. Of course, there is some humbug about it. There is in every thing; for one person may be in a trance, really and sincerely in a trance, and another pretend it. But I do not mean to say that the mental manifestations are all false. Many are true, and I think I can prove it as well as anybody can. I can produce all the manifestations, here publicly, that they can. I can beat them at their own game, and give them odds. I can make trance-speaking mediums, as good as theirs, talking and writing mediums as good as theirs, and that will produce the manifestations as well as theirs. That, I admit, I can perform, myself. Let us have a medium, to produce raps and answer mental questions, thus. I cannot do it. I cannot do it without cheating. "Well, but it is done." I cannot do that, and neither can you. Let us see you do it. We will bring twenty men to see this done, and they shall decide whether you can do more than I can. When I speak of mental questions, I do not mean to deny the possibility of an answer to them, as a mental phenomenon. I do not know but the questions in that envelope might be answered; but I do not believe it. I was perfectly willing to be shown it. I am to account for the known manifestations, and I will do it. But when the gentleman says such and such a thing happened, whereas it did not happen, he says he wants me to explain it. What? explain a thing that does not exist, explain a thing that his own experiments fail in showing? And if Mrs. Coan wants to try it over again, in her own way, we will try it. She can't talk about shrinking. She is in the habit of giving these tests. They advertise for her. If you will pay so much, you can have it. Not one thing can be answered the committee. To help her out, I will write twenty names, on pieces of paper; and if she will tell one name, I will give her more money than she has made this week, and I will own up, and it shall be in the Report, and an illustration of it. She has rapped in public, again and again, and if she will come here, on this stage and make a rap, I will sit down. There might be one rap made under those circumstances; — if there can, I will examine, — that is all.

MR. MILLER.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentleman: The question is, — *Can the various phenomena known as Spirit Manifestations, be satisfactorily and philosophically accounted for, without admitting the agency of departed human beings?* I would here say that the word *known* was intended to imply nothing more nor less than that the so-called spirit-manifestations are known by that name.

MR. GRIMES. — I do not quibble about words.

MR. MILLER. — I have spoken to my brother in regard to that, before; and I am sorry that he dwelt upon it so long. And I do regret, exceedingly, since we have mutually concluded that this discussion shall close to-morrow night, that he has not commenced, this evening, an explanation. What has he said? — "I made and built up Spiritualism." — "I tell you it is false," — "I tell you there is no healing medium in the world but is a cheat." "Big I tell you they are fit subjects for an insane asylum."

MR. GRIMES. — Oh, no, not insane asylum; they don't deserve it.

MR. MILLER. — House of Correction, then.

MR. GRIMES. — That is it.

MR. MILLER. — Now, he who repudiates the testimony of others, should not use big I, quite so often; he should not tell what *he* has seen and knows, and in the next breath reject the testimony of men quite as competent to decide this matter as himself. He did beg of me to receive the testimony of these three witnesses. He says they are well known in this city as men of integrity. I believe their testimony is good enough, and yet I want to point out to my brother wherein his committee have failed; I do not, in the least, doubt, if either of these gentlemen should say they had these envelopes, that they did have them. Yet, I repeat, he did ask me to receive their testimony, upon the statement that they are men of candor and integrity.

A failure may occur. We all acknowledge there never was a science developed, but there were a thousand failures before it succeeded. And it is well known, that a failure does not disprove any thing. And let me add that a counterfeit does not destroy the validity of the genuine. That these things may be counterfeited, I will acknowledge. Mr. Bugbee told me, to-day, that he had witnessed mental manifestations, where thoughts were read,—mind acting upon mind, independently of the five senses. He believes it. And now, my brother says, he has the envelopes, and believes these to be the true ones, and we are to receive that testimony. He stands up and says, "I know that mind-reading is true." Does not Mr. Bugbee's testimony go a thousand times farther than that of a man who shrinks away, in his mind, and says, "I don't know it is true"? Does the gentleman intend to offer negative testimony, to overthrow positive, direct affirmations? He says that where there is a rap there is a rogue. How can he say so?—has he witnessed every rap? has he seen every manifestation? No. Rev. G. W. Skinner, of Newport, Herkimer County, New York, is a rapping medium, and a minister of the Gospel; and a year ago, he said he was quite interested in this subject, in spite of himself, and that for the past year he could not write a discourse without hearing raps on the table; denoting approval or disapproval.

Is not the testimony of Mr. Skinner, who says he is likely to lose his situation as a minister, on account of this, good? Now, one of the most overwhelming arguments against the theory of deception, and one which my brother will never be able to answer is, that there is no sufficient motive for the alleged fraud being practised. People seldom lie and cheat without a selfish object in view. Where is the inducement for falsehood and deception on the part of Rev. Mr. Skinner? Let the gentleman show the motive, before he introduces his sweeping denunciation and denial. He has spoken of the candor and veracity of certain men in this house. Now let me introduce the name of one. To-day, in the company of Mr. Berry, I called at the express office, to see Mr. —, a man known all over the world, a man whose expresses run to Australia, and Calcutta, and over Europe. Do you know him? He stated to me a manifestation he had received. He said he had had a clerk in the express office in Australia, by the name of D— A—, who was an entire stranger in this place. While acting as clerk in the office, there, he drowned himself, whether accidentally or purposely. He had appeared in a moody state of mind, and it was thought by some, that, perhaps, he had, in that mood, put an end to his life: others thought differently. Mr. A— said that he called upon Mr. Mansfield; but before going into Mansfield's room, he sat down in the anteroom, and on this piece of paper, which I hold in my hands wrote

the following: "Mr. A——, — Did you drown yourself purposely, or accidentally?" — then folded it up in six or eight thicknesses, took the muddle, and pasted it down so that there was no chance to see the name inside. He then went from the anteroom, through another room, into Mr. Mansfield's office, laid the paper upon the table, and held his hand upon the part which contained the name of D—— A——. Mr. —— said he would take his oath, before God and high heaven, that the contents of that paper were unknown to any man living, but himself. He took it from under lock and key. The following answer was written through Mr. Mansfield:—

"MY DEAR ——, — Why ask me that? Is it not sufficient that you know I have passed on? But, dear one, I did not drown by accident. I well knew what I was doing; I had become sick of life. But ask me no more about that.

"Your friend,

"D—— A——.

"To ——."

Mr. —— told me he did not believe that this man was known to three men in this place. It just happened to enter his mind, as he came in there, that he would write to this spirit. Mr. A—— told me, the day after I heard of this, that if it would be any additional evidence, the paper might be opened, to show if it contained the inquiry. Now, my brother says human testimony ought to be relied upon, provided the witnesses are as good men as compose his committee. What will they do, to account for this fact? Brother, the laboring oar is in your hand. You have assumed the responsibility from which the entire scientific and theological world has shrunk. Many have made efforts, many have made their theories of explanation; but their theories have died out. You have come forward, here, to account for these facts. Did you suppose, when you consented to the discussion, that these facts were to be illustrated before the public? If you did, you greatly misapprehended.

MR. GRIMES. — That's a fact.

MR. MILLER. — You have given your statement that you know these things to be false; and you expect us to believe it. I have given the testimony of your citizens, — and how do you account for the facts? It is not half so extraordinary as the "rock story," though it may not be found in the Bible. I will give other cases. I hold in my hand, — and I have since obtained the consent of the gentleman to have his name given, — a letter, which I will read.

"Dorset, March 8th, 1890.

"*MR. MILLER, Esq., — Dear Sir, —* Agreeably to your request, I give you an account of two manifestations, out of many, which have taken place in my own house through the mediumship of Mr. Squire. One afternoon we were sitting in conversation; — a pencil which had fallen from the table was suddenly thrown back again. I asked Mr. Squire if he did it. He replied that he did not. I immediately said, let us see if it can be done again. I put the pencil on the floor and took the medium's hands in mine, — again the article was thrown on the table. I then took a pencil from my pocket, threw it on the floor, placed my feet on his feet, and took his hands in mine; the result was the same as before; the pencil appeared on the table. I then took my knife and marked the pencil so that there could be no mistake about it; — four or five times it rose from the floor a foot or more above the table and fell upon it. There was no person in the room, except Mr. Squire and myself: it was in broad daylight.

"The other manifestation referred to, was the opening of a watch, suspended by a chain from the medium's hand, which hand was closely wrapped up with two pocket handkerchiefs, and pinned in such a manner as to render it impossible to get his fingers out; this hand, with the watch thus attached, was held under the table; his other hand and those of every person present were placed on the table; the watch would be opened, the cap covering the works removed, and dropped on the floor. This has been done more than a hundred times, — but the operation could not generally be seen. On one occasion, I sat where I could look under the table. I saw the watch suspended; and the medium's hand, enveloped as before mentioned, was in plain sight, while I was looking at it; — the watch was slowly raised up behind the frame of the table without a single movement of the medium's hand, which remained in sight; in less than half a minute, the watch again appeared in sight, but opened, and the cap fell to the floor. During the whole process, the medium's hand was entirely passive. I have thus hastily written this account, which you may use.

"Respectfully yours,
"D. FARRAR."

Will my brother account for these facts? Or will he say, I will contradict, entirely, all human testimony? Are not these responsible witnesses? Are they not your neighbors? And are they not as competent to investigate this matter as my brother is? Now, he has stated that he has had every opportunity of investigation. I wish again to impress upon your minds that, in his position as an opponent of Spiritualism, he could not have free access to private circles. He could not have the opportunity of investigation while known as an avowed opponent. Mr. — has, again and again, in his own house, seen a large piano raised from the floor, and moved about the room. Scores of his neighbors have witnessed it. This could not take place in his own house, day after day, by deception, without his being a party to the fraud, and no one thinks that he is. Mr. — was not willing that his name should be made public, in connection with these matters, and it was only upon the condition that his name should be suppressed from the published Report, that he would consent to have it used in the discussion. Until my brother can show the motive to induce these gentlemen to enter into a plot to impose upon their neighbors, in a manner more cruel than the grave, he is but offering an insult to the common sense of the world. I am confident that the public regard it in this light. Is it because there is no interest in Spiritualism, that this house is not crowded? Why are not his friends here? It is because they are mortified to discover that he is not going to meet these facts, but gives the lie to thousands and thousands of our best men and women. For he has said, to-night, there cannot be a rap without a rogue, there cannot be a healing medium unless he is an imposter, there cannot be a physical manifestation without deception. There are thousands and thousands of our friends and neighbors, — sceptics, many of them, — who have seen these manifestations, though they are not satisfied that they are produced by spirits, and who are now waiting a satisfactory explanation. Will they get it?

MR. GRIMES.

Produce your facts, and not your assertions. You want me to investigate Spiritualism, and you lock it up in the dark. Bring it out. You have pieces of paper —

MR. MILLER. — Will Mr. Daniel Farrar rise, and state whether he wrote this letter, or not?

MR. FARRAR. — I did.

THE CHAIRMAN. — This is out of order, unless Mr. Grimes gives way.

MR. GRIMES. — I trust the chairman will do his duty, and prevent these interruptions.

THE CHAIRMAN stated that while Mr. Grimes occupied the floor, he could not be interrupted, except for correction, without his consent.

MR. GRIMES. — I think every one has noticed the manner in which I have been interrupted. The moment I say any thing that makes the gentlemen wince, he rises and interrupts me on the spot. If he wants to explain something, I am perfectly willing; but otherwise, I hope I shall be allowed to proceed without interruption.

I say once more, I shall not remark upon the testimony of Mr. Farrar, Mr. —, or anybody else. It is entirely out of order, here. I am not going to get into a personal quarrel with these people. They have managed, in every way, since this debate has been going on, to get me to engage in a quarrel with their sisters or mothers, or to say something disrespectful; and now they want me to say something disrespectful to some respectable

man. I know my own position, and what is due to myself and others, too well to call in question the veracity of others. I can show how it is that honest men can fancy they see such things; and Mr. Sunderland, — who stands before me, — though a Spiritualist, will say that a dozen honest men can be made to see a piano raised, and will swear to it, while it never rises an inch. Does not Mr. Sunderland know it is so? I have done it hundreds of times; and, therefore, I am not going to say that no honest man has seen a piano raised. Thus, an honest man will see a thing that is not there. I have made hundreds of mediums as good as any you ever saw, — speaking mediums, tipping mediums who will tip a table over and break it, and who will not believe they are deceived. Talk about candor! Why did not that gentleman take up my offer, when I said Mrs. Coan could not produce their alleged manifestations? I said that where there is a rap there is a rogue. Perhaps she is here. Let Mr. Skinner come here, he is a rapping medium; he can't help it, poor, unfortunate man! If he can't help it, we couldn't help hearing it. Such a man hears a rap, and when others wish to hear it he says, "There was a rap; and you must not question my character;" and another stands here, and says, "That is my sister; do not question her veracity." What can I do? Here are rapping mediums — there are hundreds in this city; — you boast of their number; and a committee cannot go and test them, but you must have another committee to protect them. And instead of bringing facts, they bring writings, and force me, if I do not accept the statements, to contradict the witnesses. Not that I do not respect the men. Suppose Chief Justice Shaw sits upon the bench, and a dozen respectable men come before him and want to swear that there is a certain piano that is in the habit of rising. The chief justice says, "You cannot give that testimony, you must bring in your piano." If a man says, "I can prove it by respectable men," — not one of his witnesses will be allowed to swear. If he says "I have the thing in my pocket," and fails to produce it, the rule of law is that the man is supposed to tell a falsehood. If he has evidence in his power, and does not show it, it is cheating. If you have healing mediums, why do you not take up my offer? You cannot make a rap, you cannot make a table move an inch, you cannot perform a cure, under fair circumstances.

The gentleman has dragged in a remark in regard to the fulness of the audience. The first night we met here, I asked my friends to report to me the character of the audience; and the answer was, nine-tenths were Spiritualists. The next day I inquired among the opponents of Spiritualism why it was that they did not attend in greater numbers; and they told me it was contemptible business. I went to one of the most respectable editors of the city, and asked him if he would be so kind as to mention that these discussions were going on. Said he, — "I don't want to say any thing about it; the thing is dead; it is killed long ago, and all respectable society treats it with contempt. Go into the street and scarcely one man in twenty knows any thing about it; scarcely any respectable people — of course, he meant his own respectable people — go to that Melodeon."

The opponents of Spiritualism have gradually increased. This very year, there are more opponents of Spiritualism, in proportion to the others, than there have been any year since it originated. Let not the gentleman say, as he has, again and again, that I have driven them away. If the hall is not quite filled, will the gentleman say I have driven the audience away? What a disgusting creature I must be! But that was one of those petty, personal things that ought not to have been brought forward.

Let me give you the origin of this debate. In the Mercantile Hall, I complained that the Spiritualists did not do as they professed to, — that they shrunk from investigation. Dr. Gardner rose, and said that I did them injustice; that the Spiritualists did

dare to investigate, — that there was no shrinking. Did I complain that the Spiritualists didn't tell large stories? I certainly knew that. Did I complain that they would not tell me of respectable men? I said they could not move a table an inch, or produce a rap; that they could tell big stories, and that was all; that when their claims were submitted to the investigation of the Harvard professors, they went all over the United States, to get the best mediums they could, the Fox girls and Redman, and the Davenport boys, and they failed. They have tried it now, and they have failed; and when I offer to try it in Mrs. Coan's own style, the gentleman was silent. Let me tell you the reason why their testimony should not be taken. I charge these good people with being jugglers; I do not say that these things never really take place, but that when they do take place, it is jugglery. A juggler stands here with a green bag — there is nothing in it — the audience search it, and find nothing in it; he puts in his hand and pulls out an egg, as good an egg as you ever saw. He will pull out a handful of things from a hat that has nothing in it. You watch it carefully as you can. "Gentlemen," he may say, "that was done by a spirit:" and he does it again. Some of the most respectable people in town will certify that it was done under circumstances where there was no possibility of fraud. I can bring you bushels of such certificates as this. "Will you not believe human testimony?" For, if you will, it was done fairly, and by a spirit. "Explain it." You cannot. Now, what is the way to test it. Here is the way. I say there is no spirit about it; it is done by jugglery. "But that man is a highly respectable man." How shall we settle it? Let me have a chance, when he performs that experiment, to fix it so that he cannot cheat. "No; I shall not insult him so" — he will bring in more certificates and tell more stories. In that predicament, I will show that in throwing back that bag, he changed it for another, so quickly that we could not see it. I tried the experiment, and left the cheat out, and it failed. But gentlemen who knew nothing about these things, and did not know how to try it, essayed some experiments of their own, and had a rap, here and everywhere. But the Spiritualists were very careful to exclude me — and my son in particular. Let me tell you why. I understand their tricks, and they could not have done it. I should have said to that committee, — Don't do your writing where anybody can see it done. Mr. Goodell, the Register of Probate, in Lynn, said to me, — "Grimes, sit there and write, and I will tell you what you write." I doubted it. He saw only the motion of the top of my pencil, and said, "You wrote, simply, 'S. D. Haven,' and then again you wrote your name." S. D. Haven was an old schoolmate of mine, I thought of him, and thought I would write some strange name. Nobody else was present, and he did it several times. A man sat in their parlor, this afternoon, while the committee were out, and performed the very same experiments as Mrs. Coan does, and showed how it was done. Bring in Mrs. Coan, and let her perform; and I will bring out my man, and let him perform. Bring in one of the Davenport boys, and let him be tied with ropes; I will bring a man who will do as well as he can. If you will bring an honest man who speaks in a trance, I will bring another who will speak in a trance. If you will bring a rapping medium, who will allow me so to arrange the "conditions" that he cannot cheat, I will bring some one to do as well — for then he could do nothing. But if you will not allow investigation, and throw yourselves upon your dignity and character, of course, I cannot investigate. You say, "Explain the facts." Here is a man who plays a juggling trick, and who refuses to allow you to go behind the screens; and I say to you, — Explain it. "Experiments," is the word. In science, experiments must be cross-questioned. Try experiments with certain conditions; then vary the conditions: and the experiment is not good unless it will succeed however you may vary it. Let a man say, in court,

he has a certain machine, but will not allow me to take it apart. Why not? Because it destroys the "conditions." What is the inference? You want the "conditions" of jugglery, or your experiments do not succeed. These are hard words: what do they mean? I mean that if you let the experiments take place, to-day in the presence of a committee who are experts, and have that committee write their ballots out of sight of the medium, not one name can be read. How remarkable, that the spirits, to-day, should have read the names written where the medium could see the movement of the pencil, while the ballots of the gentleman who went away to write them, they could not read. The gentleman says I have not tried it so often, nor so long a time, as is necessary. The spirits, probably, have been telling him what I have been doing. I have been interested in the matter, since the first, I wrote the first letter against the Fox girls. I cannot get near the Davenport boys nor Mrs. Coan. Why did not she want my son? Because she had met him once before. And when he then laid down his gold watch, and said,—"Tell what is in that envelope, and you can have the watch," a man said, "You will lose your watch; she has done that, twenty times, to-night." "My friends," said he, "my father made me a present of that watch; and he says it cannot be done. I will never take up that watch if she does it." She did not do it; and they never do it.

MR. MILLER. — I will ask my brother a question in psychology. What per cent of humanity at large is susceptible of psychological influence, readily and easily?

MR. GRIMES. — Sometimes I have tried, and failed to get a good medium, of them all; at another, I have tried a dozen, and found most excellent mediums in the whole of them. Why one person is a good medium, and another not, I cannot tell. Sometimes the proportion is large, sometimes not, — just like catching fish, — you don't know what you are going to have.

MR. MILLER. — What is the proportion?

MR. GRIMES. — Perhaps, one out of four.

MR. MILLER. — I heard Professor Grimes lecture in Mercantile Hall, a week ago last Tuesday; and he stated, there, that about one out of twenty upon the average, was susceptible of those influences. I noted it down in my book, and am sure I was not mistaken. Now he says one out of four is susceptible. Here then is a piano, in the house of Mr. —, that is raised up mysteriously. He has attempted an explanation on the grounds of imagination, or self-induced psychological illusion. The gentleman had not the moral courage to say, "I advance this as a theory." In fact, he has not advanced a single theory of explanation. He has in big *I* — "*I say it is so,*" — and "*Bring it on.*" And yet, in the house of Mr. —, hundreds have seen the piano move; and I venture to say it never moved, with twenty in the room, that one man saw it rise and the others did not. Here, then, the gentleman's theory is good for nothing, — that the phenomena are to be accounted for on the ground that men are susceptible of psychological influence. And if all men are so ready to be deceived, and may fall into this psychological state at any time, what reliance is to be placed upon human testimony? What is the testimony of the five hundred who saw Christ after his resurrection? Five hundred have gone to Mr. A——'s and seen that piano rise. I have been told that a professor in the college saw the piano move up and down. He had full faith in the imaginative theory; and they requested him to put his foot under, and he lost faith in his theory, at once, and was clothed and in his right mind.

The gentleman uses his delicacy as a kind of salvo; and when he wants to evade the question, he says I want to force him to attack or speak disrespectfully of my sister.

That is a mere cavil. My friend well knows that my sister can be in no way implicated in the execution of that painting, having been in the spirit-world four years before the painting was executed. Will he tell me how she could be implicated?

MR. GRIMES. — Ask Mansfield.

MR. MILLER. — Ask Mansfield? It has been said that Mansfield has practised deception, — *ergo*, all the manifestations ever produced are false. Is this logic? If so, away goes Christianity; for even our ministers acknowledge that the Fathers of the Church made use of a number of pious frauds and interpolations. Mosheim, in his Ecclesiastical History, says the early Fathers practised frauds. But for this reason are we not to rely on any thing they said? Those early Fathers, with their zeal for Christianity, felt that the end justified the means. And our mediums may be tempted. They have read of pious frauds on the part of the early Fathers of the Church. And if it proves any thing in one case, it does in the other.

My brother wants the mediums *here*, regardless of every condition whatever. I illustrated this, the other night, very forcibly, I thought, — so forcibly, at least, that my brother has been entirely silent in regard to it. Does he deny the phenomena of sleep? Is it not governed by conditions? I offered him five hundred dollars if he would go to sleep, upon this platform, while I was speaking, and the audience gazing at him. I deny that there is such a condition as sleep, unless you demonstrate it before this audience. Do it, yourself. I deny that you have slept at all, during the last five months. Now, come forward and go to sleep. You cannot do it; I will give you a thousand dollars to do it. Let me refer you to the illustration of a prayer-meeting, where the spirit of devotion may be utterly driven away by the mere entrance of an unsympathizing person. Mr. Grimes is known as a bitter and determined opponent of Spiritualism, and so is his son; therefore, the medium feels that she or he is to be left misrepresented: they feel that it may be true which they have heard, — I know that it is true — I do not say of my brother, but of our opponents generally — that there is misrepresenting, that the mediums are traduced, that they are malignèd. Now, there is a certain passive state of mind necessary for the reception of physical manifestations; for spirits can produce them only through a medium, who must be in the condition of mind and body requisite for the production of the manifestations. By looking into the Bible, you will see that these conditions were there necessary. When Christ restored the widow's son to his natural state, from a profound trance, he turned all the men out of the room. In Daniel, we find that when the prophet desired visions, he fasted. I deny, brother, that a daguerreotype was ever made. Bring in your camera, and demonstrate it, to-night. All the intelligence that you possess, and all the science in the world, cannot come forward; here, to-night, and demonstrate the fact that a daguerreotype may be taken; because, you cannot establish the conditions necessary to the production of these manifestations. And let me say, moreover, that you never saw a picture taken; the world has never yet seen the entire process of the execution of the daguerreotype; a part of it is done in the dark. Yes, ladies and gentlemen, remember that the pictures are taken in dark rooms; you cannot have the privilege of seeing them; the operator must not himself see them; he must not have light, there, enough to see them. He must take the picture in a dark room, — shut down his cover quietly, and leave the plate in the dark; and as soon as the shadow is taken, he must again exclude the light from it.

Again, the gentleman talks about evidence. I repeat, that even in court if the first-best evidence is not to be obtained, the second-best is good. If I could produce the raps, I would do it to-night; but as spirits do it, I cannot force them to come here.

Therefore, we must take the evidence of men and women who have witnessed these facts. Now, if my brother will accommodate us with a little more truth, a little more argument, a little more evidence, instead of his own assertion, we will thank him very much. It has been all assertion, as I need not tell you.

This evening is nearly closed; there are but twenty minutes more, for my brother to speak. He talks about the committee. He says I wanted a committee to protect the lady, and sneers at it. The sneer shows that my committee was needed; for had it not been for that committee, the audience would have lost all knowledge that one of the others had a very bad memory. Yet, the gentleman will spend his time in talking about this and about Andrew Jackson Davis. Is it possible that in the discussion of this second question, a question so important, we are to have nothing better? He has a darling theory in his mind, which he thinks will cover some of the manifestations; and every thing that is inconsistent with that, he refuses to accept. He makes every thing bend to that theory. Remember that facts are the basis of theory. He says it is jugglery; and yet, he does not show us how the jugglery is performed.

MR. GRIMES. — Bring it here, and I will.

MR. MILLER. — We have stated that the conditions do not render it possible to bring it here. The necessary state of passivity cannot be produced in your presence. And I repeat, you cannot produce a state of passivity in your mind, sufficient to enable you to go into the natural sleep. For many of these manifestations, the conditions are very intricate.

Let me say a word in regard to others who have given their investigation to this subject. Professor M —, a learned professor of chemistry, says he was invited to investigate the subject, and received manifestations which compelled his attention. He states in his articles, published under the head of "An Old Spiritualist," in the *Banner of Light*, that while attending a seance, he mentally inquired what course he should pursue to obtain satisfactory evidence of the truth of spirit-intercourse. He was directed, through the raps to form a circle of twelve individuals, composed of six positive and six negative minds, and to continue to hold the circles once a week for twenty nights.

He then inquired, mentally as before, what they meant by positive and negative minds. They replied, in substance, that what they meant by a positive mind, was an individual, who, when it was necessary to say "no," would say it without fear or favor, — a man who had a mind of his own and would not be easily moved without the best of reasons: a negative mind, was one that never could muster moral courage enough to say "no," an individual who always went with the crowd, and would believe any thing to oblige a personal friend. Professor M — proceeded to select twelve persons to compose the circle, making each one pledge himself or herself that they would pursue their investigation the twenty nights, whether they obtained any thing or not.

The professor was a good deal laughed at by the "positive" minds who had already set it down as a foregone conclusion that there was no truth in the alleged spirit-manifestations; but to accommodate their eminently scientific friend, they consented to become members of the circle. The circle was held night after night until eighteen evenings had passed, without getting any thing worthy of note, the "positive" minds, in the mean time, voting the investigation "a bore," and looking forward with anxiety to the close of the twentieth evening, when they would be released from their obligations. On the nineteenth evening, Professor M — and two or three of the "positive" minds went to the room usually occupied for their meetings, some little time in advance of the rest of the company, and, without any definitive object in view, and more out of fun than

anything else; they placed several pieces of white paper, and four or five pencils, on the floor, under the large centre table, besides a guitar and a harmonicon. The remaining members soon came in, and the circle was formed, as usual, round the table, not a word being said to the late comers about any thing being under the table. In a short time they heard a movement, under the table, on the paper, as if some one was writing, and on looking down (it being light) they beheld, for an instant, the pencils moving over the paper without the least physical contact from any earthly object. On taking up the papers, they found several names, poorly written, upon them, designed for different members of the circle. Afterwards, their chairs were pulled out from under them by some mysterious agency, and raps were made on the back of the chairs, floor, and table. The guitar was played upon while resting alternately on the knees of every member of the circle. The harmonicon kept time with the guitar, and sent forth the sweetest music. Late in the evening, a handful of coins was thrown on the floor, and they were piled up inside a tumbler which had been placed under the table.

The room was well lighted with gas, and the hands of the circle were placed on top of the table. Even the "positive" members became interested, and agreed to continue the sittings, and the same circle sat for more than four years, once each week.

Professor M — says that nine-tenths of all experiments in science have thus far failed; and nine-tenths of spirit-manifestation may be questioned, and yet there is truth left.

MR. GRIMES,

One word about sleep, upon which the gentleman so harps. Nothing can be more inconsistent than what my friend has said upon that subject, — that because I cannot go to sleep here, that proves that nothing can be done without conditions. I acknowledge that nothing can be done without conditions. You cannot exist without conditions. But let me see about his illustration from sleep. His mediums cannot come here and perform, because I am here — that is one difficulty — there is something very bad about me. Yet they speak every Sunday, at an advertised hour, before an audience, and the spirit is here, and sets the woman a-going. Where is your theory of sleep, after that? They will write here. Let me offer twenty-five cents, and I will have a half-dozen writing mediums here. And yet, "they cannot come here." Here they come by the advertisement. Only give them reasonable pay, and treat them well, and the spirit will come and speak for you. Professor M — investigates so long, and is a Spiritualist. Mr. Harris, who has been a Spiritualist for fifteen years, the highest and best among you, abandons Spiritualism, and stamps it as perfectly heathenish and devilish. So much for your "experience" and "investigation." I am told that if I examine it I will find it not only true but sweet and beautiful. And Harris, one of their best men, comes out, and says — but to-morrow night I will read you his very words. And if I chose to go on reading, as the gentleman does, I could show you what language those hold who have had opportunities to know it, and who know what it is. He says the manifestations cannot be produced here, because there is noise and confusion; yet, in private circles, where there is as much noise, and where I could no more sleep than here, a piano rises up to the wall, and a dozen excited people see it. Could I sleep there? Why, sir, what a miserable escape that is!

Mr. MILLER proposed to continue the debate further.

Mr. GRIMES. — It is late enough for adjournment; and it is no time to speak now. If the gentleman wishes five minutes, I have no objection.

Mr. MILLER. — Have you any objection to my occupying my twenty minutes?

MR. GRIMES.—If the audience wish to hear it, I have no objection. You may speak all night.

MR. MILLER.

I am very sorry we are obliged to leave, to-night, without a single explanation of any fact produced.

MR. GRIMES.—Or a single experiment tried.

MR. MILLER.—We have claimed to give no experiments; but we have produced good and reliable witnesses. The only inference that can be drawn from the gentleman's remarks is that the mediums are engaged in practising deception; yet he has not said so, but has left us to infer it. I would make a few remarks in regard to some little slurs he has made. "Pay the mediums and they will come here." If that is evidence of their dishonesty, and is *prima facie* proof that they are rogues, is not there *prima facie* evidence of my brother's dishonesty?—since every one knows that where a medium takes in ten dollars, he takes in a hundred.

I would say a word in regard to T. L. Harris. I mentioned the name of Professor M—— as one who, after a thorough study of the subject, has come to the conclusion that Spiritualism is true. My brother gives the impression that Mr. Harris has abandoned Spiritualism, entirely. There is not one particle of proof that he has abandoned the belief, or denies the facts, of spirit-intercourse, not even in the garbled report of the *Morning Advertiser*. We have received letters from Europe, stating that the report is greatly garbled. But let that be as it may, Mr. Harris has not been endorsed by Spiritualists generally, for his eccentric views; and it would seem that he, with a few others, have tried to build up a creed, and sought to make others receive it, and appoint him to the leadership; and having failed in this purpose, he may have made remarks in regard to Spiritualism and Spiritualists, which will reflect discredit upon his name, and of which he will, upon more reflection, be ashamed.

* But do the points my brother has urged answer my facts? He has not offered a direct affirmative argument upon the question, to-night; and to-morrow he promises you he will read a garbled extract of Mr. Harris' sermon, from the *London Advertiser*. He says he will give the very words of T. L. Harris. How do you know they are the words? A bitter opponent goes into the hall, and says he went there for evidence against Spiritualism, and he could hear but one-half of the story. And let me say to my friend that prejudice is as apt to lead us into an error, as credulity. If a piano moves around the room, his prejudice is so great he would not see it. Prejudice may be as blinding as credulity. Taking my brother's theory,—the only one he has admitted,—is it not possible that, after all, he is the only one really deceived?

One other statement he has made. He has accused me of casting personal reflections upon him, because I have stated that the reason why his friends were not here is that he cannot sustain their side of the question,—that the position he had taken would but act against them. Friends, I would have spared his feelings too much to say that, had he not voluntarily stated that they kept away because I had not fairly presented the subject, because I had not sustained it sufficiently to make it interesting.

MR. GRIMES.—I venture to say it cannot be found in the Report. I never meant to say that. If I used any language that could bear any such construction, it was certainly an idea not in my mind. Nobody could say, with any regard for truth, that that gentleman has not made his part of the discussion, interesting. For Heaven's sake, do not make me any worse than I am! for I am bad enough.

[Some little discussion here ensued in regard to the words used by Mr. Grimes, Mr. Miller further complaining that Mr. Grimes had charged him with using certain specific blasphemous language. This, also, was denied by Mr. G., and an appeal made to the Reporter, who substantially confirmed Mr. Grimes' recollection. See page 68.]

MR. MILLER.—To-morrow evening, my brother closes up the question on the affirmative; and I hope and trust he will be able to lay down a position, and defend it,—to present his theory, and arguments in support of it.

SIXTH EVENING.

SATURDAY, MARCH 8TH.

MR. GRIMES

Opened the discussion by reading the following remarks:—

Several distinct issues and points have been made in this debate, which need to be reviewed in closing, and placed clearly before the audience.

1. The Spiritualists agree that the spiritual nature of the modern manifestations is rendered probable, at least, because all the bodies and minds in the universe are related, connected, and in sympathy, and must therefore communicate with each other.

I reply that this does not follow; for if it did, the inhabitants of Australia, of America, and Europe, would have been acquainted with each other before the voyages of Columbus and Cook.

2. The Spiritualists argue, that the modern manifestations cannot be consistently denied by Christians, because the Bible history and miracles are proved by the same kind of human testimony.

To this I reply that, in the first place, the argument comes with a bad grace, and has no force, when addressed by those who deny the infallible inspiration of the Bible, as all the Spiritualists do, and who place its authority on a level with that of Homer's *Iliad* and other profane writings. In order to avail themselves of this argument, they must admit that the transactions recorded in the Bible actually took place, as there related. Whereas it is notorious that Spiritualists, almost without exception, repudiate the miracles, and most of the precepts and the examples, set forth in Holy Writ.

In the second place, I reply that Christians are perfectly consistent, and proceed in accordance with the established and well-known rules of evidence, when they accept human testimony to prove the Bible truths, and reject it if brought forward to prove the modern manifestations. The Bible is a moral and religious history, relating to events which are presumed to have taken place so long ago that all the witnesses are dead. The best evidence that the case admits, and the only good evidence which it is possible for us to produce in the present day, is the Bible itself. This being so, any court of justice in the world will receive the Bible, as competent evidence, on the same principle that they would receive human testimony, in any case when positive and ocular proof does not exist or cannot be produced.

The Spiritualists are in a different predicament. They have never claimed, until this discussion commenced, that they rely on human testimony; on the contrary, the whole civilized world has rung with their pretensions to the possession of positive demonstrations which appeal directly to the senses,—not in one place only, but, in the forcible language of Judge Edmonds, “there is scarcely a village or hamlet in the United States where this evidence cannot be produced.” Now, are there any special times for their appearance? They are announced as continually, daily, and almost hourly, forcing themselves upon the attention of persons of all classes, conditions, and degrees

of intelligence. The mediums are numerous and willing, the opportunities abundant, the conditions few, simple, and easily discerned. Under these circumstances, the phenomenon must be proved by being reproduced in the presence of those who are appointed to scrutinize them. The testimony of those who profess to have witnessed them, cannot be admitted for any purpose, except as preliminary, and to excite to experimental investigation.

There is no court of justice in the world, that will receive the testimony of witnesses in such cases, however numerous or credible they may be. The invariable end is that the best evidence, which the case admits, must be produced; and if a party refuses to bring it forward, and attempts to introduce a witness, when an *experiment* is required, there is always a presumption of fraudulent intentions, even though no other evidence of fraud appears.

3. The ground taken by the Spiritualists, in this debate, is that the Bible miracles, and the other modern spirit-manifestations, are both the results of the operation of natural law, and not properly and specially miraculous.

To this I reply that it is absurd to assume that the sun stood still at the command of Joshua; that the rock was rolled away from the sepulchre; that water was turned into wine; that the dead were raised; or that a child was born of a virgin, by the operation of natural law. If these things did not take place miraculously, by the will of the Divine Author of nature's laws, they did not happen at all. Nature cannot produce such phenomena.

4. If we, for the sake of argument, assume modern Spiritualism to be true and carry it out to its logical consequences, we have an excellent example of the *reductio ad absurdum*. Thus, the Spiritualists declare that departed friends return and haunt their former residences and manifest themselves to their friends and nearest relatives by rapping, moving furniture, etc. Would not the slave mother and father haunt their masters and the ministers who uphold slavery, if this were so? Would not abolitionists, like John Brown, rap around the house and furniture and head of the slaveholder? Would not departed fathers and mothers and brothers frighten away those who aim to injure a daughter, a sister, or a child? Would not crime be impossible, detection and conviction certain, and police unnecessary? If the spirits of Washington and his compeers could so easily manifest themselves, would not disunion be easily prevented, and treason surely exposed, even before it could be uttered?

If the spirit of Franklin could communicate with his talented grandson, the present head of the coast survey, would he not have informed him where the telegraphic cable to Europe was broken? Would not the elder Herschel have communicated to his son the cause of the perturbations of Uranus and directed him where he could find the planet Neptune? Would not the internal structure and functions and diseases of man and animals be made known to physicians by the spirit of Harris and Hunter and Jenner and Bell? Surely, those spirits would be much more likely to give us *such* communications than the silly twaddle that mediums pretend to receive.

Again if it is really true that departed spirits can assume the control of passive mind, no one is safe — the moment a natural medium is off his guard he loses himself, his mind's throne is usurped by a wandering spirit, a medium is a person who cannot say his soul is his own. Any one who prostitutes the body is considered infamous, throughout the world, but what shall we say of one who prostitutes the very soul to the service of any vagrant spirit that happens to be wandering through this world? When any one is imprisoned or abducted away without legal process, a writ of *habeas corpus* is issued to bring the body into court and show cause for the detention — but by what means is the

conquered mind to be freed, when a medium is possessed by an evil spirit? What court has jurisdiction? Will Judge Edmonds, or my friend here, answer?

5. The Spiritualists call upon us to account for their manifestations. I answer, the so-called phenomena may be divided into two classes, one of which is produced by jugglery, and can be exposed if it can be fully and fairly scrutinized by means of properly conducted and varied experiments. The other class is produced by mesmerism or its counterfeit, and these phenomena cannot be exhibited by the Spiritualists in a manner in any degree superior to those produced by the mesmerizers. If the Spiritualists deny this, I will undertake to produce at short notice every phase of this species of honest mediumship which they can exhibit.

I will produce trance speakers whom they cannot surpass in eloquence nor in originality. The audience may select the subject and may ask questions and debate with the medium and spirit just as they do with theirs. I will make writing mediums, of honest people, strangers to me, who never before knew that they possessed the faculty of writing unconsciously. They will write communications from friends—generally from relatives in the spirit-land, often of a touching, pious, and affectionate character, sometimes giving advice concerning health, sometimes concerning moral conduct or business matters, or they will give information concerning the manners and habits of beings in the spirit-land. In a word, they will write as intelligently and as spiritually as any of the pretended spirit-mediums can.

I can also make mediums that will see visions of the spirit-world, converse with its inhabitants, shake hands with them, and describe, in glowing terms, the heavenly scenery on the other side of Jordan.

Other mediums, who appear to be perfectly sincere, can be made, who will hear raps when and where none are made—see tables and pianos rise, when none do rise, or unconsciously tip tables over while they seem to be holding them up. To do this I have only to produce impressions of a particular kind upon their minds, under proper circumstances, until I produce a somnambule and dreaming state. The Spiritualists reply, to this, that spirits mesmerize just as I do, and this is the reason of the resemblance between their manifestations and those of my mediums—they say that the will of a spirit of one dead can mesmerize just as the will of a spirit of one alive can.

But there is a fatal defect at the foundation of this reasoning; for it is not true that the will is essential in mesmerizing, as is generally supposed, nor is it true that to produce the mesmeric or medium state there must be two persons engaged, one of whom is an active operator or mesmerizer and the other a passive subject; for, a susceptible person can be taught to mesmerize himself, and become what the Spiritualists call a medium, without the intervention of any operator. These views and doctrines are not now taught for the first time: I have taught them for many years in my lectures, and have explained and illustrated them at length in a book, written two years ago but just published by James Munroe & Co., of this city, entitled, "Human Nature and the Nerves, and the Art of making Mediums." I beg here to refer you to that work, and I have no doubt the publishers will thank me for this advertisement. I ought to state further that all the phenomena of mesmerism and trance can be explained on strictly scientific and physiological principles.

I wrote this out because I desired to have it quite definite. I generally speak extemporaneously, or, as I heard a Spiritualistic medium once say, *extemporashusly*. But I have made these points distinctly, in order that they might be clear, if, in some other parts, I might have spoken hastily.

But in regard to the explanation of these phenomena. There is one class of them with which most of you must know I am somewhat familiar. I refer to those they call *mesmerie*. Mr. Sunderland, who does me the honor to attend my discussion, is, also, very familiar with that subject; and I am sure he knows, and will testify, if you desire it, that these phenomena of trance speaking, and seeing things and hearing sounds that are not there, do not necessarily require a mesmerizer; that there are many persons whom I can teach — and, indeed, I can teach any person very susceptible of mesmerism — to put themselves into a trance. Such a person can speak as a trance medium; he can see heaven or — you know where; he can see spirits of any kind,

"Black spirits or white,
Blue spirits or gray."

And, therefore, when I see a trance speaker pretending that it is not he, or she, but a spirit, that speaks, I don't know whether they are deceiving the audience, or themselves; I believe that in nine cases out of ten they are dishonest. It is just as in court, with a person perjuring himself, — you cannot tell it by his appearance. I have operated, in mesmeric experiments, upon persons who have deceived me, when I supposed the phenomena were real. In the same way, I have seen persons who were making a pretence of being in a trance, who I believed were really as wide awake as I was. The same person may sometimes be honest, and sometimes dishonest, and playing a trick upon their audience. A person in a trance state is in the same condition as when he or she is asleep, dreaming; and this can be proved, to entire satisfaction. Of course, such a scientific fact cannot be proved to the satisfaction of persons who never read science and cannot reason on any thing; but give me a jury of fair, educated medical men, and they will decide that this trance-mediumship, this spiritual state, and dreaming, are all one, and that there is not a single point about the trance type of speaking or writing, that gives the slightest evidence of spiritual manifestations. It is either founded upon ignorance, or upon some worse motive.

[It was here agreed, between the disputants, that the debate should be continued through two additional evenings.]

MR. MILLER.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I was somewhat surprised when my brother arose and introduced, here, this evening, for the first time, I might say, a negative argument on the first proposition. It does seem to me that any lyceum student should understand that my brother's argument at the outset, though proper in itself, belonged upon the first question, and should have been introduced as a negative argument against my affirmative arguments. Really, since this discussion is to go before the world, for my own part, I would like to see it conducted orderly, and with propriety, and governed by the rules of parliamentary debate; and if my brother will confine himself to the question that is before us, such will be the case.

I hardly feel at liberty to go on and offer an argument against his first negative position, this evening. Yet I shall do so, and then I shall begin to pile facts upon facts; and since we are to have more time, and since the gentleman has insisted upon it that ancient spirit-manifestations were produced miraculously, and that modern spirit-manifestations are not, I shall proceed to show their perfect analogy — to prove that they are precisely alike; and that those theologians who have claimed that the former was miraculous have erred in their theological definition of a *miracle*, — that the idea of a miracle grew out of the ignorance of the human mind in regard to the laws of nature.

But to the position which the gentleman has raised this evening. I think I have clearly shown, heretofore, that he has, in rejecting our evidence, taken the same position which every infidel writer has ever taken, in regard to the testimony of the Bible witnesses. I think I have also clearly shown that in denying the spirit-manifestations, and various gifts of the present day, his position is antichrist. And to-night, my friends, he has taken the ground of the atheist! You cannot look into an atheistical work in the world, you cannot talk with an atheist, but he will use the same arguments which my brother has offered here to-night. When Robert Dale Owen discussed, with Mr. Origen Bachelor, the question whether there be a God or not, one of the strongest arguments which Owen used, and which he wielded with such mighty power against his opponent, was the fact that evil exists, slavery exists, crime runs riot, and yet God does not cause it to cease. My brother says,—If there are spiritual beings, and there is crime, why do not these spirits descend, and put an end to it? Owen says,—If there be a God of the universe and he be a God of infinite love, mercy, and justice, why does he not stay the assassin's hand? Why does he not roll back the tide of wickedness, and cover the enemies of truth with shame? If that discussion is to be found in this city, and it is necessary, I will bring forward the book and show that Owen, when an atheist, took the same position with my brother. The churches begin to tremble; and the friends of my brother begin to feel,—If you strike a blow at these modern manifestations, if you strike a blow at Spiritualism, away goes the whole fabric of Christianity.

Really, I feel a sympathy for my brother, when he is compelled to take this ground. Is it not plain to your mind? He says that if we are surrounded by evil spirits, and they may exert an influence over us, we have no safety. Did not Jesus Christ teach us that we are surrounded by good and bad spirits? Was he not himself tempted? He said to Satan, "Get thee behind me:" and angels came, and ministered unto him! Here, then, are good spirits, which are ready to aid us in resisting the bad. Does not the entire Church, the theological world, teach the doctrine of good spirits and bad? Have we not been told that there is a devil, that "goeth about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour?" Where is our safety, then, says my brother if there are evil spirits?

MR. GRIMES.—In God.

MR. MILLER.—Yes, brother, in the infinite God. And those messengers that come from the realms of light are his ministers. We find good and bad in this world. We find evil-minded men that would seduce us down to the very gates of hell, even as we find a mother and sister and brother, whose counteracting influence helps us to resist them. Why, I might ask, does God suffer bad men and women in this world? Why has he ever permitted any thing like evil? The question is just as pertinent. I repeat to my brother, that our safety is in the infinite God. We are surrounded by ministering spirits; and, as the inspired writer says, these are the "spirits of just men made perfect." "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister unto them who shall be heirs of salvation." We are also surrounded by evil spirits, both in and out of the body. And we are taught to resist the evil and seek the good. We are told to "try the spirits," which certainly implies that there are good and bad. If they were all good, there would be no need of testing them. And when we try them, it must be as we try men, by their words and works. If my brother's argument is good, why, it is perfectly fatal to the entire Christian religion; it is perfectly fatal to the teachings of Jesus Christ, eighteen hundred years ago. I cannot, friends, in the course of this discussion, be expected to answer such statements as my brother very frequently makes. To

give you an illustration:—"Spiritualists reject the Bible, and reject the greater portion of its precepts." When he makes such statements as these, will he refer to the Spiritualist papers or journals, or any leading Spiritualist, that rejects the inspiration of the Old and New Testament? A great portion of the Bible; it is true, is not inspired: a great portion of it is merely historical. But I do not know of a single Spiritualist, no, not one, who does not believe in inspiration to-day and in olden times—that the ancient bards and prophets and seers spoke as the spirit gave them utterance; that in the second dispensation, Christ and his apostles were inspired. And when he says they disregard the moral precepts, he has made a charge which he is not able to prove. What do they disregard? Christ says,—Feed the hungry, and clothe the naked. If this charge applies any more to Spiritualists than to the Christian world, I am unable to see it. Why are millions of dollars needlessly expended in decorating churches, in this city, while hunger and poverty are pleading for aid? In this city and other cities in America, there are thousands of wretched, poverty-stricken females, who are driven by poverty till they are tempted to sell their virtue, in order to obtain bread to keep soul and body together. Is it not true that millions of dollars are thus needlessly expended by different churches, in trying to outvie a neighboring church, in having a higher steeple, or in having their seats more finely cushioned? Check this needless expenditure, and go out and feed the hungry and clothe the naked. I say this precept does not apply to us, more than to the Christian Church, or half as much. For those who conduct reforms, in every age, are generally poor, and have not the means to give, as they are often humble fishermen, and those who walk in lowly life. Christ directed us to do unto others as we would that others should do unto us. Do you say that Spiritualists disobey this precept more than others do? I acknowledge, friends, that none of us live up to the examples and teachings of Jesus Christ, as we should; and I would to Heaven that every Spiritualist, and every one who is not a Spiritualist, would live in accordance with those pure moral precepts. But when we are told to obey the doctrine of "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," I do not hesitate to declare that I consider it any thing but good for moral beings; it may do for the age of animalism, but it does not accord with the law written within the soul of every morally developed being.

A few words, now, in regard to the statement that if it be true that spirits return and communicate, they would introduce inventions, and make remarkable discoveries for us. Will my brother say, here, that he would really like to have it so,—would like to have the spirits come and do all our thinking for us? Mercy knows that the world has been employing men, for the last eighteen hundred years, to do their thinking for them. I was talking with a friend, this afternoon, in regard to this very subject. He is not a believer in Spiritualism, but he said,—“I, for one, am glad that we are left to work and dig out these things ourselves.” All we ask of spirits is, merely to point to where the mine of truth is to be found, and we will dig for ourselves, and endeavor to gather up these golden grains of beauty and truth, and treasure them up in good and honest hearts. We do not wish them to do every thing for us, and leave us nothing to do. He says,—“Why do they not direct us in regard to the science of astronomy?” Who shall say, good friends, that the mind of Galileo was not first inspired by a spirit? Who shall say that Columbus felt no extraordinary interior impression that there was a western world? who shall say that it was not suggested to him from the invisible? Who shall dare to say that the Father of his country, George Washington, was not surrounded by an invisible body-guard, who inspired him with wisdom, with great discretion, with great judgment? We are almost disposed to believe that there was a Divine Providence overruling the great Washington. He had one of the most invin-

cible foes upon earth; and with a handful of men, he conquered at last. And have we not his own word, that he was oftentimes governed by impressions for which he could not account? When no external reasons were presented to guide his choice, he was yet led to take the course which terminated in success. And did he not say that when he disregarded these strong impressions, he invariably failed? Who shall say that the immortal Franklin did not help Professor Morse? I have conversed with geniuses, with inventive spirits in the body, who have told me that they have been enlightened and their powers unfolded by the aid of spiritual beings, but not to such an extent that it relieved them entirely, of all thought. I will again answer these questions, here, asking as I did on a former occasion, — why does not the professor in a college work out the problem, or translate the Greek, for the student? The poor student would rust out; he would never unfold his faculties.

We have spent four evenings in discussing the first question, to which alone this matter would have been pertinent. Now, will my brother come to the question before us?

MR. GRIMES.

That is a most extraordinary inquiry, when the gentleman has not come within a thousand miles of the question.

MR. MILLER. — I was obliged to follow you on your argument.

MR. GRIMES. — The gentleman says I do not speak to the question, when, supposing this was the last evening, I drew up a *resumé* of the whole, putting down, *seriatim*, every thing, whether his arguments or my answers: he caught that up, although he must have known that the very proposition to sum up was made by him, and that that was my answer. Then he launched upon the theological world. He brought up the Bible. My friend is a very good Christian, in one respect; when he is in trouble, he takes refuge in the Bible. If I say they do not make raps, they appeal to the Bible. If I say that Mrs. Coan is a humbug, and they cannot show they contrary, they get under the Bible. If I deny that they can produce any manifestations, they say I am an infidel, and that all the Christians are infidels, and that *they* are the Christians. They invert things most beautifully! They ought to publish a new dictionary. The Christians are infidels, and they Christians; and I am an atheist, and injuring the cause of Christianity. The gentleman's whole argument is full of the assertion that I am taking infidel ground. My dear friend, here, has been very eloquent; he speaks most fluently and eloquently about taking infidel ground, and seems to be really alarmed lest I should become an infidel while he is maintaining the doctrines of the Bible. And he wants to know to what Spiritualist book or paper I will refer, to show that the Spiritualists are opposed to the Bible. And before he got through, he made himself a perfect example of what I charged upon the Spiritualists. I refer to him and his speech; I never heard more rank infidelity in my life, as I understand it, and as all the Christian churches understand it, than I have heard from my friend in the course of this debate. If any one should ask me what the public mean by the word *infidel*, or what all Christians mean by *infidels* — I do not mean any sect calling themselves *Christians*, who may be themselves infidels — I should say it is this. I do not speak of my friend, himself; I speak of him as a representative of Spiritualism; I never saw him before I saw him here; I have the most perfect respect for him; I admire him; I like him, individually; but as a representative of Spiritualism, I do detest him as the embodiment of the worst doctrines that the world has ever heard, the most dangerous to the morals, the health, the religious hopes and interests of man. Again I say, if, by any use of language, at any time, I seem to be disrespectful to him, my heart does not mean it.

What are these Spiritualistic doctrines? Let us look at them a moment. Notwithstanding all the differences of the Spiritualists, there are some things in which they agree. They agree in hating evangelical Christianity. They agree in utterly repudiating the idea that they need the blood of Christ as an atonement, or in any way that they need the mercy of God for their sins. They agree in that. Their doctrine is, that every thing that is done and ever was done, from the beginning of eternity till now, is the result of natural laws. Whether God made the laws or not, they don't know and don't care; they rather imply that God himself is subject to the laws, just as the ancient Pagans held. I never heard, anywhere in their teaching, that God made the laws of nature, but that there are certain inexorable laws, above every thing, and that the spirits come here and play the pranks they say they do, in obedience to such a law as that which makes snakes live and grow, the same which makes grass grow, the same that made the rock roll away from the sepulchre, the same that made the sun stand still. The gentleman says he believes that the transactions recorded in the Bible really took place.

MR. MILLER dissented.

MR. GRIMES. — I state it as you did.

MR. MILLER. — I believe that most, the great majority, of spirit-manifestations in the Bible are genuine. But I am far from believing that the infinite God rolled that big rock, weighing several tons — be the same more or less, — the story of which my brother ridiculed. I am far from believing that the infinite God did stop this earth, rolling, on its axis, from west to east, and cause it to go back ten degrees, in order to convince Hezekiah that he could get over a pain in the stomach and live fifteen years longer; for I am sure that such a spirit-manifestation as that — I have not ridiculed it, however, half as badly as my brother did, — I believe that such a spirit-manifestation would be productive of a good deal of insanity. For —

MR. GRIMES. — You are going a little further than an explanation.

MR. MILLER. — Pardon me: I wish to state that very few of us could keep our minds balanced, if we should go out and see the sun rising in the West. A great portion of the inhabitants of the earth would have seen this phenomenon, if it had ever occurred; but since we have no corroborative evidence, from other nations, that the sun did turn back in its course, we must believe that there is a misinterpretation or interpolation. I do not believe that God ever stopped the world.

MR. GRIMES. — The gentleman has sustained my proposition better than I could.

MR. MILLER. — I did not ridicule the story of the "big rock."

MR. GRIMES. — I am not afraid of your ridiculing any thing you wish to. I believe in that; I practise it, myself. Don't be afraid of my being thin skinned. At the same time, I do not ridicule the gentleman himself — any thing but that. I charge the Spiritualists with not believing the Bible. He rises and says, to all intents and purposes, that he believes every thing that agrees with his own notions. When he comes to any thing that he thinks God should not do, according to his ideas, it is a mistake. When he comes to something that just fits his own notions, that is inspired. When the Bible writer is inspired just as he is, it is inspired; when he differs from him, it is a mistake, and in that way he believes the Bible. Why, what a Christian he is! how full of grace! what a son of the Church! Now, some Christians, in joining the Church, are called to make a confession of faith; and when the gentleman stands up, he says, — Your reverence, I believe the Bible just so far as it agrees with my notions of things; and as far

as I differ, it is mistaken. I fancy I see such a man joining the Church! He has reiterated, already, what I said as to the doctrines of the Spiritualists generally. When I say that the doctrines of the Spiritualists are shocking, I can refer to what he has said. Those doctrines *are* shocking. They shock the nerves of those we call Christians. The vast majority of the people of this city, men who are educated, men who know more than he or I, both, and who are just as capable of knowing what the Bible means, find no such mistakes.

Now, I wish to go a little further, and show what Spiritualists do believe. It is perfectly plain that they do not believe the Bible. They believe part of it, as they would of a novel. In the *Waverley Novels*, we find a description of a scene: that, we believe, but when we come to Scott's big stories, we do not believe them. When the Bible describes people as eating, the gentleman thinks that is probable; but when it says that God, who made the world, stopped it for his own purpose, a moment, the gentleman does not believe that. Because he can't do that, he does not believe that God did it. When God does any thing that he cannot do, he does not particularly believe there is a God. I heard a Spiritualist say, yesterday, "he wouldn't mind worshipping God, if he would behave himself"—and quite a number of Spiritualists joined in the laugh.

MR. MILLER. — Will you please to tell me who the Spiritualist was?

MR. GRIMES. — Mr. Jones — a "very respectable man" — very!

I heard a Spiritualist lecture in Buffalo, — I cannot think of his name, but he is the editor of one of your Spiritualist papers. I declare he was the best and most interesting Spiritualist lecturer, — excepting the present company, — I ever heard. And he rose before a large audience, — I think there were a thousand people there, — and, speaking of Jesus Christ, said he did very well considering he was a young man; and the audience seemed to be quite pleased with it. And Christ was a Jew, and had prejudices against Samaritans. Then he ridiculed the idea of imitating Christ. He said that among the savages, all the tribe imitate the great chief: and the Quakers imitate William Penn, and if he wore a broad-brimmed hat, they did the same: and the Israelites imitated Moses, and they were all Moseses. And he ridiculed the idea of imitating Jesus. And that man called himself a Spiritualist. I have no doubt my friend, here, will give you the same doctrine, and tell you that he has a great respect for Christ, and will be very indignant if you do not think that he believes in the Bible. Surely, this point needs no further explanation. When I say he does not believe in the Bible, when I say that he treats the Christian religion outrageously, he himself reiterates what I mean. And he knows, he knows well, that the feelings of all the Christians in the audience are hurt to hear it. What cares he for that?

Now, what is their doctrine? There are spirits all around, existing as mosquitos exist in swamps; and they have an independent existence. Just as in the heats of August, the mosquitos come out and bite, just so, when the conditions are right, the spirits come out; and many Spiritualists teach — I do not know that there is any exception — my impression is that the greater portion of the Spiritualists teach — that a vast majority of the spirits around us are evil spirits, that they come on purpose to deceive us, and take delight in tormenting us. They say that most of their spirits are lying spirits, and they certainly illustrate that. The Spiritualists that have had most experience teach — and I refer to one gentleman whom I see before me now, who, in one of his books, — and an able book it is, and if I could pick it out I would like to read from it — says that he has no doubt, — that there are spirits here, but holds up his hands in warning, and gives a warning against them as evil spirits.

MR. LAROCY SUNDERLAND. — That is not quite true.

MR. GRIMES. — Please correct me, sir.

MR. SUNDERLAND. — I do not choose to give a lecture here.

MR. GRIMES. — Then you did not give the admonition?

MR. SUNDERLAND. — I did give the voice of warning, but not particularly, because there are evil spirits.

MR. GRIMES. — What did you say about it?

MR. SUNDERLAND. — I say there is danger in listening to revelations from the invisible world.

MR. GRIMES. — Well, that is what I meant. Revelations from the invisible world are dangerous.

MR. SUNDERLAND made a remark not overheard by the Reporter.

MR. GRIMES. — Well, never mind the name; you may call the revelations by whatever name you please. Mr. Harris, who has renounced this modern Spiritualism, in language of burning eloquence warns all to beware of its terrible consequences. The peculiar notions Mr. Sunderland has on the subject, I did not name; but the particular point I am making here, is that the doctrines taught by the Spiritualists are so far from being Christian, they are absolutely heathenish, and worse. I defy you to show, in all the annals of paganism, any thing half so demoralizing, either in principles or practice, as this modern Spiritualism. You may go to the ancient Greeks, to the Hindoos, you may go to the annals of Sodom, and you will find purity itself, compared with the picture which Rev. Mr. Harris draws of modern Spiritualism. He a Christian minister, too, a Swedenborgian Christian.

MR. MILLER.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen: Really, am I mistaken?—

MR. GRIMES. — I guess you are.

MR. MILLER. — Then I will ask the chairman to read the question for discussion this evening and we will see.

THE CHAIRMAN read the question, as follows:—

Can the various phenomena known as Spirit Manifestations be satisfactorily and philosophically accounted for without admitting the agency of departed human beings?

MR. MILLER. — The very first point which my brother brings forward, is an inquiry as to what are the Spiritualist doctrines. I want to know if the point in discussion is, the doctrines of Spiritualism, or its phenomena. Brother, I am not mistaken; the mistake is on the other side of the house. Not one remote allusion has he made to this question. Has he, in a fit of desperation, abandoned it? If so, let him stand up and say to the community, — I cannot meet this question. It is evident he cannot; and he is now avoiding, — artfully dodging it, — and begins to talk about something else.

MR. GRIMES. — About the Bible.

MR. MILLER. — That is not the issue.

MR. GRIMES. — Why did you begin it, then?

MR. MILLER. — I did not begin an issue on the divine authority of the Bible, or any thing of the kind. I, in my remarks on the first evening, quoted from the Bible, to establish spirit intercourse, as I would quote from the writings of Socrates, Plato, or John Wesley. I do not hesitate to define my position upon the Bible, where it becomes a question, and it is necessary for me to do it. I believe, if I know my own soul, I love truth more than the opinions of the world. And when the gentleman attempts, here, by pandering to your prejudice, to get up an ill feeling, he departs from the rules, it does seem to me, of this debate, and from the question, entirely. The question, here, to-night, is not of the moral tendencies of Spiritualism. Yet, I am willing to discuss that question at any time, with any man who will take the principles of Spiritualism on which to reason, — not the acts of professed Spiritualists, for by this rule nothing would stand. I am, indeed, sorry to be obliged, here, to follow my brother outside of the question.

MR. GRIMES. — Will you allow me to interrupt you a moment, to refer you to a point where you have made a mistake. Did I not speak of mesmerism, and go on to show how mesmerism accounted for trance-speaking, and other of your manifestations?

MR. MILLER. — You might as well say they are caused by a man's "ebeneser," as by mesmerism. The gentleman has not told us what mesmerism is. He has told us that the influence of mind upon mind, independent of the senses, is a humbug; and he uses one humbug, — on the principle of *similia similibus*, — to neutralize another.

I shall not follow the gentleman through all the random remarks he has made here, but will continue to present facts upon facts, and occasionally reply to some of his unsupported assertions. I shall — and he has drawn me into it — be obliged to reply to some of his assertions in regard to the moral tendencies of Spiritualism. I prefer, however, to present, to him, facts; and I desire him to give, according to the statement of the proposition, a satisfactory and philosophical explanation. I will offer presently, two manifestations, — one of a physical nature, and the other of a mental nature.

But before doing so, since my brother is constantly making quotations from others, since he tells us he has heard a lecturer, in Buffalo, make certain declarations, since he has heard "Mr. Jones'" opinion, and quotes him as authority, allow me to say, I might reasonably reject them, if his line of argument be a correct one, unless he will give the best evidence of which the case admits. The best evidence to afford, here, would be to bring that lecturer forward, or a report of the objectionable speech which he made in Buffalo. He ought not to ask us to take his word alone. Why, he has, here, without qualification or reason, accused nine-tenths of the mediums of being impostors. There is an old saying; that a dishonest person thinks everybody else dishonest. I cannot conceive how my brother arrives at such conclusions as these, without reflecting severely upon himself. But I am satisfied my brother does not mean you to take his statements in their full sense. He has a hard question, and he finds it is necessary to talk, and therefore fills up the time with these remarks, begging of you, with his mirthfulness and playful manner, to take just about as much of it as you please.

He has divided off the manifestations, and there he has left them; he has not explained either the one or the other class. First, for the manifestations of a mental character. He says he can do any thing that any honest medium can do. The truth of it is, all he can do he will admit, and all that he cannot do he will say is dishonest. He must make every fact bend to his theory.

MR. GRIMES. — I will do all that your mediums will do up here.

Mr. Miller.—He may do this by trickery, by jugglery, he may get up a very faithful counterfeit; and yet the genuine not be exposed. He may produce all the external appearances, and yet it is a mere counterfeit. I have seen a man, on the stage, go through an excellent counterfeit of *delirium tremens*. Now, that he could counterfeit the condition of a man seeing devils around him, does not show that there is not a real condition in which reason is dethroned. We have seen, on the stage, an assumed character of Richard the Third; and yet was there not a genuine Richard the Third? I have seen a man, upon the stage, go through with the struggles of death. Does that disprove its reality? Let me say, in regard to every effect in nature, physical and spiritual, that certain conditions must be established before they can take place. My brother seems willing to admit just so much of the phenomena as will come inside the limits of his narrow theory; the rest, by an unwarrantable assumption, he denounces as unmitigated imposture. If I would state that I saw a medium sit down and write a few verses, that her arm moved mysteriously, he can, possibly, account for this by his science of mesmerism, and will, therefore, admit it to be true; but go beyond this, and the capacity of his theory suddenly gives out, and the straw which he catches at then is, the stereotyped cry of "Humbug and dishonesty!" Mesmerism is true, but it is but the abc of the great science of mind running through the vast empire of created intelligences.

But, I will not dwell further on this subject, but will now introduce, under the head of what is called "mental manifestations," an occurrence which took place in the village of Madison, Madison County, New York. In that village resides the family of Mr. Carlton Rice. They were not Spiritualists till after the following occurrences took place. Their daughter, one day, seemed to be singularly affected. The village physician,—I cannot now recollect his name,—was called in to examine her case, as the parents were somewhat alarmed at her condition. I will refer you to any man in the place, so well known are the facts. While holding a discussion there, last fall, I brought forward a score of witnesses, who knew the reliability of the communications through this girl. Not one farthing has she, or any party concerned, ever received for their time and trouble. They called upon physicians to determine what was the matter with the girl. The physicians said it was some kind of nervous disease, they could not tell exactly what. She acted strangely and abstractedly. One day, she called for a pencil, and wrote down the names of some twenty persons; and when Mr. and Mrs. Rice looked them over, they saw that many of these were names of their relatives, while others were those of old acquaintances, who had been many years in the spirit-world; and more than half of them, they declared to me, their daughter had never heard of. From that time she began to speak; she was always deeply entranced; and on some occasions, twenty or thirty spirits controlled her, in the space of an hour, giving their names, residence, etc.; and in every case where they have corresponded with the persons living in the localities named, the statements, through the girl, have invariably proved to be correct. I have two cases of the correspondence between the parties. The spirit, in one, said, "My name is Augusta Jewett; my husband's name is William D. Jewett; we resided at South Berwick, Maine. We were married" at such a time, and had so many children. "I passed into the spirit-world" at such a time (giving the date). "Address a letter to my husband, William D. Jewett, of South Berwick, Maine, and you will get an answer." Mr. Clink, a brother-in-law of Mr. Rice, accordingly sat down and wrote a letter. He put inquiries to Mr. J., in the shape of several interrogatories, without assigning any very definite reason for asking the questions. He asked him if he had a wife named Augusta Jewett, if she was married to him at such a

time, and died at such a time, had so many children, etc. As they did not know there was such a place as South Berwick, they went to the Post Office Directory and found it. Mr. Jewett wrote to the postmaster at Madison, before replying, to know the character of Mr. Clink, so singular was the receipt of such a letter. The postmaster replied that Mr. C. had been county clerk, for some time, was highly respected, and was now an honorable member of the legal profession. Then Mr. Jewett answered the inquiries by saying: "Nearly all the questions you have asked, I answer in the affirmative. There are some things wrong, however; but so far as her name was concerned, the descriptions of herself, the time of her decease and marriage, they are all correct." On another occasion, a spirit said, —

"I am the spirit of Emma Sexton. My maiden name was Emma Stephens. My father's name is O. S. Stephens. My mother's name is Matilda Stephens. I died in Clinton, Lenawee Co., Michigan. I was married to Mr. Sexton the 1st of March, 1848, and died the 10th of the same month, and year, having scarcely lived out the honeymoon. Address a letter to my husband, Dwight Sexton, who is now living at Clinton, Lenawee Co., Michigan, and is yet unmarried."

On being inquired of if her husband was a farmer, she replied: —

"No, he is a villager."

The family did not know, in this case, that there was such a place as Clinton in Michigan. But Mr. C. wrote his letter according to the directions of the intelligence. He put the letter in the shape of six interrogatories, and to all those questions he received an affirmative answer, — "Yes," says Mr. Sexton; "but why do you ask these questions of a stranger?"

Now, this comes under the head of *mental* manifestations. It cannot be very accommodating. Facts are not accommodating. They will not bend to any theory. They are as fixed as the Infinite, himself. I would like to accommodate my brother, but facts cannot yield. As it will not accommodate itself to his little theory, of course, he will say it is humbug, and the parties deceivers. Such wilfulness and absurdity reminds me of the eccentric Irishman, who had built up a darling theory, regardless of facts; it was the idol of his heart, he rejoiced over it, he drank over it, he sang over it. But, said the logical Frenchman to him, "Here are facts; the theory is against them; it cannot be true." "Well, bad luck to the facts, then," said the Irishman; "the facts must go by the board; my darling theory will stand." This is my brother's ground precisely. If the facts will accommodate themselves to his a-b-c science of mesmerism, it is all right; if they do not, he denies the facts.

MR. GRIMES.

I should like, Mr. Chairman, to ask who has so much reason to say "bad luck to the facts," as the gentleman himself. He does not like assertions; and he has told you, a great many times, that I do not touch the point; and he thinks he gives facts, and not any assertions. Will you all remember that every fact, as he calls it, which he has introduced, he has *proved*, absolutely proved!

MR. MILLER. — Have I any proof of it, do you say?

MR. GRIMES. — I say you *have* proof of the facts you have brought forward. The gentleman has proved them. Shall I tell you how? By assertions. He has got a tremendous pyramid of facts, all resting upon assertions and nothing else. He has got raps, tremendous raps, that will convince anybody, and are proved by assertions! Not a rap can be produced, — yes, they did produce some — a committee went and heard some — but they didn't look to see where they came from. That is, they asserted it. And that

very medium that made these raps, is in the constant habit of making them, in public, all over the country. And when we ask for facts, they give us assertions. Tables grove, and pianos rise and bump against the wall;—that is a fact, you know, I will not deny fact. How does the gentleman establish that? By his assertion; and then turns around, and says I make assertions. Why, my dear friends, have you sense and reason? and do you notice that? Am I awake, or am I not? What do you call this that I am doing now? These wonderful facts are actually taking place, and they are proving them by assertions! If you went into court, and had a case of an old horse not worth five dollars, no court in the world would decide the case against you, on that evidence. And yet, my friend says we are not going to be held down to the technicalities of courts. This is a free country. We are going to be free—"Take facts, but we are not going to bring them into court." We have a letter from somebody,—Mr. Jones, I believe,—of Madison County;—if you don't believe the story, you can go and find out all about the man. *These are facts!* It is a "fact," too, that mental questions are answered, sealed up in envelopes, there being no chance to open them—it is fairly done. But that is not going to be proved by assertion. He is sick of that. I will choose three men. He will not have my three; that will not do. The three men shall present the names I write in the envelopes, and try the experiment. "Stop; I want three of my friends to accompany them." They get there, and present the envelopes. There is no answer. "Well, that is a mistake." Some things are done to which I did not consent, which were not my experiments, but done upon the authority of the individuals themselves; and the Spiritualists try to make them amount to something. I turn around, and say,—If you can do it in that way, if there is a mistake about it, if the medium cannot do as you state, but can do it in this way, I will submit to that: here, or there, or anywhere you please to go, in this world. I will go, and roll up the ballots, in the way her own conditions require; and if she will answer them, as they claim, I will never say another word against Spiritualism. I say Mrs. Coan cannot answer one mental question. You shall have every thing but a chance to cheat, and that I will not give you. I want to know if I am dealing in facts, or not. I will submit to any thing—if you do not get me where you can hurt me, particularly—any thing else in the world, that you want, for conditions, I will give you.

When I spoke of mesmerism, and said some of your manifestations could be accounted for thus, you will remember there was a very vague, general sneer, that I said I thought mesmerism was a humbug. I say the phenomena of mesmerism are, every one of them, produced by making impressions on the imagination. I have mesmerized, perhaps, as much as any man living; and I know, therefore, what I say, when I say that every one of the phenomena of mesmerism is produced by imagination. You can make a man's arm powerless, you can make him speak, and go to sleep and dream. And what they call "biology," and "psychology," is a pretence. It is all a mistake; and mesmerism is a more simple thing than they attempt to make it appear. I do not stand here to make assertions. I am ready, if there is a proper occasion, to substantiate all that I may say, on this point.

But "*facts*" is the word. I have but little time, and I wish to read a communication. We had a fact stated, in a paper in regard to a certain occurrence said to have taken place in this city; and I did not believe it; and my friend says I rejected it because it was not according to my theory. This paper I hold in my hand relates to some of your experiments with Mr. Squire. I received it, to-day, a gentleman whom I well know, one of the most respectable scientific gentlemen in this city.

"THE EXPERIMENTS OF MR. SQUIRE."

"PROFESSOR GAINES.—*Sir*: Mr. Miller read a manuscript paper last night (Friday, March 9) in proof of Spiritualism, which consisted of an account of some of the physical experiments of Mr. Squire. It is due to the public that some remarks or criticisms should be made in reference to that paper. Mr. Squire was a very prominent medium in Boston, a few years ago, and was referred to by the Spiritualists as one who was abundantly capable of removing the scepticism of all unbelievers in Spiritualism. Thus, he was visited by hundreds, if not thousands, of our intelligent citizens, who were anxious to have some evidence, if any could be given, of the truth of Spiritualism. Mr. Squire was the guest of Mr. Farrar, of this city, one of our most respectable citizens, who generously opened his house to the public, and granted to every one, so far as I know, an opportunity of witnessing the performances of Mr. Squire without any charge for admission. This proved the sincerity as well as enthusiasm of Mr. Farrar, who, I am sure, would not wilfully deceive any one.

"I called as a stranger, to witness the manifestations of Mr. Squire, and was admitted. I was shown into a room up-stairs, with several other visitors. The room contained a bed, a table, chairs, and other furniture.

"The experiments, we were told, would be performed in the dark. The spirits were unable to do any thing in the light.

"In the first experiment Mr. Squire took his seat upon the bed. The table, which was circular, was placed before him. He said the spirits would throw the table over his head upon the bed. The room was then made dark. He gave me his right hand to hold, so that I might be assured he was passive, and making no muscular efforts to move the table. Presently, a cracking sound was heard in the dark room, as if the table was moving. Mr. Squire, who was in the habit of making humorous remarks during his experiments, said—'There it goes—I feel it sliding over my nose.' In another moment, there was a heavy sound, as if the table had fallen. The light was restored, and, sure enough, there was the table, upside down, upon the bed. I should not have known, by holding the hand of Mr. Squire that he made any muscular effort.

"I said to Mr. Squire, and those present—'I think the spirits will assist me in performing that experiment.' No objection was made, and I took my seat upon the bed, with the table before me. I requested the room to be darkened. I gave Mr. Squire my right hand to hold, in imitation of the method he had pursued himself, I seized the further edge of the table with my left hand and found it an easy matter to bring the top or upper surface in contact with my knees; then, with a little manipulating, I was enabled to pass it upward over my face, and I felt the table, as Mr. Squire had expressed it, sliding over my nose. Whatever muscular exertions I made, I took care that they should not be communicated to my right hand, which was held passively by Mr. Squire.

"Another moment, and I was enabled to throw the table over upon the bed. I called for the light, which was restored. There was the table upon the bed, as every one saw, but not a word was said, by any one present, as to the nature of the experiment.

"Mr. Squire then proceeded to perform the *watch experiment*, which was detailed in the paper of last evening. The watch was placed in his hand, and his hand enveloped with handkerchiefs, securely tied and knotted. He said that the spirits would remove the watch from its place of confinement, which, to all present, seemed to be quite impossible. Mr. Squire, thus prepared, took his seat, with the rest of us, around the table, he having his hands under the table. The room was darkened. Mr. Squire called upon the spirits to remove the watch, as he had promised, and amused us with his witty remarks, for he was a very social and pleasant young gentleman. In the course of five or ten minutes he called for the light, and the watch was found upon a ledge just under the top of the table. Every one seemed to be lost in wonder, in consequence of this apparently incredible manifestation.

"I said,—'With the permission of the spirits, I will endeavor to perform this experiment also.' The watch, accordingly, was placed in my hand, which was enveloped in handkerchiefs tied and knotted in the most secure and unquestionable manner. No Egyptian mummy was ever more tightly swathed than was my hand on that occasion. I concluded in my own mind that the spirits would never succeed in extricating the watch. Under these circumstances, I took my seat, with the rest of the company, at the table, and ordered the light to be shut out, for my spirits were as averse to the light as those of Mr. Squire. I began to twist and work my fingers in every possible way, and in the course of five minutes, I found, greatly to my surprise, that I had extricated the watch from its multitudinous envelopes, and placing it upon the ledge under the table, I called for the light. I had the credit of a very successful manifestation, and for aught I know, it was considered in every way equal to that of Mr. Squire.

"Another experiment was this: Mr. Squire seated himself upon a chair, on the opposite side of the room from the bed, a distance, perhaps, of twelve or fifteen feet. The table, which was quite heavy, was placed before him. He said the spirits would throw the table across the room upon the bed, and this I knew was a feat which he could not accomplish by physical strength alone. I was satisfied that his manifestations, thus far, had been the result of deception and jugglery, and concluded, in my own mind, that he would perform the experiment now proposed, by approaching the bed sufficiently near to enable him to throw the table from his hands. This he could do in a dark room, without being observed. Accordingly, I proposed to take his hand, during this experiment, or at least to be in contact with his person, for in that case I knew that he could not move without my being aware of it. But he replied, at once, that the spirits would not allow of any contact with his person. It will be noticed, however, that in the first experiment, when the table was thrown over his

head upon the bed, the spirits allowed me to hold his right hand in mine; but in the last case, such a privilege or liberty seemed to be wholly out of the question.

"Mr. Squire took his seat upon the chair, to which he was tied, and the room made dark. Very soon we heard the sound of the table falling upon the bed. The light was restored, and thus the experiment ended.

"The chair had evidently been so adjusted to his person as not to embarrass him in his movements. Had he allowed me to be in contact with his person, he never would have given us the 'manifestation,' and why he refused this contact, must be apparent to every unprejudiced person present.

"I did not propose to repeat this experiment, although I could have performed it quite as easily, with the room darkened, as the two others which I have just narrated.

"These experiments were repeated over and over again, in the presence of hundreds of people. For many months they were the town talk. Many of my friends, whom I regarded not only as intelligent, but critical, believed in the experiments or 'manifestations,' and became willing converts to Spiritualism. For my own part, I felt that they were a gross imposition upon the public, and but for the fact that I was admitted to see them through the courtesy of Mr. Farrar, or those of his household representing him, I would have done what I could to expose them, in a newspaper article. Several years having elapsed, I was astonished, last night, to hear an allusion to those experiments as furnishing any proof of Spiritualism.

"I will say that I am a sceptic in Spiritualism, although, I believe, an honest one. I have been diligently seeking for manifestations for many years, but have never found any thing to satisfy my judgment. I believe in the full and perfect sincerity of many of the Spiritualists. I have thought that some of the 'physical manifestations' so constantly spoken of by my spiritual friends, might readily have taken place, but I shall be more careful than ever, how I receive an alleged fact on the Spiritualistic philosophy.

"I am unwilling to have my name made public, in this communication, even if it were of any consequence. Nevertheless, you are at liberty to make it known to Mr. Miller or Dr. Gardner, neither of whom, I am sure, will have any desire to go contrary to my wishes."

MR. FARRAR. — Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him one moment? There are two misrepresentations in the statement.

MR. GRIMES. — I shall have finished in a moment. I know the gentleman very well, who wrote the communication; but he said he did not wish to be brought out publicly in this matter. But he sat here and heard the former statement, and it seemed to produce an erroneous impression. He felt that he ought, in justice, to make this statement; and I asked him, when he mentioned it, that it should be in writing, in order that there might be no misunderstanding.

MR. FARRAR was permitted to speak, by permission of Mr. Miller.

MR. FARRAR. — Will you be kind enough to give me the name of the gentleman who furnished that communication?

MR. GRIMES. — I am only at liberty to give it to Mr. Miller and Dr. Gardner. They can furnish it if they please.

MR. FARRAR. — There are so many misrepresentations —

MR. GRIMES. — From my knowledge of the gentleman, I am sure he did not mean to misrepresent.

MR. FARRAR. — If it be the gentleman I have in my mind, perhaps there are reasons why he could not remember all that took place. I shall give no name.

MR. GRIMES. — Dr. Gardner and Mr. Miller can receive the name from me, and then my power is ended.

MR. MILLER. — The public, and the audience, want the best evidence; the second is good for nothing, you say.

MR. FARRAR. — I know of but one gentleman — I might call him so — who ever attempted to make the experiment of throwing a table over his head. That gentleman did not do it with the light shut off; it was in the light, and not in darkness. It was very plain how that was done.

It was in a manner entirely different. He has misrepresented it in saying that his hand did not exhibit muscular effort. He agrees that Mr. Squire did not; but all agreed that ~~his~~ did. He said, to turn it off, that if the spirits would give him a little more practice, he would do it.

Another word, in regard to the opening of the watch. That was never done in darkness, but always in light. Another fact is that the watch was not concealed; it was always in sight. I used a watch that I carried. It was suspended from his middle finger by a chain about six inches in length, the hand bandaged with two, and sometimes three, handkerchiefs. Once, I sealed his hand up in paper; and yet that watch was opened. The cap covering the works was dropped on the floor. That has been done a hundred times, under the like circumstances. It has been done with a mitten on his hand, with a hole for the chain. It was done under the table. I did not speak of the results which other people had seen, but I spoke of what my eyes witnessed. I sat apart from the circle, on the occasion to which I refer, and saw the hand, wrapped, as it was, in a handkerchief, and the watch plainly in sight, as well as his hand. After a very few moments, the watch slowly rose, without any apparent contact. It may be said that I was psychologized; — perhaps, sir, I don't see you, — but I think I do. I saw that watch rise, as plainly as ever I saw any thing; I saw it rise out of sight behind the frame of the table; it was gone, half a moment, it then fell, and, at the same time, the cap covering the works fell on the floor. The evening the gentleman was there, it was done the same way. The watch was not placed in the hand and bound.

MR. GRIMES. — It seems to me the gentleman has given a sufficient contradiction. I suppose you have contradicted the statement.

MR. FARRAR. — I contradict the statement. I believe the thing was never done otherwise, in my house. I know nothing of it, if it was.

DR. MATTSO. — I was the person. It was in the afternoon, not the evening. You were not present.

MR. GRIMES. — Dr. Mattson resides in Summer Street, No. 64. He said he hoped his name would not be brought out; but if it was absolutely necessary, and they carried the thing too far, he was ready to give it.

MR. FARRAR. — [To Dr. Mattson.] Were you not present on another occasion when this was performed, in the evening?

DR. MATTSO. — Only once, and that in the afternoon.

MR. FARRAR. — I can bring many witnesses who can say you were.

DR. MATTSO. — You are mistaken in the person, sir.

MR. FARRAR. — I am not.

DR. MATTSO. — Where are your witnesses?

MR. FARRAR. — I can bring them, sir.

DR. MATTSO. — If you can, it is a great marvel, sir, — greater than any I have seen.

MR. MILLER. — It may be the doctor is under psychological influence!

MR. GRIMES. — Do not attack the character of this gentleman. My acquaintance with Doctor Mattson is public and not private. He may be a man of bad character,

he may be a great liar, for all I know. He is a very respectable gentleman, so far as I know, and, I know, a very scientific gentleman.

MR. FARRAR. — Dr. Mattson was *not* the gentleman I referred to; I exonerate him. But he was at my house more than once.

DR. MATTSON. — I certainly was never at your house but once.

MR. FARRAR. — Well, that is a question.

MR. GRIMES. — I have met this gentleman, somewhat, professionally, but his private character and word I know nothing about.

DR. MATTSON. — I presume my character has nothing to do with this question.

MR. FARRAR. — Are you correct in regard to the holding of the watch in his hand?

DR. MATTSON. — The watch was wrapped up very carefully; I believe a mitten was used, which I have not mentioned in that communication. The watch was wrapped in the hand, and the handkerchief over it, and the mitten over the handkerchief; the object was to take the watch from the hand; and it was placed on a ledge under the table.

MR. FARRAR. — That was an experiment that I never saw Mr. Squire perform. He must have done it for your especial benefit, as you alone were present.

DR. MATTSON. — He did it on that afternoon.

MR. GRIMES. — Does Dr. Mattson say there were no other persons present but himself?

DR. MATTSON. — There were six or eight present.

MR. FARRAR. — Do you recollect any?

DR. MATTSON. — All were strangers, some ladies and some gentlemen.

MR. FARRAR. — At the time you were there, there were two ladies visiting me, from the country. I can bring the testimony.

DR. MATTSON. — It may possibly have been in the evening. I was there but once.

MR. FARRAR. — I know you were present in the evening.

DR. MATTSON. — I am confident, sir.

MR. FARRAR. — That was not the experiment to which I referred. Only the closing the watch in the hand, or extricating the watch from the hand, was spoken of. The doctor speaks of the light being shut off, in the afternoon. Yet it was in the dark, that this thing was performed! It never was done in darkness.

DR. MATTSON. — I am sure it was in the afternoon; for the windows were closed, and the light was shut out in that way. Were you in the habit of experimenting in the afternoon?

MR. FARRAR. — Not often, sir.

MR. MATTSON. — But sometimes?

MR. FARRAR. — Well, I may say it has been done. My house was open for all who had a desire to examine the matter. I never felt bigoted, on the subject, that this was the work of spirits, and do not now. I am open to conviction from any one. I opened

my house for every phase of mind to come in and examine the subject. I invited physicians; and even the Harvard professors came. Professor Felton treated me with the utmost courtesy, and, I am happy to say, I retain his acquaintance still, and we often meet, in good feeling.

DR. MATTSON. — I do not understand that I am accused of making any misrepresentation.

MR. FARRAR. — Oh, no, sir, except in this — but I don't say that in that you misrepresent in relation to that *afternoon* you were there; — I don't know but it might have been performed the other times. I know that was not the way it was usually done.

MR. MILLER.

I shall claim, here, a few moments, if my brother is willing. I wish the parties to settle that question, and then we will look to this gentleman's letter. I shall not occupy the attention of the audience, a great while. I wish to speak of this particular case. I ask my brother — as, perhaps, it belongs more properly for me to discuss the point here — what possible relation this negative testimony, which has been introduced to-night, has to the fact that was offered on yesterday evening. Let us examine it. Last evening, I presented a fact, — gave my informant's statement, as he had given it, in writing. And the fact was this, that while Mr. Farrar and Mr. Squire were together around the table, a pencil rolled off the table, and was thrown back. Mr. Farrar took that pencil and put it on the floor again, and it came back; and he asked Mr. Squire if he did it. "No," was the answer. He then put private marks on the pencil, and laid it upon the floor as before. He then held Mr. Squire's hands in his, placed his feet on Mr. Squire's feet, and again that pencil came up on the table as before. This experiment was repeated several times. Mr. Squire could not possibly use his feet, without drawing them around in such a way as to be observed by Mr. Farrar. He could not get the pencil between his toes, as he wore boots. This prevented all possibility of fraud. Here is a fact by itself. Now does my brother expect to introduce, here, some other failure, to render nugatory a positive fact?

MR. GRIMES. — No, no.

MR. MILLER. — He acknowledges the fact, then. One failure never renders nugatory a positive experiment. I went into a daguerreotypist's establishment, and the operator tried all day to get my picture, and had to give it up. A thousand failures do not affect one positive fact. The doctor has written, perhaps, what he believes to be true. But the other fact stands there, immovable as the Rock of Ages.

MR. GRIMES. — They are both true?

MR. MILLER. — They may both be true. It is a *truth* that I did not get my picture taken, with trying all day. It is a *fact* that pictures are taken.

Again, my brother takes occasion to speak of the report of that investigation, yesterday. There is one thing in that investigation, for which he can never account. I am, myself, really glad I proposed the investigation, as it shall go before the world and thousands shall read that six men wrote names in ballots, and, while writing, held the paper up before their faces in a manner to completely hide the pencil from the medium, and yet she read names from those ballots. Such was the fact, and his own witnesses will testify to it. Unless a man was a very awkward writer indeed, he would hold the top of the pencil down in writing, and the medium could not, of course, see its movements.

Further, six of those witnesses wrote names on pieces of paper, and then rolled them up into pellets so that thirty or more were found, all looking alike. Now, suppose Mrs. Coan had seen the top of the pencil, and knew by its motion that "Mary Collins" was written out: the papers were rolled up, and the pellets were each like the others, and all thrown together upon the table. Will my brother tell us how she could point to a particular ballot, and say, "that is the one containing the name of Mary Collins?" He cannot tell us. The gentleman, who wrote it, himself, did not know which pellet it was.

The audience and my brother will now excuse me from speaking further; for I have to speak here to-morrow afternoon and evening, and am in need of all the rest I can get. I shall be pleased to see my brother present, then; as I shall touch somewhat upon his favorite science of phrenology to illustrate my argument, introducing it to prove the fact of a New Dispensation at hand. In the evening, by request, I shall speak upon Apparent Evil and Positive Good, or the doctrine that "All's well that ends well." I leave the subject here.

MR. GRIMES.

I have no disposition to occupy time. The fact that I wrote as I did, and received no answer, tells its own story. And then, in regard to my friend's remark as to Mrs. Coan proving so much by her reading of the other writing. I have an individual present who can do all that Mrs. Coan can do; and if you will bring her out, I will bring the man, and you can see which will do best, at any time you please.

MR. MILLER.—I beg to state, here, in regard to the gentleman whom my brother has with him,—

MR. GRIMES.—Oh, I have no gentleman with me.

MR. MILLER.—As to the gentleman, then, who is so ready to imitate:—I reply that there is nothing but can be seemingly counterfeited. The individual you refer to, as I know, seems vacillating between two parties, and hardly knows where he stands. He can imitate, no doubt, many of the manifestations, and so can I, but it is another thing to have the genuine. And I am willing to show up all the deception possible. But there is the fact, that these gentlemen wrote those ballots, as has been explained, and they were mixed up on the table, and Mrs. Coan read them. Your imitator can never do it under such circumstances.

SEVENTH EVENING.

MONDAY, MARCH 12TH.

MR. GRIMES,

After a word of recapitulation of his course of argument on the preceding evening, proceeded to read the following paper:—

The phenomena of modern Spiritualism may be divided into those that depend upon mesmerism and those which are produced by imposition.

The reason why mesmerism is a means of misleading such a vast number of people, is that the theories or explanations of mesmerism have been so erroneous.

Mesmerism is so called from Mesmer, who attributed the effects to a fluid, or animal magnetism, which proceeded from his body, and especially from his hand, to the bodies of his subjects. This theory was repudiated by the report of Franklin, and the other members of the French Commission, appointed by the king to investigate the matter. The theory is, however, still adhered to by most mesmerizers. Franklin, and the Commission, attribute the effects to the imagination; and this, I have no doubt, is correct; and in my work on Human Nature and The Nerves, I have explained the manner in which the imagination is operated upon. Mesmerism first became popular, in this country, in 1837, in consequence of the experiments of Mr. Hartshorn, and Rev. Dr. Bonneville. Hartshorn also practised clairvoyance, or the art of seeing without the eyes, through the top of the head or through the side. This was exposed, and was supposed to be exploded by Mr. Durant, in a small book, published in reply to a pamphlet by Col. Stone of the *N. Y. Commercial Advertiser*. The belief in clairvoyance still continued, however, and is now almost universal. I confess that I have long supposed it to be true, in some peculiar cases; but it is due to candor to say, that through I have diligently endeavored, for several years past, to find a single undoubted case of clairvoyance, I have been unsuccessful, and I consequently begin to doubt it altogether.

The Baron Reichenbach of Germany, has published an account of his experiments upon what he calls *od*, or *odylic force*, which is but another name for the mesmeric fluid. His experiments and reasonings in favor of a species of clairvoyance, appear plausible, and to those who are not thoroughly acquainted with the subject, may be convincing, but I am confident that they only prove that many nervous and sickly persons have active imaginations, and that the baron, as well as his scientific translator, is very credulous. The Rev. Mr. Mahan, in his work against Spiritualism, supposes that he has explained many of its phenomena by clairvoyance. To make this explanation effective, he should have first demonstrated clairvoyance itself, which I have no idea he can do. The phenomena which he attributes to clairvoyance, are, to my mind, clearly referable to mesmeric credulity.

In 1842, Dr. Buchanan, of Cincinnati, claimed to have discovered that the phrenological organs could be excited, by touching the heads of mesmerized or impressible persons, in

a particular manner; and he proclaimed that by this means he had discovered many new organs and functions, both in the head and in the body. This new notion made so many converts, that I devoted several months to the subject, the result of which was that I published in 1844, a work entitled, *Etheriology, or the Philosophy of Mesmerism and Phrenology*, in which the whole matter was explained, by showing that the experimenters deceived themselves, and that the astonishing results were produced by operating, unintentionally, upon the mesmeric credulity and imagination of the subjects. Phreno-magnetism is now abandoned and almost forgotten. In 1850, mesmerism was presented to the public, under several new names: *Biology*, *Electro Biology* and *Psychology*, were the terms employed, for what was claimed as a new science, by means of which many diseases could be cured, and many strange and fantastic tricks performed. Some people now present, will recollect that Mr. Theophilus Fiske introduced this pretended new discovery into Boston, and they will also recollect that I gave a series of lectures and experiments in the Tremont Temple, to show that it was nothing new, but merely the same old mesmerism in a new guise. The phenomena were essentially the same as those described in my book published in 1844. *Biology* was sold as a secret, in this city, for ten dollars to each person initiated, and Fiske realized six thousand dollars, while I made one thousand in showing that it was merely an effect produced upon the body and the mind, by affecting certain faculties of the mind, especially reverence and credulity.

I now come to the conclusion of this history, by assuring you that all the honest mental phenomena presented by spiritual mediums, are the very same mesmeric manifestations, in a new form and under new names, and associated with the most sacred sentiments of love and reverence for our departed friends.

The best evidence may be given, that I am not mistaken in this view of the subject; for I pledge myself to reproduce all the honest phenomena of the trance state, such as unconscious speaking, and writing communications, apparently from the dead, but really from the heated minds of the writers:—unconscious table tipping—vision-seeing, seeing furniture move that does not move, hearing raps when no real noise is made, the healing of acute and sometimes chronic disorders, is produced by operating upon the minds of the patients, and in no other way. The pretence and belief that spirits have any thing to do with these cases, is unworthy of one of our country, and it is a positive disgrace to our city of Boston, that such a superstition can exist, especially among its respectable and educated people. Finally, above all, in a religious and moral point of view, this new doctrine and practice must be regarded as commencing in blasphemy and terminating in perdition.

I thought proper to state my views upon that matter, in as clear and brief a way as I could, to give a brief statement of the history of mesmerism; and, at least, you will, some of you, understand how it happened that when this Spiritualism came forward, I became its particular opponent. I did not volunteer to attack Spiritualism; it attacked me. I stood upon the defence. It is well known to some of you that, more than twenty-five years ago, I was lecturing upon phrenology, while I was a law student. I did not intend to continue it. But I happened to discover, as I thought, a certain classification of the organs, in phrenology; and when, afterwards, Dr. Buchanan said he could affect a certain class of organs, I denied it. At the same time, I could not explain the phenomena. I was in the same predicament as many people are in regard to Spiritualism. They say, "Here are the phenomena." A man touches certain organs of the head; and he shows the fact. Do you accuse him of dishonesty? I could not say that, but I was certain that it was false. And I recollect a conversation with Mr. Sumnerland;

in this city, in regard to biology ; where I agreed with him, that it was a humbug. It was claimed that biology was something new. What was it? It was taking a man perfectly awake, and operating upon him, and making him do essentially the same things that Spiritualism does now. It was the old mesmerism experiment, that Mr. Sunderland and myself have performed, thousands of times. And yet, men had the impudence to come into this city and declare it was a new discovery, and charge ten dollars, to each person, for teaching it. When Spiritualism came up, I thought there might be something in the rapping part. I knew there was not in Andrew Jackson Davis. He commenced while I was lecturing on mesmerism, in Poughkeepsie; and if I had not lectured there, you would never have heard of Andrew Jackson Davis. He became interested in the subject, and became a healing medium, and went into Connecticut, where he became acquainted with Brittan. It seems I started Davis, and he started Brittan, and he started Lyon and somebody else. They went like a row of bricks. And they have told me, sometimes, I was to be their great apostle, and perhaps I am doing that work now. I am trying to do it, but I work the other way. But certain it is that I have acted, from the beginning, with only one motive, and that is, the desire to develop the truth. I have led a life of investigation, as every one of you who knows me is aware. Now, in regard to Spiritualism. When the Spiritualists came out with their phenomena of pretended healing of diseases, I examined it carefully, to see if there was any thing in it more than, or different from, mesmerism; and I found it was not. The true test, as they themselves said, was the production of the like effects. They often said — "Why, Mr. Grimes, if this is no more than mesmerism, you ought to be able to produce the same phenomena that we do." At first, I had to try some new experiments; and I did not know that I could succeed. I had never seen a mesmerizer produce a tipping medium or a writing medium. The manner in which mediums wrote was something different from any thing the mesmerizer had ever done. But I went to work and tried an experiment, to make just such writing mediums as theirs, and I found I could. And I will enter into a contract to manufacture as many writing mediums as you want, at short notice and upon reasonable terms — just as good ones as you are. You may appoint a committee of your fairest men, and point out the difference. They may be different in complexion and stature — you know what I mean. I commenced a course of lectures in Mercantile Hall, and made a writing medium of a man whom I did not then know; and I ascertained, afterwards, that he was a member of the Legislature. He had never tried the thing, in his life; and in ten minutes he wrote a communication from his departed father, saying that he was happy in the spirit-world. He did not know how he came to write it; the whole thing was new to him, and he did not know how he did it. I really am not able to see the difference between this mediumship and that of the Spiritualists. If I am wrong in this, I shall take the greatest delight in being instructed by my eloquent opponent here.

MR. MILLER.

Mr. Chairman, and Ladies and Gentlemen: I am unable to see what bearing my brother's remarks, — or the great bulk of them, — have upon this question. The question is not whether phreno-magnetism is true; the question is not whether psychology, biology, and mesmerism, are all one and the same thing. The question is, — *Can the various phenomena known as modern Spirit Manifestations be satisfactorily and philosophically accounted for, without admitting the agency of departed spirits?* All that my brother has said, except some few general remarks, seems, to my mind, to have no bearing whatever upon the question. I have not, in the relation of my numer-

ous facts introduced here, night after night, even mentioned the name of a writing medium. Will my brother be so kind as to "attend" to the facts which I introduced for his consideration; and moreover, will he show us the logical consistency in rejecting certain facts that will not accommodate themselves to his theory, while those facts which are more obliging, but no better established, he is ready to receive on the slightest testimony? Now, I will give him a fact connected with mental manifestations; and it can be confirmed, over and over again, by witnesses living in this immediate vicinity. [Mr. Miller proceeded to relate the incident previously described as taking place at the house of Mr. Southworth, of Neponset. See page 17.]

My brother has told what he has done,—that he made Andrew Jackson Davis, and that but for him there would never have been such a man.

MR. GRIMES.—Did I say that?—have you not misstated what I have said?

MR. MILLER.—That we never should have had his brilliant productions.

MR. GRIMES.—That is a fact; but I didn't make him.

MR. MILLER.—I meant Andrew Jackson Davis as a clairvoyant: it is needless to catch me in words, for it is plain, to every one, what my language implied. I mean Davis, the clairvoyant, whose "Nature's Divine Revelations" has gone through some fifteen editions in this country, and several in Europe; who has awakened the mental and theological world from the sleep of ages. And should one of the young men who came forward the other night, in the professor's lecture-room, to be "developed" as a writing medium, ever become a president or senator, I do not know but my brother will claim the credit of promoting him. But this is not here nor there. My brother has done good; I know he has done good.

MR. GRIMES.—The gentleman seems to deny my veracity, I would say that Andrew Jackson Davis, in the very book which my friend spoke of, said he started in his career in consequence of my lectures.

MR. MILLER.—I did not deny that Davis came forward with others to be experimented upon; the gentleman may have mesmerized him; but Davis says that he did not.

MR. GRIMES.—I did not say I did.

MR. MILLER.—No: but you would lead us to infer that Davis and the world are indebted to you for his productions, simply because you went into a certain Dutch town in New York and mesmerized "zome folks," among whom was the lad Davis, whom you did not mesmerize; but who afterwards became a highly susceptible subject, and astonished the world. It is very possible friends, that all my brother claims, in relation to the matter, is true; and it is possible also that this discussion may lead thousands to converse with the angel-world and with the dear departed of other days. There is not a man living but is doing good, either directly or indirectly; and I often think that the exposé of Spiritualism does as much good as the advocate. I am not sorry that my brother is in the field. I can have no personal feeling: I expected to meet this opposition, and a determined one. There never was a theory of explanation advanced that has not done good. In the very outset, some writer came out with an explanation, published in the *Tribune* and other papers, exploding the whole thing. It was explained to be nothing but electricity, working in pine tables; and pine tables became popular in orthodox circles. The whole religious world breathed easier when they learned how simple it was. Pine tables were procured, private orthodox circles were formed, and,

for the amusement of the thing, they called upon the ghost of Old Dog Tray, or any thing else they chose; imagining it to be nothing but harmless manifestations of electricity; when lo! spirits stepped in and exploded the pine-table theory; and confounded the company of the presence of the dear departed! Thus does opposition and persecution do good when it is intended for evil; and I am thankful that, in the order of nature, every thing is overruled for good. Yes; my brother has done good; every opponent has done good; those who crucified Jesus Christ did good; those who burned Michael Servetus at the stake did good; those who opposed mesmerism and the gentleman's darling science of phrenology have done good. My brother is doing his work. "It must needs be that offences come; but wo to that man by whom the offence cometh."

I do not intend to follow the gentleman much longer, however, if he leaves the question; for what have a thousand of these things to do with this proposition? I propose, this evening, to offer such facts as I have to offer, and to-morrow evening to reply to his position, and sum up the argument.

I am requested to read a letter. It will be remembered that Dr. Mattson sent in a letter to be read, last Saturday evening, in relation to certain spirit-manifestations, so called, at the house of Mr. Farrar. Mr. Farrar feels that in that letter he was misrepresented, or that the facts in the case were misstated, and that the doctor must labor under a mistake, or has wilfully misrepresented.

"BOSTON, March 12th, 1860.

"LEO MILLER, Esq.:—Dear Sir,—Will you present the following history of Dr. Mattson's visit to my house, and what was done there? A gentleman called, one morning, giving the name of Dr. Mattson, and requested to see Mr. or Mrs. Farrar. I not being at home, Mrs. F. saw him. He stated to her that he had heard that we frequently had spiritual manifestations, and being somewhat interested in the matter, would like to be present at some sitting, if agreeable. She replied that we had many applications from our friends, and it would be impossible to accommodate all; but if he would call between three and four o'clock, I should probably be at home, and it would also be necessary to see the medium, Mr. Squire, who lived some distance from our house. At the time named he came; I was at home; Mr. Squire was there, and three ladies. He was told that the only manifestations we ever tried in daytime, were writing and the watch experiment. The latter was then shown him, precisely in the manner described by me. He was then told that we should have some of our friends, on an evening which was then named,—it might have been the same evening,—but of this I am not certain. On the evening named, he was present, with others. The usual course was pursued, among them the watch experiment, as has been described by me, and in no other way done or attempted. The gas was burning brightly at the time, and every hand placed upon the table, except one hand of the medium, from which the watch was suspended; that was under the table. This statement is substantially corroborated by the three ladies who were present.

"There are several errors in his statement respecting the manifestations which were made when the room was lighted, but as I have made no reference to any manifestations under such circumstances, I shall not notice them. As to his trials to accomplish the same things, no one of those whom I know were present on that occasion, recollects any such thing; but still it may have been the case. Mr. Bugbee, the chairman of Mr. Grimes' committee, has been at my house to witness these things, and it would be well to ask him if the room was light or dark, when the experiment with the watch was tried; also, whether the description I gave, as that of the doctor, was the mode used when he was present. Hundreds of others have visited me for the same purpose, and many are present to-night, who would doubtless corroborate my statement in this respect, if necessary.

"Yours truly,

"D. FARRAR."

I have conversed, myself, with persons who have been present, and no one has known, no one knows, of an instance where Mr. Squire attempted such an experiment as was described,—by holding a watch in the hand and covering up the watch. The chain was held upon the fingers, then a handkerchief, or something, fastened over the hand, and the watch held down below it. I would ask Mr. Bugbee, chairman of Prof. Grimes' committee, if such was the fact.

MR. BUGBEE.—That was the fact when I was present. He left the watch out; which was suspended by a chain, and then a handkerchief tied over the hand only.

MR. MILLER. — I presume there are other witnesses here who have seen this experiment at the house of Mr. Farrar: and as many as have, in the manner described, and never in any other way, will please raise their hands.

[A number of persons raised their hands.]

Here are some eight or ten. Any who have witnessed the experiment tried in any other way, will raise their hands.

[No response followed this call.]

I leave the audience to make up their own minds in regard to this matter.

DR. MATTSON, being allowed to reply, said: — I would like to know the difference of performing the experiment, whether the chain, merely, was held in the hand, or whether the entire watch. It is just precisely the difference betwixt tweedledum and tweedledee. It is a mere quibble, to escape from the truth. So far as my recollection serves me, the watch was held in the hand, covered by a mitten, as was stated the other night, and as I did not state in the paper. Then it was covered with a handkerchief. I am free to confess the room may not have been dark. It may have been light. But what difference would that make? The experiment, as you asserted, was performed with the hands under the table, where you could not see the trickery going on; and, therefore, it was of no consequence whether the room was light or dark. What I have stated therefore, was essentially true. The room was dark, however, in the table experiments: and why? Because he could not have performed them but in a dark room.

MR. MILLER. — Are you not discussing the question?

DR. MATTSON. — This is not the first instance in which you have attempted to gag witnesses who have come here.

MR. MILLER. — I simply object to your arguing the question.

THE CHAIRMAN. — This altercation is entirely out of order.

DR. MATTSON. — When a witness who comes here to testify, is accused of misrepresentation, he has a right to speak. I have something farther, which I have a right to say; and I claim the privilege of saying it, at another time — at any time you please, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN. — I sit here simply as chairman; and I understand my business is to keep order and to dispense the time, to each disputant, correctly. And if either debater sees fit to give away his time, I have nothing to say. Unless either does, I cannot allow it.

MR. FARRAR. — May I be permitted to say a word?

THE CHAIRMAN. — If Mr. Miller gives way.

MR. MILLER. — I give my time.

MR. FARRAR. — The gentleman says the difference is between tweedledum and tweedledee. The difference is just the difference between truth and falsehood. I stated, sir, that the evening you were there, the watch was depending from the finger, one hand only being under the table.

DR. MATTSON. — I do not believe I was ever there in the evening.

MR. FARRAR. — I have witnesses.

DR. MATTSON.—You had witnesses last night; and you took back your own words.

MR. FARRAR.—I have said all I have to say, and I will maintain it anywhere.

MR. MILLER.—I shall be sorry, indeed, if our time is to be frittered away in this manner. I read the gentleman's letter as he handed it to me; and the letter will go into the Report. If there is any personal feeling between the parties outside the discussion, it should be settled outside.

MR. GRIMES.

Every one will understand that I had no personal feeling in this matter. I did not bring the matter up. My opponent read what he called facts, which I did not consider any facts at all, and I took no notice of them. I stated what the rules of evidence are; and I believe he is a lawyer, himself, and knows them; and, indeed, he admitted my statement, and is disposed to say but little about it. He knows, and every lawyer knows, that if a man says a thing is in existence, he is bound to bring it forward if possible. If a man says he has a bear with sixteen legs, locked up there, and will not let you look at it, the inference is that it does not exist. He knows the old legal maxim, *non apparentibus non existentibus*. When he read that story about Squire, I took no notice of it. Every one who begins to talk about that, in this city, tells what an excellent man Mr. Farrar is,—that Mr. Farrar has lived here so long time, and everybody loves him, to show that Mr. Squire is not a imposter. It is not said that he is a very fine man. I have heard the contrary. It is said that Mr. Farrar is a very fine man, and therefore every one whom he admits into his house is a very fine man. It does not follow, because we respect Mr. Farrar, that we respect his ox, and his ass, and every thing that is in his house. A great complaint is made that I do not believe the stories told of these mediums. When they contradict nature itself, when all nature rises up to say they lie, they are very angry because I do not believe them. But when one man comes forward, as an honest man, contradicting nobody, but merely what he himself knew, he is stopped. He told, himself, in his letter, that Mr. Farrar was a respectable man, that he invited him courteously; and he told me, over and over again, till I was vexed with it, what a fine man Mr. Farrar was. I told him, "Never mind Mr. Farrar; let us hear your story." Even at the time, there was an outcry against Mr. Mattson's character; even before his name was made known, they began to attack him. They said they knew the man, and intimated that he was a little intoxicated. Then they said he was there twice. Then I understood Mr. Farrar to retract it.

DR. MATTSON.—After affirming it half a dozen times.

MR. FARRAR.—On inquiry, I found I was mistaken in the name.

MR. GRIMES.—That story was not understood. I have heard it said, to-day, that Mr. Mattson "backed out." After the lecture was over, a Spiritualist said to me, that Mr. Mattson was not a respectable man, and wondered that I introduced him. I told him I thought he was, though I knew him only as a scientific man: for, in my travels, I never met a man who knew so much about physiology, as he. I was told that if I went to the Merchants Bank, I should find out his character. I accordingly, to-day, sent a gentleman to the Merchants Bank, who inquired about his character. They said they knew nothing against his character, whatever; they had nothing to say against it; I supposed he owed the bank; and there are a great many honorable persons who owe

the banks and cannot pay. But the bank owed him. There was a dispute about a lost check, and they did not know who lost it; and Mr. Mattson had a written statement, from all the officers of the bank, that they had had the money; and they had nothing. One of the officers of the bank said that he knew him well, and was surprised that any thing should be said against him. But to-night, my opponent failed in the courtesy which generally characterizes him. He wants to know what motive people had to lie. What motive had this gentleman, — a professional man, — to lie? what motive has he, to tell a falsehood in regard to this matter? Beside, he does not stand alone. I have been told, to-day, that there was another witness. And let me say that if the trick is performed successfully a thousand times, you are to suspect a jugglery if it is once detected. *Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*. He may succeed a thousand times; if he is caught once, he is gone. If Squire has tried once, and been detected, he is caught. I understand that Professor Eustis, of Harvard College, went there and tried the experiment, and found there was nothing done but what he himself could do. I asked a couple of gentlemen, who had time to go, together, to Harvard College, and call upon Professor Eustis, to inquire of him what the facts were. And if either of those gentlemen is here, I wish he would rise and state what Professor Eustis said about that.

DR. F. S. GRIMES. — I would say, sir, that I called upon Professor Eustis, at your request, with another gentleman. He told me that in the month of May he went to the house of Mr. Farrar, in the evening, in company with Professor Felton, and Dr. Johnson, of Cambridge; that they witnessed several of these manifestations; that the table was drawn over the medium's head, upon the bed, in the usual manner. They also witnessed the watch experiment, — and another, in which the table was apparently suspended in the air. After the medium had performed this table experiment, — sitting with his back to the bed, in the dark, — the door was opened, so as to admit light into the room, and Professor Eustis, there and then, right in the light, performed the experiment that the medium had previously performed in the dark. He stated to me that he did this in the presence of Mr. Farrar, Professor Felton, and Dr. Johnson. He also witnessed this watch experiment, — the watch-chain being placed in the hand, the hand bandaged, and the watch suspended a little distance below the hand. He did not try that, himself, but watched the medium, carefully. While the medium observed Professor Eustis was looking at him, he seemed very diffident about performing the experiment; — he evidently didn't like too close examination of the matter, especially by Professor Eustis. But the professor's opinion, and that of every one present, except Spiritualists, — that is, Professor Felton and Dr. Johnson, — was that he did it by gradually working the chain up into his fingers until he could grasp the watch, and then loosening the case, — the idea conveyed being that as he held it suspended from his hand, where it was impossible for him to touch it, the spirits loosened the case and let it fall to the floor. Professor Eustis' opinion was that Squire did this with his fingers, it being a loose, rickety watch, the case of which being opened, it would fall off by a mere rap against the table.

With regard to holding the table above the head, it was declared that spirits would raise the table above the heads of those present, and touch the persons present on the head. The professor was careful to observe the circumstances of the experiment; and he there saw this man hold the table on his head, being a little taller than those present; and thus, by merely tipping his body a little, the medium could hit the heads of those around him. Professor Eustis remarked that Dr. Johnson would testify to these facts.

MR. GRIMES. — Did Professor Eustis say that they gave their opinion upon the character of the performance?

DR. F. S. GRIMES. — He said that the opinion of Dr. Johnson, Professor Felton, and himself, was that that medium was imposing upon the credulity of Mr. Farrar, and living at his expense, in his home.

MR. GRIMES. — Have you said any thing of your own accord, or have you reported merely what Professor Eustis said?

DR. F. S. GRIMES. — I have merely reported the conversation, — not in the precise language, but from impressions that I received from the professor, when I visited him at your request.

MR. MILLER. — [*To Mr. Grimes, Senior.*] Do you believe the statement that those professors make? and do you believe these facts occurred as they state them?

MR. GRIMES. — That is for the audience to say.

MR. MILLER. — Do you consider their testimony reliable?

MR. GRIMES. — The public know Professor Felton, and it not necessary for me to say any thing about him.

MR. MILLER. — Do you put confidence in their statements?

MR. GRIMES. — I decline to answer that. Is it not a little ridiculous for me to say that I have confidence in Professor Felton, President of Harvard College? I might as well endorse one of Mr. Farrar's notes.

MR. MILLER. — You think their testimony good, then?

MR. GRIMES. — Yes, sir.

MR. FARRAR. — On the occasion of these gentlemen's visits, the sitting was not public; and it was very different from what the young gentleman has said to-night, no such assertions having been made; and the only thing in regard to this watch matter, that was said, by Professor Eustis, was, that while his eyes were intently fixed upon the medium's arm, nothing was done; but the moment he withdrew his eyes, the cap fell to the floor. It was not a rickety watch, by any means; it had three cases, one of which was opened by a spring from the bottom. It was not the case that was loosened from the watch; it was the case of an old English watch, which, every one knows, is covered by a cap with a spring turning round. Three cases of the watch were usually opened, and that spring on the cap turned, which covered the works, and that fell to the ground. Now, any one can judge, whether a person with his hand firmly bound, with the watch suspended by the chain which I have now, — any one can judge whether a person so situated could probably perform the feat, as described by Professor Eustis to Dr. Grimes. The watch hung several inches below Mr. Squire's hand. And on one occasion, it was sealed up in paper. He could not get that up into his hand; there was not the slightest chance for him to hold it in any way, and by knocking it against the table to open three cases, one of them the face of the watch, closed by a spring at the bottom, which must be held up by the bended finger, the little spring inside turned, which held the cap, and the cap dropped on the floor.

As to Mr. Squire living at my expense, that is a wholesale falsehood. Mr. Squire had a father and mother, on whom he depended; and had beside, another calling. He was then studying law. He came to my house occasionally; he was never an inmate of my house, but merely came there when I requested him to do so, as I did very frequently, for the purpose of ascertaining the truth of these things. I wished every phase of mind to examine it. I should have been very happy, had I known you to be in

this vicinity, to have had you there. I sent an invitation to Professor Felton, to come when he pleased, — the house should be at his service. There were none but my own family, there, on the occasion of the visit of the Harvard professors — they had it all their own way.

These things were performed in my own family, and many others have seen them done; and no person has been able to detect the slightest jugglery. If it can be explained, let it be explained. I stand ready to be convinced that Spiritualism is humbug. I shall go about my business as calmly, to-morrow morning, if you explode it, as I shall, probably, believing it to be true.

One word more. The statement which I made was that I saw that watch. I did not say any thing that could be controverted. I merely mentioned that the watch, in my plain sight, was raised up for a little while, remained there, and then fell down in sight, and the cap fell upon the floor. That is all I said, and that the gentleman has seen fit to controvert by discrediting the entire experiment which he saw performed.

DR. F. S. GRIMES. — Allow me to say, it was the cap which fell to the floor, but that the case would be opened so that the cap could fall to the floor. That was what Professor Eugis said. At the same time, allow me to say, he spoke very kindly of Mr. Farrar.

MR. GRIMES. — Everybody does that.

DR. F. S. GRIMES. — He stated his impression, and that of every one with him, that Squire was a rogue, without doubt.

MR. MILLER. — I would suggest that my brother and myself conduct this discussion, hereafter.

MR. GRIMES. — No one on the other side seems to see the bearing of the matter. Let me tell the gentleman what the bearing is. My friend is all the time telling stories about something that happens in Madison, Madison County, New York, or in Ohio. When a story is told that happened here, persons rise in the audience, — I don't hunt them up, as it is well known that the lawyers do. One man rose, under the influence of his conscience, and told what he knew. That brought out another; and when he rose, his character was attacked. When Professor Felton was quoted, I was called upon to endorse Professor Felton's character. And the character of everybody that does not believe Spiritualism, or any of these wonderful stories, has to be upheld.

MR. MILLER. — I beg the gentleman's pardon: I asked if he considered their testimony reliable.

MR. GRIMES. — Oh, everybody heard what you asked, my friend, and everybody knows what you meant.

I beg leave to present another document. I think it will introduce another of these "facts." I read from the *New Orleans Crescent*, of February 29th, 1860: —

"DISAPPEARANCE OF DR. REDMAN. — We yesterday gave some account of the sudden disappearance of Dr. Redman (not Redmond; as we had it), the pretended Spiritual medium, who had for some weeks been astonishing and fleeing credulous people in this community; he disappeared in consequence of the arrival of Dr. Bly, who quietly went to work to show some of the victims how they had been deceived, and opened an office on Dauphine Street, near that of the swindler, that he might be ready at hand to explain the swindle to all who felt like calling.

"We were misinformed when we stated that Redman's cheating was first discovered by a well-known Spiritualist of this city. Dr. Bly, arriving quietly, and finding out the names of some of the most prominent of the victims, had an interview with this gentleman, and after astonishing him with raps and messages from departed friends, all done in such a manner as to baffle the closest scrutiny, developed the whole cheat to him, and requested him to visit Redman again, the latter not yet being aware of Bly's arrival. The gentleman went;

had another sitting with Redman; was this time able to see into the truth; and, instead of taking an impostor, and demanding the restoration of over a hundred dollars he had paid to him, Redman refunded the money, and in less than an hour from that time, he was off for parts unknown.

"Yesterday, we visited Dr. Bly. He satisfied us thoroughly as to what he professed. He produced what he called spirit-rappings, and produced written messages from our dead friends, in a manner as perfect as we ever saw at any Spiritual sitting or circles, at many of which we have been present. He told us before he began that he was only going to humbug us; and believing this we were still profoundly astonished, for we were utterly unable to detect the humbuggery. Afterward, when the doctor explained the tricks, and put us in the way of doing the same things as well as he, we will freely confess that our astonishment amounted to the nothing. There never was a cheat so simple. The "California ball game," and the other scientific tricks with which swindlers decoy cash out of the pockets of the unwary, must hide their diminished heads before these pretended Spiritual manifestations, by which Redman and other robbers have reaped so much money from the unsuspecting multitudes."

There is another one of the acknowledged mediums, one of those men who stands between us and the spirit-world, whom my friend Dr. Gardner, — who, I think, certainly acted honorably, himself, — took to the professors of Harvard College, to pour a flood of light into their benighted minds.

MR. MILLER.

Mr. Chairman, and Ladies and Gentlemen: I have not called in question the veracity or integrity of my brother's witnesses. It is unnecessary to make any personal attacks. But I will again repeat, that one denial never disproves an affirmation, — that one counterfeit, one fraud, never destroys a single fact.

And now in regard to this testimony. I asked him if he considered Professor Felton's testimony reliable. I did not ask him in order to call in question the evidence, but simply to make my brother commit himself, one way or the other, as to whether human testimony is reliable or not, though this would seem unnecessary since he makes such free use of it himself. Mr. Eustis stated, to Professor Grimes' son, that he saw certain things by the aid of light coming through a slight opening of the door; and this is introduced as good evidence. Now, what I wish to ask is, does he take this as reliable evidence, to establish his negative position? and if so, by what rule does he set aside my affirmative proof? I believe that human testimony is good. God has not given us eyes to deceive us, nor has he given us so much marvellousness that we shall always be led astray by it. But it is doubtless true that strong prejudices have often blinded men's vision, so that they are hardly capable of seeing things in their true light. Prejudice operates as far, and even further, in obscuring the mind, and the vision, as the most unbounded credulity. The testimony, therefore, is to be received and weighed carefully, on both sides. But, I have brought forward a man who testifies that he has seen and does know. Now no amount of negative testimony can set this aside; and particularly when the witness says he did not see that thing, but saw something else.

One word in regard to the motive which would induce these men to practise deception. I can see a thousand times more reason for one man to practise deception, than for another, in this matter; and I will tell you wherein. I do not wish to be understood as accusing either party of dishonesty; but simply say this to show the fallacy of such an argument. Mr. Farrar holds unpopular opinions, and without any personal interest defends them amid all the prejudices of society. It can be of no possible interest to him, in the world. Unpopular opinions are generally cherished in sincerity. How is it with Dr. Mattson? I need not select him, as an individual; but how is it with the medical profession? It is manifestly for their interest to drive back the spirit-world, if so be they come to heal the sick; that they may be allowed to drag humanity, till they

have drugged it into the grave. My friends, I have seen this spirit of persecution; I have known of homœopathic physicians being tarred and feathered, because their system was making an innovation upon their regular practice of "bleeding and blistering." I say there is a thousand times more motive for the doctor to be dishonest, than for the medium whom he represents as a humbug. I have read Professor Grimes' book. He states a case that occurred in the presence of Dr. Bell of this city, where a girl, without remuneration, and not a public medium, was detected, as he affirms, by himself, in deception, pushing the table with her feet. Now what is the difference in the motive for dishonesty? For a seemingly conclusive *exposé*, Professor Grimes gets, from a prejudiced world, a thousand dollars; whereas the girl gets not a farthing, but subjects herself to all the reproach and scorn which any such thing would naturally inspire in the minds of those who are ignorant of the facts. And I may say the same of the Harvard professors: it is for their interest to oppose the spiritual philosophy. It is making innovations upon their system of education, I confess. Have they not exclusive ideas of education, wrapped up in selfish interest? And is it not important for them that the young and old should be trained up in this "learned ignorance"? When spirits of the other world will teach men to speak in different languages, when they will inspire Andrew Jackson Davis to promulgate a philosophy which enlightens the world, what will be the need to plod through the colleges, and over the dusty pages of the past to obtain "a finished education"? Here is a young man of thirty-five, who has written some dozen different books, without the aid of this learned ignorance; books which will live when Harvard College is forgotten. And so I might proceed with the Church. Spiritualism is making innovations upon some of their men-made doctrines; and, therefore, they find it for their interest to misrepresent Spiritualism. Have they not always done so? Was not Christ misrepresented and traduced? And why? It was because he uttered truth not found in their creed-bound institutions; and they crucified him for it; and the same spirit exists to-day.

Now, a word in regard to Mr. Redman. Mr. Redman I presume, is not above temptation. That he should be tempted is no matter of wonder. There have been but few above temptation. Why, the meek and lowly Nazarene, the martyr of Calvary, selected his twelve disciples; and one was a Judas, and betrayed his master for thirty pieces of silver. If Jesus Christ, with his knowledge and wisdom, would select a man who could be bought for thirty pieces of silver, shall we say that Redman was above the temptation of a thousand dollars? No; it proves nothing whatever. A medium is desirous that the manifestations occur; and when circumstances and conditions render it impossible for spirits to communicate, he may be tempted to get up a wretched imitation; but it is almost always detected. Let us here give a statement of fact, written and authorized by Dr. Bell, of this city, in regard to raising a table, through this same medium, under circumstances which precluded the possibility of deception by any one.

CHARLESTOWN, March 10, 1860.

DEAR SIR,—I have a distinct recollection of the experiment made about the first of July, 1857, when we weighed, by a spring balance, each end of a table as it was made more or less ponderous by some medium power exercised through Mr. Redman. So far as my ability enables me to discover the facts, I did not then feel, nor do I now have, any doubt but that the difference in the weight, which amounted to many pounds;—how many I do not at present recollect, was produced by some occult cause, in no way involving fraud or trickery on the part of the person exhibiting the experiment. I do not undertake to explain the nature of the influence producing this phenomenon, but so far as I am qualified to appreciate or observe what occurs before my eyes, I cannot admit that there was juggling or self-deception in the matter.

"Yours truly,

L. V. BELL.

"P. S. This experiment was made at noonday, before quite a number of editorial gentlemen, in the same room and with the same table which had been used with the Harvard committee a few days previously."

"To Dr. H. F. GARDNER."

"B."

I have also another statement.

"We hereby certify that we were witnesses of the following phenomena at the house of F. G. Pope, No. 11 East Springfield Street:—

"Miss More, a medium, stood at a pine table, four and one-half feet in length, but not in any way coming in contact with it. A bright gaslight from a two-burner chandelier over the table, was burning brightly. After a few minutes each of us was requested to raise the table from the floor. Each of us tried the experiment, but was unable to raise the table over one inch from the floor.

"Mentioning this fact to a friend one day, one of our number, Mr. Steaton, was told it must be only imagination on our part, and was told to take a pair of steelyards and weigh the table before the medium took her position near it, and to use the same means of deciding as to any increase in weight, after the table had been, as was alleged, made heavier by some unseen force.

"The weight of the table was ascertained to be seventeen pounds. When the medium announced that the table was in readiness for the test as to increased weight, the steelyards were applied, and the spring was extended to its utmost length, without raising the table from the floor, at a weight of twenty-four pounds.

How much more it would have weighed, we don't know—that was the extent of the steelyards.

"It was then announced that this unseen power would lighten the table; and directing the balances to be applied, the weight of the table, raised from the floor, was found to be twelve pounds, or five pounds less than the table weighs when not charged with any force foreign to itself as a piece of furniture.

"RECAPITULATION."

Weight of table,	17 lbs.
Weight when charged more than	24 lbs.
Weight when lightened, as claimed by spirit force,	7 lbs.

"This trial took place in January, 1868.

"W. F. TUCKER,
"GEO. J. THURSTON,
"CHARLES O. HOLTON,
"F. G. POPE.

"Boston, March 12, 1860."

Now, if human testimony is as good as the gentleman says it is, if Dr. Bell has eyes to see, and the gentlemen who have signed these papers are not wholly bereft of their senses, why, then, here are some pretty stubborn facts for my brother's consideration. Dr. Bell has invited scores to his house, and among others Dr. Ray, to witness the mysterious moving of a large dining-room table, through the medium of a young girl. Dr. Bell told Dr. Ray that Professor Grimes had been at his house, and that he had professed to have detected the girl in deception.

Dr. Ray watched, with all the care in the world, and could detect nothing of the kind, and concludes that it could not be done by any such process as Professor Grimes said he had discovered. Dr. Ray tried to move the table with his feet, as Professor Grimes suspected the girl to do, but could not move it more than six or eight inches; and yet, that table has often been seen to move, rapidly, in midday, through two or three rooms, and at the threshold of the doors would rise up and pass over. And now I ask if the testimony of Dr. Bell and these witnesses is not good? They have testified, positively, that they *have* seen; others have testified negatively, that they have *not* seen. Which shall we accept?

MR. GRIMES.

The gentleman is very unfortunate in the cases that he cites. He states that that same Redman—actually, that same Redman—just whipped out of New Orleans, came here, all prepared for a modern miracle, to be performed in the presence of this "Judas;" and then the gentleman talks about human testimony.

MR. MILLER.—Dr. Bell is the witness.

MR. GRIMES.—Now, then, one word of Dr. Bell. The gentleman is still more un-

fortunate there. The question before the meeting, of which my friend talks so much, and says I do not take any notice, and which he sticks to so closely, is,—*Can the various phenomena known as Spirit Manifestations be satisfactorily and philosophically accounted for without admitting the agency of departed human beings?* Now Dr. Bell has seen all these things; and to what conclusion does he come? That they are not done by spirits: he told me so himself, and published it to the world, a long time ago. A little unfortunate, that quotation!

MR. MILLER.—I would explain here —

MR. GRIMES.—That fact cannot be explained, at all. Dr. Bell has told me, himself, and has told the world, the facts. Dr. Bell, let me tell you, would not wish to be known as a Spiritualist. He is just as much above it—oh, I beg your pardon—some of you are Spiritualists—I forgot that.

MR. MILLER.—If you will allow me an explanation, according to the rules, I would like to make it. I would state, to my brother, that I do not claim it is the work of spirits. They are the “so-called spirit-manifestations;” it is the gentleman’s business to explain them. I occupy the negative, and ask for a “satisfactory” explanation, according to the question.

MR. GRIMES.—Yes, exactly: that is it. That whenever a juggler performs a trick, I have got to show that it is not a spirit; I have got to account for it in some other mode; I have got to wait till he runs away, or is driven out of the city, for robbery; and then the gentleman will admit that so far as that medium was detected, he was wrong,—that the very tricks in which Redman was not caught, are all good and genuine, but where he was caught, that was a little wrong—just a little. Then he spoke of Davis, and told what a tremendous man Andrew Jackson Davis was; and he said I undertook to make out that I made Davis. I said nothing about what I did, except what Davis’ own book says. And as to my claiming it—faith! I am ashamed of the whole thing, if I was the father of it. I denounced the brat, and did all I could to kill it. And Spiritualism lives in spite of me; and because Spiritualism is getting kicked out of good society, its opponents say it is down, because it is not fashionable. But let me tell those who say so, that they are mistaken. It was never increasing faster than now. And I will tell you the reason: it has got down into a more numerous and a lower class. Spiritualism, its believers say, is running like wildfire: and it is. But who ever knew the truth to run like wildfire? I never did; truth is confined to a few; it is error that runs like wildfire, not truth. When was truth ever popular? Put truth up for the Presidency, to-morrow, and it will be defeated by an overwhelming majority; it is not an available candidate. Truth is like a straight bar of iron, that will not bend, popular or unpopular: error is like plaster of Paris,—it will fit into any thing: and that is the reason why error is popular and truth is not. Errors are like caterpillars; they live and increase and grow as long as they can find any thing to feed upon. That is the reason why Spiritualism is popular and increasing. As long as there are superstitious minds, the Spiritualists need not be alarmed about Spiritualism. Let them go to those who are superstitious: those low passions to which they pander so much will keep them well supplied with disciples.

The gentleman is so fond of “facts” and “cases,” that I must allude once more to the Report of the Harvard College committee. Here is the testimony. The committee consisted of Professors Pierce, Agassiz, Horsford, and Dr. Gould. The *Courier* offered five hundred dollars, and appointed these men to arbitrate the question of the payment

of this money. Dr. Gardner took up the offer; he came forward like a man, and I honor him for it. "I will bring forward," he said, "the best mediums I can." If he failed, it was not for want of courage. He brought forward the Fox girls, the Davenport boys, and this same Redman; — a fact which shows the entire confidence of the Spiritualists in Redman. What was the result? It is a long story. After giving the full account of this failure, the committee say: —

"We leave with little ceremony, deeming it conclusive; the Spiritualists hang their heads and make no reply; Dr. Bell comes out with us and pronounces it an unsuccessful trick."

Very respectable man, that Dr. Bell!

"Thus ended the session. . . Nothing was done; by the most famous mediums which could be collected, in the country, far and near, except a little rapping by the Foxes, easily traceable to their persons and easily done by others without the pretence of spirits; —"

If you doubt that, I can bring men here, who can do that, in three minutes —

"not a table or piano lifted, or any thing moved a single hair's breadth; not a bell rung, not an instrument played upon; nor any phenomenon or manifestation exhibited or even attempted. Be ends this ridiculous and infamous imposture."

These are pretty "respectable" men! — this is "human testimony"!

"If, therefore, upon such a trial, at a meeting held under the most favorable circumstances, — with a pecuniary stake depending, of value enough, that we cannot suppose operators who exhibit for a dollar or two to be indifferent to it, — and with every opportunity, means, and motive to do their best, the Spiritualists actually did nothing — the inference seems to be inevitable to a rational mind, that upon other occasions, nothing to sustain their spiritual pretensions could have been done, and therefore that nothing was done."

I could give you a great deal of it; but that is beautiful, that I have given. It is human testimony. I have said that if the Spiritualists are to give human testimony, they must bring the thing itself, not a statement that they can do it. They have not dared to try it, except in the case of Mrs. Coan, and then they failed. They have said that after the committee had got through with my tests, its members did something more. I have offered to repeat that experiment in the way proposed by Mrs. Coan, and, as the Spiritualists claim, successfully tried by those gentlemen. They cannot do any thing but brag of what has been done, and of what will be done, some time, when the "conditions" are right.

If I have sufficient time remaining, I will read a letter. I would not enter into this kind of discussion, but that my friend forces me to do so. He says he will introduce human testimony and nothing else. If I pretended there was a gold field, and, instead of showing the gold, brought people here who would say they had seen it, I should be laughed at. It will not do to bring in human testimony for such purposes. When you buy goods, you want to see a sample. "Just let me see it." "But it is away down out of the way; won't you take my word?" Show the goods! — But let me read the letter. It was sent to me, by a gentleman; and, in courtesy, I must read it. It is written by Mr. Kellogg, a gentleman on the committee, and approved, certainly, by another member of the committee, Mr. Bugbee.

"Boston, March 12th, 1860.

"Prof. J. S. GRIMES, — Dear Sir: — As much stress has been laid by your opponent in debate, Mr. Miller, upon the fact that your committee, appointed, last week, to test Mrs. Coan's ability to read the contents of sealed envelopes, tried certain experiments with names written on pellets, and written out by the medium; — we think it proper to state that these experiments were tried at the earnest solicitations of Mrs. Coan and her friends, after two of the committee had repeatedly declined to go beyond the commission entrusted to us, and after we were placed by them in such a position that we could not refuse further, without seeming unamiable and obstinate: — That we plainly intimated that it was exceeding our delegated office, and should not be

connected with the proposed test:—That two of us were novices in such experiments, and took no unusual precautions against imposition, although we cannot accuse any one of practicing deception upon us:—That being rather forced to make the experiments, and not having been charged with scrutinizing any such trials of skill, we felt comparatively little interest in it during its progress, and now see several ways in which we might have been deceived:—That the fact that both of those who were novices in the matter, did write so that the names on their pellets were correctly given, while those written by our chairman, more guardedly, and in another part of the room, could not be given, makes it proper for us to infer that his precautions prevented the medium from reading his names, and that similar precautions would, in every case, prevent the success of the experiment:—That we protest against any use being made of all such informal and incidental action connected with our commission, and submit to the parties that the public have no right to question any thing beyond our legitimate action on the experiment proposed by Mr. Miller, which, for the reasons heretofore given, was not successful:—And that we further protest against a counter-report handed in by Mr. Miller's friends, which referred only to incidental and unauthorized experiments, and *entirely omitted* to state that Mrs. Cogg did call upon the spirits to inform her of the contents of the envelopes, and could get *no response*.

"In justice to ourselves, we beg you to make use of this to correct the erroneous impression which remains in the minds of many.

"C. D. Kellogg."

I said, and I now say, that nothing could be done by them. Amidst all that has been given through mediums, not one new idea, so far as I know, has been given. These Harvard professors, who have been spoken of so contemptuously, *have* given to the world new ideas. The Spiritualists cannot complain that they want the conditions; for I have offered to go anywhere with them, and to submit to any conditions. If there has been any thing unfair on our part, I cannot see it.

MR. MILLER.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentleman: I have, night after night, introduced the testimony of reliable witnesses, in regard to facts. I have testified to what I have seen; and yet, my brother has not in the least deigned to notice it. He seems to have taken pains to talk all around the question. He read a lengthy article, here, to-night, as the Report of that Harvard committee. And what is that Report, ladies and gentlemen? It is simply that they did not see any thing. Hundreds have gone to Professor Grimes' lectures, expecting to see mediums developed—

MR. GRIMES.—I beg pardon: I did not do justice to that; I did not read the whole Report. They did see the Davenport boys try experiments; and it was an unsuccessful trick.

MR. MILLER.—I say hundreds have gone to see the gentleman make mediums, and psychologize subjects, and have gone away and reported that nothing was done. Three men go into court to swear that they saw a certain transaction in the streets; and three men say they did not see it; and now my brother says the negative evidence is going to neutralize the positive testimony in the case! And further, when my brother brings in rebutting testimony, I would advise him to get a man who can remember for five minutes that he wrote down the name of a spirit-friend! Yet he brings in a lengthy letter from that gentleman, detailing what has occurred.

MR. GRIMES.—I want to know whether that gentleman means to charge Mr. Kellogg with falsehood?

MR. MILLER.—No; but that, according to his own confession, he has a very treacherous memory.

MR. GRIMES.—That is it? That gentleman is one of the most respectable merchants in the city.

MR. MILLER.—But his memory may be short, nevertheless.

MR. GRIMES. — You were very tender with Mr. Farrar. He is an intimate friend of Mr. Farrar.

MR. FARRAR. — He is an intimate friend of mine; I endorse his character.

MR. MILLER. — I have no objection to endorsing his character, myself. Yet, is it not strange that a man should write a name upon a piece of paper, — the name of "Mary Collins," — and that when that name is shown him, three minutes after, he should have no knowledge of it? I am inclined to think he was flurried and bewildered. No man is properly capable of making such a statement as he made in that letter, if he was in the condition of mind in which that gentleman's forgetfulness of the name he had written, shows him to have been. I have not impeached his veracity. Over-excitement prevented his knowing what was going on.

MR. GRIMES. — That is what he said, himself.

MR. MILLER. — Then he is not prepared to write such a letter.

MR. GRIMES. — That does not follow.

MR. MILLER. — I have introduced well-substantiated facts, and begged of my brother to meet these, instead of going outside of the question, in search of some fallure, or supposed doctrine, to offset them. I have asked him to explain the phenomena at Mr. Southworth's house. Not one of my many facts has he touched. He has demurred to the presentation of a report on our side of the house.

MR. GRIMES. — I did not.

MR. MILLER. — In the letter you just read, such was the case. And, I say, the very night when I called upon the chairman of the committee to make the Report, my brother rose, and rather demurred, until he saw his inconsistency, and perceived that the audience desired to hear the Report.

MR. GRIMES. — I did not say a word about it.

MR. MILLER. — Well his own committee did, and he endorsed it.

MR. GRIMES. — What is that to me?

MR. MILLER. — He has read a letter, to-night, blaming us for bringing in a Report embodying as important truths as could be presented on this occasion.

MR. GRIMES. — Treacherous memory, that!

MR. MILLER. — Not one explanation has he made, in regard to one or another class of facts. He has in a wholesale manner denounced them as trickery, jugglery, and fraud. He has, from the beginning, denounced nine-tenths of all the trance-mediums, and all the physical mediums, as dishonest. But yet, when I allude to the credibility of his testimony, he really implores me not to cast the least reflection upon the character of his witnesses, or those who sympathize with him.

MR. GRIMES. — I did not; I merely asked you if you meant to do so. I did not object. Do it if you dare.

MR. MILLER. — When I said his friend, Dr. Mattson, might possibly be psychologized, he rose, and said, "Oh, don't, don't! he is honest," — or something to that effect. Yes, my friends, he has some respect for the feelings of those whom he respects. He will not attack the character of Mr. Farrar, Mr. ———, or any one who occupies a high position in this city; but on a poor, defenceless woman, one whom the popular breath

would denounce, he will, with the rabble cry "Humbug!" and "Impostor!" and attack her without mercy. One who floats on the breeze of popular favor, he will pass by; but a defenceless woman he hesitates not to pronounce an unmitigated humbug.

MR. GRIMES. — What woman?

MR. MILLER. — You did, on Saturday evening, pronounce Mrs. Coan a humbug.

MR. GRIMES. — Well, she is.

MR. MILLER. — You see, friends, how ready he is to acknowledge it. From the beginning, instead of seeking truth, he has endeavored to suppress it; instead of meeting my arguments and facts, he has studiously avoided them; instead of introducing science, philosophy, and reason, he has unblushingly paraded before you the vulgar cry of "Humbug!" "Imposture!" "Trickery!" "Blasphemy!" and last, though not least, himself! and what he has done. He has not given us one explanation. But these facts shall be piled up. I know they are overwhelming him, and he, in his struggle, is trying to throw dust in your eyes by talking of what certain men have seen, and of what he can do. He has told us about his experiments in mesmerism; and no one can tell, from what he says, what he believes mesmerism is, unless they have read his book; and then, it is doubtful. I have read it; and he there seems to deny clairvoyance. He has not said that mind acts upon mind, though he has inferred it.

Now, my friend has said a word about Spiritualism going into the lower classes. Why, friends, do you know who are Spiritualists? Is it necessary for me to name such men as Robert Dale Owen, Ex-Governor Tallmadge, Judge Edmonds, Ex-Senator Simmons, William Gregory, of Scotland, the Emperor Napoleon upon his throne, and a large number of Representatives in the councils of this nation? It is among the lower classes! Is it necessary for us to mention such men as Mapes, and Hare, and Bishop Clark, of Rhode Island, who has investigated this matter, and says it is worthy of all respect and investigation? My brother may make up faces, and endeavor, by his queer smiles, to excite laughter; yet he cannot disprove these facts. Thousands all over the world, are daily realizing the truth of Spiritualism. In Oswego alone, over two hundred and fifty persons have been excommunicated from the churches, because they have said they believed that the spirits of just men made perfect are "sent forth to minister unto them that shall be heirs of salvation." And yet, it is "going among the lower classes!" Friends, if you wish to know that Spiritualism is true, form your own family circles; and angels will come, and give you the most undoubted proof of its truth. My friend says it leads to immorality and vice. You know better. Does he believe that it would make him a worse man, to feel and know that his father, mother, sister, or brother, were by his side to-night? Talk as you will, it must have a salutary influence, so long as man is tempted and needs restraint. What greater influence can be brought to bear than their presence? It may be said, indeed, that the eye of God is upon us always. Men commit crimes under the cover of darkness, when the eye of God is upon them; yet, when the eye of a sister or mother is upon them, the evil man will shrink back in dismay. When the young man took his first cup of intoxicating liquor, and raised it to his lips, on whose account did he tremble most? It was because he feared his mother might know it, or his sister hear of his debauch. Had he believed his mother or sister would have known it, his arm would have been paralyzed, ere he raised it to his lips. Does it look reasonable, that the moment I become convinced that a sainted mother or sister hovers over me, I would plunge headlong into vice? or does it appear to you that it would restrain and strengthen one in the hour of temptation? While I was lecturing

in Illinois, a young man said to me he had buried a mother, a brother, and two sisters, in the past year. He desired evidence of immortality. Now I ask, how could that man, with a belief in Spiritualism sit down and deliberately plan the ruin of an innocent and virtuous girl, when he realized that a sainted mother stood before him, a sister on either hand, and a brother in the midst? You know it would be a moral impossibility; every honest man in the house feels that such belief as this would have a saving, refining influence upon the human heart; and none but a fiend of darkness could entirely disregard it.

If my brother is going to depart from the question altogether, if he is going to talk about the tendencies of Spiritualism, let him show wherein the principles are demoralizing; and point out wherein we are made worse by believing we are surrounded by those we love most. Such weapons as my brother uses are illegitimate; though he is borne in mind that these are the only weapons ever used, and that he who uses them the most recklessly, obtains the most applause from the foes of Spiritualism. The spirit of persecution exists to-day, as it did two thousand years ago; and he who will loudest call "Deception!" and "Immorality!" will receive the aid of the popular Church. In the popular Church, indeed, there are many good people; but there are also as flagrant violations of the precepts of Christ, as are to be found in the world. In one of your own churches, in this city, a member was dying for want of food. She had three children, one a babe. One of the mothers in Israel took a pail, and went around taking a subscription to procure something for the starving young ones of that poor woman, who was without a cent. She went to a member of the same church to which the poor woman belonged, a man estimated to be worth a hundred thousand dollars, to solicit aid; and the professed follower of the meek and lowly Jesus, went into another room, and brought out a bag from which he took a handful of ginger snaps, and said, — "Soak these in water, and let the baby suck them." The physician declared that the poor woman had not food enough to supply her babe with milk. The lady went to a Spiritualist, who said he would aid the poor woman, and did supply her with food for four weeks, and paid her house-rent. These churches have lost the spirit of Christ. So far as they are based upon popularity alone, with little regard for principle and for Christianity, so long will I raise my voice against them. They "are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness." Why is the popular Church willing to strike hands with the rabble, to-day, in opposing Spiritualism? Is it because the world is converted to Christianity? No; it is because Christianity is converted to the world; they have departed from the principles which Christ and the apostles taught.

One word in regard to evidence. My brother knows that there are a thousand things true which he cannot prove. All manifestations depend upon conditions. The surroundings and circumstances here, render it utterly impossible for us to have communications, except, perhaps, through a certain phase of mediumship, where the tongue or hand only is employed. Christ did not accomplish his miracles where scepticism abounded. My brother has brought in the same arguments that were then adduced. Had the Jews been discussing Christianity, to-day, they would have said, — "Do these things here, to-night; turn these stones into bread, and we will believe." Christ did not perform the miracles at their demand: and, therefore, they said, there was no truth in any thing he did. "Come down from the cross, and we will believe." But Christ said, "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen." My brother scorns the evidence which I present, as he does every thing that is not in the Bible, — and that also, if he does not know that it is in the Bible.

MR. GRIMES.

My brother says Bishop Clark is a Spiritualist.

MR. MILLER.—I beg pardon; I did not say any such thing; I said he had suggested an investigation.

MR. GRIMES.—He is opposed to Spiritualism.

MR. MILLER.—I have a letter in my possession, from him, which I can read if necessary.

MR. GRIMES.—I care nothing for letters. I know. I inquired in Providence about it, and was told. Just so it was said that Professor Felton was a Spiritualist. And so I have been called a Spiritualist; and you have had a specimen of my Spiritualism.

My brother said that mediums could not do any thing wrong, because their mothers and sisters were around them.

MR. MILLER.—I said that if any thing would restrain them, it seems that that would.

MR. GRIMES.—I want to know where are the mother and sister of Redman? Where were the mother and sister of Hatch? Where were the mother and sister of Bly, who is now denouncing the trickery of Spiritualism, but who was once a Spiritualist,—and of VonVleck, also formerly a Spiritualist but who now denounces Spiritualism? Where are the mothers and sisters and dead companions of many of your Spiritualists whom you know to be immoral,—and denounce them as much as anybody else? They complain of me for speaking of the immoralities of Spiritualism. I have touched upon that in the most general manner, as little as possible. I had the best reason. I could not do it without mentioning names and going into family matters, which is unpleasant to any gentleman. I have said their mediums could not produce any of their alleged phenomena; they have answered that I must take the testimony of some one else, that they had given them, at some other time.

MR. MILLER.—Such was the argument of Jesus Christ.

MR. GRIMES.—Jesus Christ never intimated that he had not power to do it; but their unbelief rendered them undeserving; and every Christian knows that that is the explanation of it.

MR. MILLER.

That may be my brother's condition. I cannot stay upon that point, now; but I will state that it is necessary, generally, for us to seek, ere we find, to knock and the door shall be opened unto us. It is found that we generally get what we are seeking after.

To-morrow evening, this discussion is to be concluded; and I do beg of my brother that he will redeem himself, then, by making some attempt at an explanation.

MR. GRIMES.—Yes, sir.

DR. GARDNER.—Professor Grimes has read what I understand him to say was the Report of the Harvard Investigating Committee.

MR. GRIMES.—A part of it.

DR. GARDNER.—There never has been a report published, and the committee dare not risk their reputation by doing it; and this Report is a garbled statement of false-

hoods, published, as a catch-penny concern, by the *Boston Courier*, which two-thirds of the world believe to be the Report of that Investigating Committee. It was written by one George Lunt. Many of you, probably, know him. There are some misstatements, some positive falsehoods, and many misrepresentations. To-morrow evening, if the time is not exhausted, I shall have a few words to say in regard to that Harvard Investigating Committee's Report, and the reason why it is not brought forward.

MR. MILLER. — It is in perfect keeping with the idea of their sending in their Report, to-night, through a third person, Professor Grimes' son.

EIGHTH EVENING.

TUESDAY EVENING, MARCH 13TH.

MR. GRIMES.

I wish to give, in as brief and clear terms as I can, my idea of the state of this question, — which, I am aware, differs very much from that of my eloquent friend, here. And in order that there might be no kind of a mistake at this stage of the matter — as it were, in closing, — I have put down my ideas in writing; and I will read the paper.

Daniel Webster once said that there are some cases of such a nature that to be gained in any intelligent court they need only to be clearly stated. It may be, he added, that there are other cases — and that in favor of modern Spiritualism is one of them — which may be destroyed utterly by being presented in their true colors without any argument, pro or con.

There are three ways in which physical facts like those alleged by the Spiritualists to exist may be established or disproved. 1st. By the presentation of the facts themselves to impartial observers and competent critics, in such a manner that they may be thoroughly cross-examined and scrutinized. 2d. By the testimony of competent and credible witnesses who can be directly confronted and cross-examined, and who may be contradicted by the counterstatements of others who were cognizant of some of the circumstances. 3d. By arguments and common sense, inferences drawn from the nature of things, the commonly understood order and course of events, and the consistency and coherence of these with the circumstances of the case. In the trial of this cause I commenced by demanding competent evidence, such as all experimental philosophers, all courts of justice, and all arbitrators, require, whose vocation is to determine important questions by the light of evidence and by investigation. I demanded the production or repetition of the phenomena — not of all of them, but a single one. This was, at first, refused, on the ground that secondary and inferior evidence was abundant and overwhelming; then I insisted, and claimed a verdict in my favor if it was not produced. The opposing counsel attempted to obtain it. He stated his terms and conditions. I agreed to them. He afterwards changed the terms; I still agreed. The experiment was made in his own way, and failed. He then claimed that some little evidence was afterwards incidentally elicited from Mrs. Coan's experiments. I immediately offered to repeat the experiments again and again, in her own way, and under the same or any other reasonable circumstances and conditions. This was refused.

The opposing counsel confessed that he could not produce the evidence that courts invariably require, although he declared that such evidence exists all around us.

The reason on which he based this refusal, and confession of inability, seemed to be evasive and frivolous. Certainly, no court, no board of referees or arbitrators, would admit them to be reasonable. They were, that the phenomena can only be exhibited through the organisms of susceptible persons, who are easily disturbed by the noise of a public audience, and the presence of antagonistic influences, such as must be present on such occasions.

To this I replied that scores of mediums do, every Sunday, stand before public audiences and pretend to be moved by spirit-influences. They also invite antagonisms and debates, and challenge the world to discuss with them. They write and rap in public. Mrs. Coan, in particular, in whom the opposite counsel has full confidence, has travelled over the whole country, exhibiting publicly, when opposed and scrutinized by committees whom she has invited and defied. I offered to surrender the whole argument if she or any other medium would make one rap, or answer one question in the way in which she pretends to, provided the circumstances were such as to expose deception if any were practised. Furthermore, to destroy the force of the objection to a public audience, I offered to try the experiment in any place in the city—in darkness or light, in public, or private.

The opposing counsel was forced to declare—not that he would not, but—that he really could not give the evidence required. He was therefore under the necessity of abandoning his case altogether, or of endeavoring to establish it by evidence which he admitted that any court would be obliged to exclude. This evidence consists of the testimony of witnesses who declare that they have had convincing evidence presented to their minds. This evidence was given to the audience by the mouth of the counsel himself, or in papers which he testified were genuine, most of which were signed by persons never heard of before, and never seen by the audience. It is an established rule of evidence, that the testimony of no living witnesses is competent to establish a fact *ex parte*, when there is no opportunity for cross-examination, and when counterevidence cannot be procured to show that the witnesses are mistaken, biassed, incompetent, or interested. The mere statement or certificate, even of the most competent witness, will not be taken in any proper and regular trial; and, although it is taken, daily in common matters that are of little consequence, no one insists upon it when a regular investigation like the present is undertaken. The only case in which *ex parte* or one-sided testimony is taken in judicial investigations, is when it is merely preliminary to a regular investigation, as before a grand jury or before an examining magistrate.

If it is said that in Madison, Madison County, N. Y., a certain transaction took place, and this is certified to by parties unknown to the court, the proper mode of proceeding, is to summon all the parties who were in the vicinity at the time, and patiently hear all sides, cross-examine all witnesses, prove all the circumstances, and then decide, and not until then. The burden of proof, in this case, rested with the opposing counsel; it was his business to bring forward experimental proofs of the phenomena. If this could not be done, and the court decided to overrule my objections, and admit parol evidence, he should have cited cases that took place in this vicinity.

MR. MILLER. — Have I not?

MR. GRIMES. — Wait, my friend; I will attend to that. Patience is a virtue that I will beg leave to recommend.

When they could be scrutinized, and when countertestimony could be found, if any existed. He should have cited cases which have taken place recently, within a very short time; for it is not pretended that these manifestations are uncommon. Spiritualists boast that they are of daily, and almost hourly, occurrence, and that they have proof of this kind, in abundance. Now, what evidence have they introduced. First, that relating to the case in Napaneset, in which the opposing counsel himself, is the principal witness, in which *Lucey*, he says, was spelt out in a manner, and under circumstances, which were very interesting, if we assume that nothing is left untold by the opposing counsel. The other case is that of Mr. Squire's performances in Mr. Farrar's house in

this city, which transpired about two years ago, and which were more remarkable, and better attested, and were enacted under more respectable circumstances, than any other which he has mentioned.

In fact, you may say that is the only case.

In this case, no one was invited to investigate, to detect fraud. It was assumed, to begin with, that fraud was out of the question. Mr. Farrar was universally respected, a deacon of the church, a gentleman of wealth, of character, and integrity; and the wonders were worked in his house, and with his sanction, without pay, and attended with much inconvenience. It is enough to say that most of the manifestations took place in the dark; this alone would shut them out as evidence from any proper and regular investigation. But it must be remarked that Mr. Farrar did not, himself, act any part in the matter, except to allow the performances in his house. His respectability, therefore, has nothing to do with the case. No one pretended that the actual medium, Squire, was a man of great respectability — his character was negative, at the best.

This case of Squire, was presented here, in a written communication, which my friend, the opposing counsel, seemed to regard as sufficient to establish all the pretended facts. But in this, the only case in the immediate vicinity, which might afford means for contradiction, providentially a witness arose, as it were, from the very earth. Dr. Mattson, a gentleman whose experience of life, and whose medical skill, qualified him to judge clearly in such matters, offered himself, and contradicted Squire, showing that some of the feats were easily performed by jugglery. An attempt was immediately made to impeach Dr. Mattson, but this failed utterly, and his character appears to be unassailable. Next we have the testimony of Professor Eustis, of Harvard, confirming that of Dr. Mattson, and still further impeaching Squire.

MR. MILLER. — I would ask where that testimony of Mr. Eustis is.

MR. GRIMES. — You will find it in that Report. In addition to this we have the observations of President Felton, and of Dr. Johnson, agreeing with those of Professor Eustis and Dr. Mattson, and all of them uniting in the conclusion that the manifestations which they had witnessed were impostures. No comment in this case is necessary, and no other requires to be reviewed.

I have stated this case very briefly. Words cannot make this argument any stronger.

The argument, so much relied upon by my opponent, that the Bible stands upon the same evidence as Spiritualism, is illegitimate; for, allowing it all the force which he can ask, it is only necessary to deny the miracles and the infallible inspiration of the Bible, to overthrow his position, for then neither the Bible nor Spiritualism are true.

He is like a man who takes hold of another on the brink of a precipice, and says, "You cannot throw me over, because, if I go, you will go too."

Here is another horn to this dilemma.

If, on the other hand, we admit the infallible inspiration of the Bible, and the miraculous character of its recorded events, we are perfectly consistent in denying their analogy to events which he admits are merely an effect of the natural order of things.

I regard that argument, briefly as it is stated, as unanswerable; and I am willing to risk, upon that point, any little reputation I have.

MR. MILLER.

Mr. Chairman, and Respected Friends: My brother has just forty-five minutes more, to "account for the so-called modern spirit-manifestations." The world, during the past ten or twelve years, has been waiting, waiting anxiously, for an explanation. Scientific men have gone to work and elaborated their favorite theories of explanation, and one by one those theories have gone down; and others again have been built up, and they, too, have gone. And now you have been invited here, by posters and circulars, and by invitations from the rostrum, night after night, to hear an explanation of these phenomena. Forty-five minutes more belong to my brother; and in this time, if he sustains the question before us this evening, he is to account satisfactorily for these manifestations. Really, my friends, shall we get a satisfactory explanation? Each one must judge for himself or herself. Furthermore, the explanation was to be a philosophical one; but instead of that, it is a legal one, standing upon the quibbles, formalities, and technicalities of law. Now, this ground has been gone over and over, time and again; and I have something to say, besides reiterating what has been already incontrovertibly established; viz., that human testimony, as a law of evidence, must be relied on. Yet, I will very briefly look at his positions again, to-night. The gentleman says that one good evidence, and the first-best is the presentation of the fact. But suppose it cannot be presented; then what is the next-best evidence,—and just as good, in a court, as any other? It is the testimony of those who witnessed it. I have raised that paper; I now drop it. This is a fact; and though ages may roll by, it is still the same. Suppose we come here again to-morrow night, and it is denied; all that is necessary is, to appeal to the witnesses present. Now, let it be borne in mind, that a great portion of spirit-manifestations depend upon circumstances, surroundings, and conditions, over which we have no control. We are all of us more or less inspirational; and one of the most common phases of mediumship is the perception and influx of thought from the interior world. That a medium may stand up here, and speak eloquently before a promiscuous audience, is very true. Then, there are other manifestations that could not be produced under the same circumstances. I have no control over the spirits. I cannot command you to come forward here; neither can I command the spirits to come.

Again, in regard to this position, let me reiterate that it is the same with that which the infidel world has ever taken. If he insists upon my calling spirits to produce these manifestations, I may, with the same propriety, call upon the gentleman, and upon the Christian Church, to summon the angel-world again to roll the stone away from the sepulchre. The same causes that produced ancient manifestations exist to-day; and according to my brother's logic, we have a right to claim that they shall repeat these manifestations, or we will reject them. Now, I say that human testimony is reliable. I was not at Lawrence when that frightful, that terrific calamity took place, yet I have sufficient testimony to its occurrence. Is it supposed that we are to have a trial here, according to the rules of law, before we can accredit it? Did my brother expect, when he signed the articles of agreement in regard to this discussion, that we would produce these manifestations here? Can he show a single instance in history, where spirit-intercourse, or any thing like revelation from the spirit-world, was tried by any tribunal of an earthly character? Had they no laws, no courts, in the time of Jesus Christ? Why did not the apostles demonstrate the validity of their claims? If they would not demonstrate it then, by a trial of the whole case, the infidel world says this is proof that they were dishonest. The next-best testimony, the gentleman himself says, is that of

credible witnesses. Have I not offered such, and cited as my authority the names of men living in your city? I presented, here, the testimony of Mr. —. Is not he a credible witness?

[Mr. MILLER repeated the statement of Mr. —'s visit to Mr. Mansfield, as given page 89.]

Here is a fact, then, that occurs at home. The gentleman says that these cases must not be far-fetched, but must occur in our midst, and they must have taken place very recently. Is it possible that he can stand up before an intelligent audience, and state, here, that because a fact occurred eighteen hundred, or eight years ago, it is any the less a fact? If so, then the further we get from the origin of the Christian dispensation, the less evidence we shall have of its truth. Does time alter a fact? If I am to be censured for bringing in cases which occurred two, or five, years ago, what shall we say of our clergymen, when they bring in similar facts that transpired eighteen hundred years ago? The gentleman says that if these phenomena occur in the dark, it is *prima facie* proof that they are not true. No phenomena take place in the dark! The rolling of the stone from the sepulchre was in the night; *ergo*, the statement of it is good for nothing. Peter was led out of prison in the night; *ergo*, we repudiate it,—it was done under the cover of darkness. Just as if a phenomenon could not occur in the dark, and just as if we could not so arrange matters as to preclude the possibility of deception! Why, my friends, it does seem to me strange that our brother should waste so much precious time in going over something that has so little to do with the question. I have produced facts, here, which have occurred in your own midst, and yet he has not even alluded to them. It is true, I have given my own testimony, as a witness of a manifestation; and I ask you, friends, can you altogether reject this testimony? No, you cannot, in sincerity and candor. Why, it is only four miles to Neponset. He might have called upon the family of Mr. Southworth, and ascertained the fact; and yet, because I have not brought forward the manifestations here, he says there is not the shadow of proof! He takes the ground that because he has not seen a thing, it cannot be true! I stated, last evening, that I had done with giving facts; but I shall give one or two this evening. And now, one right to the point.

Dr. Gardner is in the house, as one witness; and doubtless there are others who have witnessed the same manifestations.

Sometime ago, a lady came into this city, a stranger to your community, through whose mediumship, in the presence of Dr. Gardner, Dr. Bell, and many others, manifestations of a most remarkable character took place. The lady's name is Miss Coggs-well, of Vermont. On her arm, letters have often been seen to rise up in response to mental questions. One gentleman with whom I conversed in regard to this matter, told me that he mentally said, "If this is the work of spirits, let the name of Jesus Christ come upon the arm." And, in plain, readable letters, as if red blisters had been produced, came up the name "Jesus Christ." Dr. Gardner asked, mentally, for some evidence that his brother in the spirit-world was present; and "M. G.," the initials of the name, came up on the arm. It was then mentally asked, "How did he die?" Presently a figure rose up on the arm, like a human heart, and over that another figure came up resembling a revolver, being discharged in the heart. His brother was shot through the heart, by a ball from a revolver. Miss Coggs-well, who had just come into the place, could have known nothing of the circumstances of his death. Dr. Gardner sent for Dr. Bell to visit his house. Dr. Bell came, and was requested to ask some mental questions, something of such a nature that it would be impossible for any one to

guess what he was thinking of. He did so. The arm was bare, and presently a spot came out like a cross, and another beside it, and still another cross below it. Dr. Gardner here remarked that he hoped the spirit would give such a manifestation as Dr. Bell had requested. Dr. Bell smiled, and said, "It is what I asked for in my own mind; I asked that three crosses should be made on her arm." And they were made, plain and clear. And in addition to the crosses, a flower, like a rose, came up upon the arm. Hundreds have seen these wonderful phenomena. Here is the testimony of Dr. Bell. It is not my place, here, to claim that these phenomena are the work of spirits, but they are called "spirit-manifestations," and it devolves upon my brother to explain them? I have read a letter from Dr. Bell, in which he said that they come from some "unseen and occult power in nature;" yet they are all alleged to be spirit-manifestations.

I will give another case, and then I shall speak no further in regard to facts. I have very opportunely come across a fact that will doubtless stagger my brother; for the witness is here, and it is his own witness, after all. He has several times, during this discussion, called upon Laroy Sunderland to bear testimony. Here is a communication published in the *Spirit World* and which will be confirmed by Mr. Sunderland, the editor and publisher. I have not time to read the whole; it is attested to by several witnesses, and Mr. Sunderland sits in front of us to be catechized and cross-examined, in regard to the fact. My brother will not reject the testimony of one to whom he has so often referred.

"SPIRITUAL DEMONSTRATIONS."

"We, the undersigned, having witnessed, this day, at the house of Mr. Laroy Sunderland (No. 23, Elliot Street, Boston), the following phenomena, deem it proper in this way to make mention of them.

"When we entered the room, there were some ten persons surrounding a table, conversing with the spirits; and as many more in the room as spectators, watching the movements of the others. Mrs. M. Cooper was the medium. There were constant and frequent rappings upon the table, and rappings to various and ingenious test questions, all of which were admitted to be answered correctly; and the company expressed themselves as being entirely satisfied with the answers given.

"We saw no motion of the medium, which would indicate that she had personally, any thing to do with the responses given; and we think she could not have had. The rappings were made on the table, without exception.

After this circle had retired, we, the undersigned, surrounded the same table when the following occurrences were observed:—

"1. In answer to the question if any of our guardian spirits were present, LOUD and prompt responses were heard upon the table, the vibrations of which were distinctly felt by our hands; and we are positive that Mrs. Cooper did not touch the table at all.

"2. We then asked the spirits if they would give us some physical manifestations, and we were promptly answered by raps, in the affirmative. The table was then immediately moved in various directions, from one to two feet; and, at our request, was quite a number of times turned over into the laps of those surrounding it. In two instances it was RAISED entirely from off the floor, and we are positive that no human instrumental, *any* was employed in producing these results. For the purpose of varying the experiment, we all took hold of the top of the table, holding it clear off the floor, in our hands, when it was violently shaken, while yet so suspended, as if its standard had been seized by strong hands; and it apparently varied in weight from twenty to two hundred pounds.

"Among the test questions proposed and satisfactorily answered, was one by G. F. Farley, Esq. of Groton, Mass., substantially as follows: 'What relation is this spirit to me?' Ans.—'Your brother.' 'What was your given name?' Ans.—'Perez,' which was spelled out promptly by the alphabet. Mr. Farley then stated to the astonishment of the company, that this was his brother's name, and that he died some fifty years ago—facts unknown to every other person present.

"[Mr. Farley, himself, may be referred to for the truth of what is here stated.]

"In the evening of the same day we met again, with an addition to our circle. [Esquire Farley, of Groton, and G. A. Somerby, Esq., of Wayland, were present at both settings,] and in the evening, Mr. George E. Haskell, Dr. Z. Rogers, Moses Babcock, and Dr. L. B. Larkin, of Wrentham, were also present. The circle was formed in Mr. Sunderland's back parlor, as before, when the following, among other phenomena, were produced. On holding each other's hands, so that no one hand was at liberty in the room, a centre table, around which we were sitting, was RAISED up from the floor five times, and let down with considerable force, so as to

shake the floor. Once or twice the raps were made; not on the table, but *with it*, the table being used by the spirits, as we were assured, to rap with on the floor. *Five times the table was upset and turned over*, so that it fell sidewise upon the floor, with violence. A small bell, which stood upon the table, was moved without human hands, from the table, four times. During the whole of this time, both of Mrs. Cooper's hands had been held in the hands of two of the company, standing or sitting by her side. We can only say that we have been profoundly impressed with the conviction that no human agency whatever, was used in the production of the phenomena we have described.

"C. P. KIBBEE, M. D. *Springfield, Mass.*

"RUFUS ELMER, " "

"NELSON L. ELMER, " "

"THEODORE M. SMITH, *Boston.*

"GEORGE E. HASKELL, " "

"Z. RODGERS, *Charleston, Mass.*

"MOSES BABCOCK, " "

"*Boston, Jan. 22, 1851.*"

[*To Mr. Sunderland.*] Is this substantially true, as you witnessed it?

MR. SUNDERLAND. — True as the Book! True, every word of it.

MR. MILLER. — [*To Mr. Grimes.*] You are at liberty to cross-examine the witness; but you will not dare to do it. He is your own witness, brother.

MR. GRIMES.

I must say that my friend has resorted to a mode of argument which I scarcely expected from him. Now, let me tell you what he has done. I referred to Mr. Sunderland, the other evening, to prove that some persons who were Spiritualists considered Spiritualism dangerous, and raised a warning voice. I misunderstood Mr. Sunderland, in regard to evil spirits, but I was right on the main point. And I am sorry to say that a little communication that I received from Mr. Sunderland, I left at home; or I should like to read it now. Now, because he corroborated that, the gentleman calls him *my witness*, to prove that a table tipped itself over; as a boy who once happened to tear his clothes, when his mother was going to whip him said he didn't tear them, — they tore themselves, when he was standing right still. Such evidence would disgust any lawyer in the world. It not merely violates the rules of law and the rules of evidence. The rules I have laid down are used not only in court, but wherever questions of any kind are tried. If the gentleman is a law student, and has studied one month, he knows it. Look in any work on evidence, or any work on logic, and you find that the same rules used in courts are used everywhere, except in common transactions where people go on without any method whatever, and which are of no value. The gentleman calls upon Mr. Sunderland to show that a table was upset. I have seen that, myself; I have seen the performances of jugglers, and have seen things I cannot explain. And if I cannot explain it, I must say it is spirits! If so, I must give up the point, — it is the work of spirits. Your best performances are outdone by the common jugglers who perform for twenty-five cents a head. If one of them pulls eggs out of a hat, and if you cannot explain it, it is a spirit: if the eggs were not laid by a spirit, he will ask you how, then, they came there. He will not let you watch him; he will not let you go behind him. Let Mr. Sunderland bring forward his table here; let Mrs. Cooper come here, and if the table moves an inch, I will be burned at the stake. You give us assertion upon assertion, as if you thought repeating a thing a thousand times would prove it. You seek to prove a thing that cannot be proved; and make up the deficiencies of proof by reiteration.

I have taken a few notes of the gentleman's remarks, and I will reply to them. First, in regard to "the technicalities of law." The rule I have insisted upon is not one of the technicalities of law; it is the rule in all matters of inquiry. Second, he says, — "If I

take a piece of paper, and drop it,—that is a fact forever; and if you come here to-morrow and say that you witnessed its occurrence, that is sufficient proof of it." That is not a parallel case, at all; and the gentleman knows it; though some of your Spiritualists smiled at it. Suppose he says,—“If I take hold of this bullet, it will rise right up in the air;” and the next night the audience will swear the bullet rose—what do I care for that. “Do you not believe that audience?” Be so kind as to let that go up again. How many men must swear to you, before you believe the multiplication table lies? Yet “you must not reject human testimony!”

MR. MILLER.—We do not claim to do these things ourselves, but that they are the work of spirits.

MR. GRIMES.—I don't care who does it, if it is only done. If the Devil does it, let us have it.

MR. MILLER.—Can my brother give us any process by which we can bring these spirits into court?

MR. GRIMES.—No; it does not belong to me. He must bring in his own witnesses. I will let him have a subpoena.

Now, let me give him a case. When Galileo, the great philosopher, was a young man, long before he discovered the telescope, he denied the authority of Aristotle. Aristotle said, that if a large piece of lead and a smaller one were dropped together, the larger would reach the ground first. Galileo said it would not. The dictum was laid down in a big book, written by as great a man as my friend Mr. Sunderland—and I believe we are friends, if I do not believe his table moves around in that style. Galileo said,—What care I for your book; try the experiment. So they ascended the leaning tower of Pisa, and dropped the weights at the same time; and every one except Galileo expected to see the larger one fall the faster. But they reached the ground exactly together. The learned men said it was not fair, and proposed to try it again. It was tried again, but the weights would come down just exactly together. All the witnesses in the world were useless. Now, my friend tells us a thing a thousand times more incredible: he tells us the story of Dr. Bell, with a great deal of unction—and forgets to state that Dr. Bell, after witnessing all these things, declares that spirits have nothing whatever to do with them.

MR. MILLER.—Do you believe that Dr. Bell saw these things on the arm?

MR. GRIMES.—Oh, I have seen worse things than that.

MR. MILLER.—You acknowledge, then, that you cannot account for it?

MR. GRIMES.—The gentleman continually implies that if I cannot account for a thing, it follows that it is the work of a spirit. According to that, I have got to explain all the universe. The moment that I fall short of omniscience, that moment Spiritualism is true. If all nature can show any thing I cannot understand, Spiritualism is true. The very argument of the ancient Greeks: when it thundered and lightened, it was a spirit—and that was the first that was heard of spirit-rappings. If they did not know what gave the magnet its properties, it was a spirit. As science has advanced, the spirits have receded into the dark caverns; as religion has held up her bright torch, spirits have retreated, and now their place of abode is very narrow. And these colleges which my brother so hates, and has so much reason to hate, and that college at Cambridge, with the noble man at its head—and we ought to thank God for both—let that college, and its sister colleges, go on, and the spirits will be scarcer and scarcer. There is a natural antagonism between that institution and its professors, and Spiritualism. I dared the

Spiritualists to investigate. I did not dare them to make assertions; I knew they could do that; but investigation was what I wanted. What did Galileo say? He had faithfully tried to ascertain, by experiment, the truth. Did he try to prove the truth of his theory by a witness? No; he would not have brought one of a thousand witnesses. He said,—Let us repeat the experiment. Bring in Mrs. Coan, your friend whom you complain that I called a humbug—and I certainly did,—and give us the manifestations.

Let me read an editorial report of the *Boston Herald*, copied from the *Herald* of Saturday morning, April 15th, 1859.

"Two-thirds of the capacity of the Melodeon was filled last evening, to test the relative merits of so-called Spiritual manifestations, as exhibited by Mrs. Ada L. Coan, and M. V. Bly. . . . At the outset, the lady went through with her manifestations in presence of a committee of three unprejudiced gentlemen, selected by the audience. After she had concluded, Mr. Bly operated and performed the same phenomena, in a manner equal, if not superior, to the lady; at least such was the verdict of the committee and audience. Bly explained how he performed the tricks, as he called them, and the affair wound up with remarks from the platform by Mrs. Coan and Mr. Bly. Mrs. Coan bore testimony to the fairness, candor, and honesty, of Mr. Bly, and for the information of her hearers said that since Bly's arrival in Boston, he had been the means of driving all the advertised mediums from the city. Nine-tenths of the so-called spirit-manifestations she was satisfied were impositions, practised by mediums themselves, and she proceeded to cite individual cases where she had discovered impostors, many of whom were among the most prominent in the world of Spiritualism."

That is enough. Bly and Mrs. Coan, before I came out publicly in Boston, she influenced by a spirit, in or out of the form, he influenced by the love of investigation, had this public meeting; and what she did, he did. She acknowledged he was candid and fair; and yet, he could do all that she did. Now, how do you account for that? I offered that same woman, when performing in one of the towns near the Cape, five hundred dollars, if she would do one of the things they said she had done every night. They all said she had done it a thousand times; but I asked that it should be done. And while I am in the city, and alive, you may wake me up at ten o'clock at night, and, if she can answer a single mental question, provided I can only fix it so that she cannot cheat, I will give you all I have, and my note for some more.

I wish to read another paper. I hold in my hand a communication from Dr. Matteson, which is as follows:—

"BOSTON, Tuesday, March 13th, 1860.

"PROFESSOR GRIMES,—Dear Sir: I desire to ask you a question, and I prefer this method of getting your answer, as I do not wish to disturb your audience.

"First of all, I wish to state that my account of the experiments of Squire was correct, to the best of my knowledge, in every essential particular. I say every essential particular, because I hold that it mattered but little whether a part of the watch hung out of the mitten, or not, or whether the experiment was performed in a dark or a light room. It is enough to know that it was performed with the hands under the table, where the eyes could not see, and therefore the room might be light or dark, just as Mr. Farrar, or his protégé, Squire, might fancy. But in the table experiments, it is admitted that the room was dark; for here, unlike the case of the watch experiment, a dark room was essential to the success of the table tricks.

"That an intelligent man should throw open his house for the reception of citizens, to witness experiments in Spiritualism, which are to be performed in the dark, is certainly one of the marvels of the nineteenth century, and goes very far to eclipse Salem witchcraft itself.

"I had no motive for misrepresentation. I am the last man in the world, who would misrepresent a fact for the sake of sustaining a theory. I am not the enemy of Spiritualism. I have many excellent friends among the Spiritualists whom I respect and esteem, and while I have always admitted that some physical manifestations may be true, for aught I know, although I might be unwilling to refer them to the agency of spirits, yet I hold that it is my right and privilege to expose such trickery as that of Squire's, even though it should be enacted under the roof of one of our respectable citizens.

"The medical profession are not the opponents of Spiritualism, as Mr. Miller asserted last night. I do not know of a physician who is to be regarded as an opponent. It would not be to the interest of the profession to oppose Spiritualism. If half of the population, or more, are Spiritualists, the doctors would be very foolish to quarrel with them, and thereby lose their friendship and patronage. With regard to drugging, to which I

am as much opposed as Mr. Miller, I must say that the quantities of stuff which some of the spiritual doctors and doctresses send off in huge bottles and packages, is a fair match for the vile drugs of any old doctor that has ever lived since the time of Paracelsus.

"Apropos of Spiritual doctresses. I had a lady patient, some years ago, who was dying of consumption. I told her husband that she could not live. He called in a spiritual doctress, who professed to be governed by the spirit of a celebrated physician out of the form, and said that I was mistaken about the lungs of the patient being diseased, that her lungs were perfectly sound, but that her *lights* were diseased. This celebrated physician in spirit-land must have been a 'bright, particular star,' not to know that the *lungs* and *lights* meant the same thing.

"But, to come to the point with which I started. When I put my written statements into your hands, in relation to the experiments of Squire's, which I did without the suggestion of any living mortal, and desiring at the same time that my name should not be made public, I did not dream that any Spiritualist would endeavor to weaken my testimony by assailing my character. I supposed that the cause was quite too strong to require such a miserable alternative. Yet, you said last night, that a Spiritualist came to you on Saturday night, after the discussion had closed, and spoke against my character, referring you to the Merchants Bank. This was a stab in the dark; it was a most unmanly and wicked assault, because it gave me no opportunity to defend myself, and but for your magnanimity, sir, in calling upon me, the succeeding day, and asking, as you did, with a great deal of concern and anxiety, evidently, depicted in your countenance, whether there was any truth in the statement, I should, in all probability, have been ignorant of the outrage until this moment. I told you to go to the Merchants Bank and inquire for yourself, without any agency of mine; and with a true manliness, which I shall ever remember, you sent one of our most esteemed fellow-citizens on the mission, and his answer, exonerating me from all censure, has already been announced in this hall, and does not require repetition.

"The report about the Merchants Bank, let me say, was put into circulation by certain men, who, in certain business transactions, fleeced me out of all the money they could, and then entered into a legal conspiracy to rob me, if possible, of 'every dollar I possessed.' Not satisfied with those doings, they put the story of the Merchants Bank into circulation, with the view of doing me still further injury. I did not suppose it possible, however, that any respectable person would have taken up the slander of these despicable men, and related it privately to you, without knowing whether it was true or false, for the purpose of injuring my vascity, merely because I had ventured to testify honestly against the impostors of the notorious Squire.

"I therefore call for the name of that *Spiritualist*, that it may be entered upon the record, as a part of the history of Spiritualism in Boston.

Very respectfully,

"MORRIS MATTSON."

I must say that I do not think it is necessary for me to give the name. I do not see the good to be attained by it. The fact is, that Dr. Mattson's character is sufficiently exonerated. So it seems to me; and I do not see the need of getting up a private quarrel.

DR. MATTSON.—I have had a communication from the spirits, and they have rapped out the name of Mr. Farrar; but as he is a respectable man, I suppose they are mistaken.

MR. MILLER.

After all this care for the doctor, it will go before the world that he is an honest man, I suppose; but I ask, in all conscience, if our precious time is to be wasted in pettifoggery a case through in this manner? What relevancy, under heaven, has that letter, to the question here to-night? I am surprised at the short-sightedness of my brother, in introducing a letter of this character, to defend the character of a man, here, as if there was no other redress. There are other "courts" beside this, where injured reputation may find redress. Indeed, I cannot find language to express my dissatisfaction at the way in which the discussion has been carried on,—at dragging in, as on this and other evenings, statements of this kind, to establish the character of some man. If he is an honest man, that will be sufficient, without its going before the entire world that there is a Dr. Mattson, in Boston, who is honest, though in certain people's eyes it seems to appear otherwise. It does no credit to my brother or his cause.

MR. GRIMES.—It ought to be stated, just here, that the attack on Dr. Mattson's character was made by themselves.

MR. MILLER. — I beg your pardon: if you mean me, I have made no such attack. I never made an attack upon that man's character, in my life. It was altogether outside of the discussion, and off from the platform. In no way have I insinuated that his character was not perfectly good.

MR. GRIMES. — You have just done it.

MR. MILLER. — Wherein have I done it?

MR. GRIMES. — You said many people thought he was dishonest.

MR. MILLER. — I beg your pardon; but I did not say so. Far, far be it from me, ladies and gentlemen, to attack the private character of anybody. I have not done so, anywhere in this debate. If there has fallen an expression from my lips, that would seem to imply any thing of the kind, it has been misconstrued and misapplied. The religion which Spiritualism teaches me, is to place confidence in humanity; to exercise charity, love, kindness, and forgiveness towards all. He is my brother, and I have no right or disposition to charge him with dishonesty, and have not intentionally done so, during my remarks, whatever may have fallen from my lips.

But a word, now, to this discussion. The gentleman has acknowledged that he cannot explain these manifestations, or, at least, he has allowed you to infer it. "Suppose I cannot account for them?—I have seen worse things than that on the arm," he says. Now, Dr. Bell declares that he has seen a certain phenomenon, and it claims to be the work of disembodied spirits. I call upon the professor, here to explain it; and if he cannot, it does not necessarily follow that it is the work of spirits. He has repeatedly attributed to me the remark that if he cannot account for these things, they are the work of spirits. I take no affirmative grounds, here, upon this question. He has assumed the affirmative position, and promised to give a satisfactory and philosophical explanation of these modern manifestations; and I stand here simply to reply to him. I have presented facts, and asked for a solution. The time has nearly passed by. Twenty-five minutes, only, remain for an explanation. Will he attempt it in this time? The facts exist, unless he does altogether set aside human testimony. He did, at last, reject the testimony of the witness whom he has repeatedly called upon to confirm his statements. Were this a judicial trial, there are hundreds and thousands of witnesses who would come in and testify to what they do know and have seen. There are scores in this house, who will lay their hands upon their hearts and testify that they have seen spirit-manifestations, and some who have seen spirits, face to face. But do we expect in an investigation of this kind, that a lady or a gentleman is to go before a justice of the peace, and swear that he or she has seen spirits? Zachariah says an angel appeared to him. Was that angel brought into court? No: nothing of the kind. Peter, James, and John, said they saw spirits. But did they bring the spirits before any earthly tribunal, to establish the fact? No, never. Now, there are tens of thousands who testify they have seen these things, and talked with spirits, face to face. I say their testimony is as good, to-day, as that of individuals who lived hundreds of years ago. And this my brother cannot controvert. He says, if the Bible is not infallible, it is not to be relied upon in the least. That does not follow. If a man is not infallible, can he utter no truth? If a book is not infallible, does it contain no truth? I take up the history of Rome, and I read of Romulus and Remus being suckled by a wolf. Every one rejects that as a fable. The general history of Rome, however, we all rely upon. I believe those ancient witnesses testified to the best of their ability, and that they spoke truthfully. Whatever may have been their moral character, I can see, in reading

dence that they attempted to impose upon the world. Yet, I can see that, after the passage of so great a length of time as has elapsed since the occurrence of the events there recorded, there is great danger of misinterpretation and interpolation. One orthodox sect, the Baptist, have a translation of the Bible, in which some twenty-five thousand corrections have been made from King James' translation; and yet we are told that the Bible is infallible—in every particular true. I have said that the wonders recorded in the Bible are mainly true. They were not miracles, however, in the theological sense of the word. The angels rolled the stone from the sepulchre. If I raise this paper, it is not a miracle; means are employed. Was it a miracle, if God employed a spirit out of the body to roll that stone away? They had to conform to conditions then, as now. When Daniel was to see visions, he fasted. Christ used clay to give sight to the blind. Why did he use it? There was evidently virtue in it, or Christ wasted his time in a senseless manœuvre. But because these wonders are above our comprehension, it does not follow that they are miracles. He cannot find any proof in the Bible, that they are not according to the laws of nature; he has only the assumptions of a part of the theological world.

I have not introduced, in my statement of facts, a millionth part of what might have been given. Individuals tell me, daily, of facts occurring in their own private homes, which I should be glad to present, had we time and permission. A lady, now here in the house, told me of a most extraordinary manifestation which she had witnessed, in her own home, but added; "I cannot bear that my name should be dragged before the public, neither is my husband willing." So there are thousands who shrink from this notoriety; and yet they will tell you, privately, what occurs in their own domestic circles, through themselves and their children. All this which comes from our neighbors, our brothers and sisters, is by the gentleman rejected, and the character of our mediums treated in the most uncharitable spirit. He has denounced nine-tenths of our trance-mediums as impostors, and, it would seem, solely for the reason that the manifestations will not come within the scope of his narrow-contracted theory. I have called upon him, here, to-night, to interrogate a witness upon a given fact,—his own witness,—and he rejects the testimony *in toto*, as unworthy of the least evidence. He is here, on the affirmative of this question, to explain the phenomena. I am not here to assert that these are spirit-manifestations; I assumed this position, on the first question, and it is for the public to judge how well it was sustained. He has now assumed the affirmative position. And on the last evening, in the speech preceding his last, he informed us that it is a very difficult task.

MR. GRIMES.—I did not.

MR. MILLER.—He said, "I have seen worse things than that;" which implies that he has seen other things equally unaccountable. And the fact that he does not explain them, or attempt to, is proof that he cannot.

MR. GRIMES.—I did so.

MR. MILLER.—If he could, thousands would rise up and call him blessed. Why, sir, thousands upon thousands have tried it, and it has amounted to nothing. And now, he has taken this position of denial, denying all the facts, except certain mental manifestations, and these he rejects, except so far as they can be produced by such mediums as he can develop. But he has not even explained how he makes the mediums which he boasts of so often, nor why we are to take their evidence that they are in any way influenced. I can find hundreds of individuals who will say,

that he did not affect them in the least; that when Professor Grimes told them to hold up an arm, and declared they could not take it down, they *could* take it down, just as well as not, but were practising deception; and that when he made them write, they were simply deceiving him, and were not affected, mesmerically, in the least. I call for positive proof, brother; for you say we cannot take the testimony where there is a possibility for cheating. Can you do a single thing that cannot be imitated? Not one, friends. He may call forward his psychological subjects and influence them; he may mesmerize a hundred, but he cannot do a single thing that I cannot imitate right here, on the platform; and he knows it: but is that an argument against the fact of mesmerism? No: but now suppose that Mrs. Ada Coan comes here and produces the manifestations, and another person imitates them, — is that an argument against the fact that raps and other manifestations really occur? He cannot go to sleep on this platform; and yet I could imitate it. He cannot produce *delirium tremens*, or become, at pleasure, insane. I challenge him to do it. He may have twenty-four hours, and he will fail. And yet any one may imitate all these realities. Do you not see that a counterfeit rather pre-supposes a genuine? Let me say of Dr. Bly, he believes in Spiritualism, in the Spiritual philosophy; but he believes many of the apparent manifestations are the results of trickery, because he can imitate them. The gentleman cited Mr. VonVleck as a witness against Spiritualism. Mr. VonVleck has given me a letter, to-day, which I will read: —

"BOSTON, March 18th, 1890.

"LEO MILLER, Esq., — Sir: — Professor Grimes stated in the Melodeon, last evening, the 12th inst., that I had denounced Spiritualism and Spiritualists. I beg leave, through you, to correct that statement. I do not denounce Spiritualism or the Spiritualists as a class; but I do denounce certain *professed* spirit mediums whom I know to be impostors. I believe disembodied spirits can have intercourse with mortals, satisfactory evidence of which has been afforded in my own experience.

Respectfully,

"W. L. F. VONVLECK.

"LEO MILLER, Esq."

So it seems that he has not denounced it, or if he had, it would prove nothing. He says he believes in spirit-intercourse, though he does not believe in a certain class of the manifestations. Professor M—— says, "I reject a great portion of the alleged spirit-manifestations." Yet he believes there are facts that demonstrate Spiritualism beyond all question. He rejects many of them, as he rejects any thing else that is not sufficiently proved. I say that I reject many pretended spirit-manifestations, and am willing to acknowledge that deception has been practised; I am as willing to acknowledge this as any person. But does this destroy the fact that other and genuine manifestations have been produced? Not in the least. Hundreds know they have. Here are private families who have these manifestations around their tables. In Laroy Sunderland's house, his daughters were the mediums; and the bishop in an adjoining city, of whom I spoke last night, has two daughters who are mediums. There are thousands and thousands of cases that might be given, where there is no earthly motive for deception. After all that has been said of Mr. Redman, we have testimony here from Dr. Ray, and Dr. Bell, and others, that wonderful and inexplicable phenomena were produced through him as a medium. He may not be above temptation to deceive. I have, myself, detected deception in mediums. Does it prove that the other manifestations are untrue? Persons have told me, as I have said, that they have pretended to be under the influence of my friend, Professor Grimes, when, in fact, they were not in the least affected. But I have myself tried the truth of psychology, and know that persons may be genuinely psychologized. Mesmerism came first, and then clairvoyance, paving the way to the higher law of spiritual manifestations.

MR. GRIMES.

The gentleman has brought forward my experiments. They are perfectly to the point. The fact is, when I have performed experiments in mesmerism, I have always taken the ground that an experiment cannot be made satisfactory to an audience. I have never asked an audience to believe, on the strength of the experiments which I there performed. I began, at Mercantile Hall, the other night, by saying that I did not ask them to believe it,—that to do so, upon the evidence of what they there saw, was in violation of the known rules of philosophy. When a man says he is mesmerized, he may be humbugging; and the only evidence, to a medical man, is that his hands grow cold; and sometimes even that symptom may deceive. I say, with the utmost seriousness, to this audience, that when you perform an experiment in mesmerism, the testimony of the person mesmerized must not be taken, at all. I have always said so. I said so in my book. In science, I have always taken that ground. In experimental science, every one knows, we must depend upon the production of the facts. And the Spiritualists began by putting their theory on the ground of experiment. The world will be glad to hear that the Spiritualists have acknowledged that the phenomena cannot be reproduced, and that they must prove their doctrines by assertions, and not by showing the manifestations themselves.

I have said there were various ways in which to arrive at a correct conclusion, and one was, to view the whole matter in the light of the nature of things. And if you take this Spiritual philosophy and view it in the light of common sense, as a body, and inquire its consistency or inconsistency, I think it will prove somewhat interesting. I have therefore embodied, in a paper, the creed of the Spiritualists, to give you an idea of it, as clear as I can, so that you may judge of the thing as you may judge of a man by looking to see what his belief is.

The creed of the Spiritualists is not set forth in any regular and systematic work that I know of; and when I have been called upon, as I frequently have, to give a summary of its principal articles, I have been unable to do so. Their views seem to be exceedingly contradictory. I have, therefore, during this discussion, endeavored to gather, from books, and from my eloquent opponent, the requisite materials, and have arranged some of them in as regular a manner as I could. I ought to state that one or two points are derived from his discourse delivered on Sunday afternoon, in this place, on which occasion I attended at his special invitation.

CREED.

Article 1. The Spiritualists, as represented by my opponent, and by their books and mediums, believe the Bible, and have great reverence for it, generally; but the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob is a barbarous God, an animal, a brute.

2. The sun and moon that stood still at the command of Joshua, were only those that were painted on banners.

3. The miracles mentioned in the Bible all took place as there recorded, but were produced by the operation of mere natural laws:—of course, the serpent—the first speaking medium—spoke by a natural law of speech. Balaam's ass was another medium, who spoke, in a trance state, by the same law which inspires modern mediums. The stone was rolled from the sepulchre without human or mechanical agency, by a natural law, and not by a miracle.

4. Christ was a natural and illegitimate son of a married woman who deceived her husband.

That was also advanced, here, on Sunday.

MR. MILLER.—I say to my brother, it is a base and false misrepresentation of my discourse here last Sunday afternoon. I said that Jesus Christ, instead of being an illegitimate child, was the *legitimate* offspring of a human father and a human mother. How can any man know any thing of the legal legitimacy of Christ? I did not say the God of Jacob and the God of Isaac was a brute. I said their highest ideal of God was their highest ideal of man, magnified, that their conception of Deity was that of a God of anger and wrath; and their own history demonstrates this fact.

MR. GRIMES.—A God of animalism, of pride, of blood;—that was the style. I do not wonder, in conscience, the gentleman is ashamed of it.

5. Science is tending to infidelity and materialism, and the Christian churches are all tending in the same direction.

6. The beau ideal of a saint in this new religion is St. Thomas Paine, who my opponent declared, on last Sunday, was never surpassed in intellectual power, moral greatness, and true piety; that he deserves the gratitude of our country to a degree that leaves Washington in the shade.

MR. MILLER.—I never said so. It is grossly misrepresented, the whole of it.

MR. GRIMES.—I declare he placed him above Washington, entirely. There are others here, who heard that discourse; and I made a minute of the fact.

7. The revelations and miracles of the Bible are not more sacred, and not half as reliable as those of the Davenport boys and the Fox girls, the letters and pictures of Rodgers and Mansfield, or the manifestations of Squire, Coan, and Redman.

8. If any of the mediums are detected in tricks or falsehood, the manifestations thus exposed are to be rejected; but all their pretensions and tricks which are not detected are to be regarded as genuine.

9. If any sceptic, or opponent of Spiritualism, demand proofs such as are required in all cases among experimental philosophers and in courts of justice, he is to be regarded as an unreasonable heretic, whose very presence prevents the spirits from performing.

10. The evidence upon which this new dispensation is founded consists of the assertions of a vast multitude of people, that they have witnessed, and do daily witness, wonderful things, which cannot be exhibited under circumstances that admit of detection in case of fraud, nor when it can be scrutinized and cross-examined, nor when proper counter-evidence can be obtained.

11. The marriage band is obligatory just so far only as it is convenient and agreeable to both parties, and while no other affinity intervenes to lessen its hold.

12. Morality and religion consists in the natural promptings and intimations of the human mind and the individual judgment, independently of all institutions, revelations, and experiences of the past.

We have new revelations.

13. The Spiritualist believes that God himself is subject to the same natural laws that govern matter, and, therefore, cannot save any one from punishment who disobeys these laws; consequently, though his mercy be infinite, his power is so limited that he cannot work a miracle to help himself or any one else; prayers are therefore useless, and forgiveness hopeless. Human beings are but parts of a universal system of machinery, actuated and controlled by an irresistible and inexorable fate, like that recognized by the ancient heathen as inferior to God and man.

14. The spirits of all the men, women, children, and of all the reptiles, insects, and other

animals that have lived from the Silurian period of geology until now, not only in this world, but in the moon, and in the innumerable planets and stellar worlds, in the regions of infinite space — all these spirits have power to visit and revisit this world, and manifest themselves by moving ponderable objects, and especially by moving hands and tongues of female mediums, and inspiring them to give utterance to ideas which cannot be obtained through mere mortal agency.

15. Though we must acknowledge that nothing new which is of the least value has been advanced by modern mediums, neither in science, nature, art, nor theology, — though most of the ideas and language are trashy, weak, silly and ridiculous, and much of it false, malicious, and immoral — even though it purports to come from Plato, Socrates, Washington, or even from Christ — this apparent inconsistency is perfectly consistent, and harmonizes beautifully, with the harmonial philosophy.

16. The reason why most of the communications received from spirits are so low, sensual, and devilish, is because they proceed from the lowest and meanest class of spirits. The reason why most of the communications are false and dangerous, even when they purport to come from the best and truest characters that have left this earth, is because lying and wicked spirits have the power of passing themselves off for good spirits, and we have no means of knowing the good from the evil. The good spirits that communicate with mortals are inferior in number and power to the evil ones; even God himself cannot help us, because the spirits are governed in their operations by natural laws which he never miraculously suspends for any purpose whatever. When, therefore, the conditions are right, we are liable in this world to be tempted, tormented, and misled, by evil spirits; on the same principles that enable mosquitos and snakes to bite us when we venture into the swamps in the month of August. Just as by a natural law the shark devours the shad, the vulture pounces upon the dove, or the cat takes pleasure in tormenting and then destroying the mouse; so do swarms of ferocious and vulture-like spirits infest the air, the water, and the earth, to feast upon the miseries of man and exult in the destruction of his happiness —

[MR. MILLER. — Is not that in the creed of the Church ?

MR. GRIMES. — That is the very doctrine taught by Spiritualists —]

with tin horns, fiddles, guitars, pianos and tables; but when the light returns they hide themselves again in their infernal caves until the conditions are once more rendered congenial to their dark natures.

17. When a man has been very wicked in this world, and has delighted in tormenting and injuring his fellow-men during his mortal life, he will at death go to the world of spirits, and his punishment will consist in his being made perfectly happy by the gratification of his fiddish nature there, and he will take special delight in hovering around the scenes of his earth-life and doing all the mischief in his power to his best friends, just as he did in this world. During his whole career he will only be acting in accordance with the natural laws of his being, and therefore must be regarded as a very interesting and innocent individual.

18. Those who are learned in harmonial philosophy, understand that the other world is like this, only more so; that just as, in this world, there are some men and some animals that prefer darkness to light, when they manifest themselves to their victims; so there are nocturnal spirits of hyena and owl natures, who, when they find congenial mortal spirits, produce through them many wonderful manifestations in darkened rooms.

Now, you may think I have drawn this with a view of throwing ridicule over the

Spiritualists. Upon my honor, I have drawn it as I have heard them teach it. And I can substantiate the whole of it by their writings, by their speeches, by what I have heard the mediums say. I have heard a woman, — I can't think of her name, now — it was a woman with a tremendous voice — stand up, in Norwich, and ridicule the blood of Christ, ridicule the cross of Christ, and ridicule the atonement, and say she did not need any atonement. She was one of their strong mediums. I appeal to any one in this audience, who has heard these mediums, to say if they do not teach such doctrines. To such an extent is this the case, that Christians who have attended these meetings hoping to obtain some information, find all run down into one perfect storm of blasphemy. This is notorious; and in drawing up this creed, I wanted to show that this whole thing is false, on every principle. I wished to use the *reductio ad absurdum*; for when such things are taught, and put together as I have here collected them, they show us to what the doctrine is tending.

How does the case stand here? They dared me to investigation. I have made it. What have they done here? They really talk as if I offered to come here and explain the manifestations.

MR. MILLER. — I have not said so: but you have accepted this question.

MR. GRIMES. — No; you have not said so. But suppose any one were going to explain them, would I not say, — sir, before I explain it, you must show it to me. Don't you all remember the story told of Franklin, when they asked him the reason why the immersion of a fish into a vessel of water already filled to the brim would not cause the water to run over. He said: "I never tried it; but my opinion is, it *will* run over." They tell me those things, and ask me to explain it. I say, whenever I have tried it, it *did* run over. I have been myself presented: — I did not offer myself as a witness, here. But the gentleman says they will not let me into their circles. I have been in many places where I was unknown, where they have had their circles, and I have been present at them. The gentleman himself acknowledges there is some humbug. He calls out Von Vleck to testify that a great number of their manifestations are humbug. Bly, their own man, makes it his special duty to do this. And yet, when we undertook to add one single witness more, the man's character was attacked with tremendous ferocity; and when he attempted to introduce a letter with some explanation, they were in a great wrath. How did this quarrel begin? Dr. Mattson sent in a letter merely stating a simple fact, his own experience. Immediately, his character was attacked: — "Who is he?" "What is he?" "He lies!" — and attempted to contradict him. You will all bear me witness that I did all I could, to prevent a word being said, unkindly, of Mr. Farrar. Indeed, I did not think he deserved it. I have not said a word against any one. If I take my choice, to believe that the spirit tips the table or that somebody lies, — he lies, of course. A man asks me to give up my religion, my Bible, to desert my church, and give up the hopes of immortality, founded upon Christ the Redeemer, — he ridicules Christ, the blood of Christ, the death of Christ, — calls them all a humbug, — and the moment I turn upon him, he meets me with "Oh, you are ridiculing us!" Have they spared Christians? Have they spared our Church? Have they spared anybody but their own mediums, vast numbers of whom, according to the Spiritualists' own story, deserve to be kicked out of all decent society?

MR. MILLER.

My brother commenced by stating what I had expressed in my lecture on Sunday afternoon, and immediately proceeded to state, in connection with that, that we repu-

diated the marriage covenant. Did you mean to impute that to my discourse on Sunday afternoon?

MR. GRIMES.—I did not say, *repudiated it*. I said the Spiritualists did hold that it was not obligatory.

MR. MILLER.—Where, then, is the Spiritualist journal, the newspaper, that contains such a doctrine?

MR. GRIMES.—I said, in the first place, that the Spiritualists have no written creed. But who does not know that they trample the marriage obligation under foot?

MR. MILLER.—I do not. Ladies and gentlemen, I regret to say, here, that I consider that my brother, in his closing remarks, has very grossly misrepresented Spiritualism, and wantonly misstated the views I set forth in my lecture last sabbath afternoon. I spoke of the three dispensations,—the Mosaic, the Christian, and the Harmonial dispensations. I refer, by the latter, to the third dispensation, or age of science, philosophy and reason. I endeavored to show, from the science of phrenology, that the old Mosaic Dispensation, was characterized by force, coercion, and power; that it was born of the animal propensities; that it was the law of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. But I distinctly stated that I thought it the best law God could give to man at that time; but that in the second dispensation, man had measurably outgrown his animalism; that the moral sentiments began to be awakened, and that these gave birth to the Dispensation of Love, as exemplified in the character and teachings of Jesus Christ; that in the third dispensation, the race is approaching its manhood, and the intellectual faculties are beginning to be unfolded, and that man is now making his researches in the field of positive philosophy and science; and that unless we can demonstrate religion and immortality, as we demonstrate other sciences, we shall be shipwrecked upon the shoals of infidelity and scepticism. I gave examples, illustrating this fact, as exhibited among scientific men, and, among them, I spoke of Thomas Paine, who did such service to the cause of American Freedom at the time of the Revolution; I spoke of him as the friend of Washington, and Franklin, and Jefferson. He possessed a gigantic intellect; and no one denies it. I stated that the time would come when the world would do justice to Paine; and so I believe. But why should this be dragged into this question? The gentleman seems to have abandoned the question entirely, to introduce what he claims to be the creed of Spiritualists.

One other thing, and I leave it. He says, we do not consider the marriage covenant obligatory. I most solemnly protest that this is not true, in any sense, and challenge him to put his hand upon a single Spiritualist journal, or book, which avows such a sentiment. I do not claim that Spiritualists have not done wrong; it would be strange if all had done right. Neither do I claim that they are better than others. But it is the principles of Spiritualism, the Spiritual philosophy, and the fact of spirit-intercourse, that I stand here to defend. That Spiritualists disregard virtue, or marriage obligations, is no more true than of the Christian Church. No sect or class of people are perfect. In first Corinthians, Paul says of the early Christian Church, that they had licentiousness not known even among the heathen. Does that militate against the Christian religion? Not in the least. It is a well-known and lamentable fact, that you can hardly take up a daily paper, no matter where published, that does not contain one or more accounts of the shortcomings of clerical gentlemen and members of the Christian churches. But does that militate against the pure and holy religion which Christ taught? No; it does not. A few misguided souls have

tried to get up a free-love institution in Berlin Heights, Ohio; and out of two million Spiritualists in the United States, they have never been able to obtain thirty to join their ranks. And yet, there are five hundred clergymen in our state-prisons, to-day, who have been imprisoned, many of them, for the darkest, grossest, meanest crimes that man is capable of committing. But were there thirty hundred there, it would not militate, in the least, against Christianity. Why, then, are these things brought up, when the gentleman's business is to explain facts? He says we ridicule the blood of Jesus Christ. This does not belong to the question, one way or the other; yet I am free to confess that I do not believe there is any such mysterious efficacy in the blood of Christ, as the Christian Church claims; though far be it from me to ridicule any person's honest convictions of truth. If I do not believe it, in common honesty do not ask me to receive that which I cannot perceive to be true, for I should be false to myself if I did. He says, "we ridicule prayer." I confess, I do not like long, formal prayers, such as Jesus Christ rebuked, eighteen hundred years ago. But I do believe in praying unceasingly; for prayer is the desire of the heart. But, friends, if we can have but one thing, prayer or work, let us have the work—the good deeds. Here are men and women starving, in your city. I mentioned a case, last night, and it was thought I was severe: now I will give you the reference. F. G. Pope, No. 3 Pembroke Street, was the gentleman to whom the last and successful application was made in behalf of the poor woman for whose starving child a wealthy member of the Church had offered a handful of ginger-snaps.

I say that these organizations have ceased to accomplish any great good. There was a time when they were doing a mighty work; to-day, it seems they are dead; and their only efforts are to maintain the lifeless organization. They do not look around them and say, Where are the hungry, the needy, the starving, that we may relieve them? I do not say any thing against prayer; but I do believe that one loaf of bread, divided among the hungry and starving, will go further, in the sight of Heaven, and do more good, than all the prayers from all the thirty-six thousand pulpits in the United States. And I further say, that when the church-members are taxed one hundred million dollars, annually, to pay men for praying for the poor and needy, there is very little money left to buy bread for the hungry, starving subjects of their petitions. Action, not prayer alone, is what humanity most needs. Fred Douglas said he prayed for his freedom for years, prayed with his head and his heart; but it never amounted to any thing till he prayed with his heels. We want men to put their shoulders to the wheel, to roll on the great car of human progress.

Friends, I did state, in my discourse, that if we are to have no proof of immortality beyond that which the Church has thus far afforded, scepticism and infidelity must sweep away all religion. Let us see, for a moment, what Spiritualism has done. Long, long ago, Job asked the question, "If a man die, shall he live again?" And from that day to this, it has been asked. To millions it has been answered. Paul says that the last enemy to overcome is Death. Death, frightful, hideous as the King of Terrors, has lost its victory over the soul; for millions feel and know that it is but a transitional sleep, from which the unfettered spirit rises to a better and higher life. It demonstrates immortality, triumphantly. You may say, and the Church may say, we have abundant evidence of immortality. I say the world has been without tangible, reliable evidence. You have *hoped* for immortality, you have *desired* it; but you did not *believe* it, with a faith based upon good evidence; for your actions tell another story. If you believe your friends exist, why do you put on the dark habiliments of woe, and say they are *dead*? Why the mournful tread of the funeral procession, why the dark pall, why the

gloom that overspreads the family circle, when the dear one is passed away? To the minds of nine-tenths of the Christian world, death is equivalent to annihilation. Why do they speak of their friends as being in the graveyard? Had you the evidence that Spiritualism affords, you would know that they are not there. I will give you an illustration to show the comparative difference between faith and knowledge. You may see it every day. A few years ago, I had occasion to leave my home. I packed up my things, and took my mother's hand for a parting adieu; and when I bade her good-by, tears stood in her eyes. When I had gone, my mother sat down, and calculated the probable chances of a reunion. Although I was to be gone a long time, she would not put upon herself the dark habiliments of woe; but she said, "Though there is danger of his being shipwrecked or lost, or I may be taken away from this life, yet in all *probability* I shall see the light of his countenance again." And I returned, and that mother realized all her highest hopes. But another member of her family is called upon to take a journey. The call is imperative, and she must go. Death came and knocked at the door, and laid his cold, icy hands upon the mother's youngest born, the idol of her heart, and my young sister is stricken down in the embrace of death. Oh, how changed the scene, now! That mother, who had as much evidence of immortality as faith, hope, and the Church could give her, who had sat under the droppings of the sanctuary for years, cries in the anguish and loneliness of her heart, "My child is dead! my child is dead!" Now did she not know, if we have the evidence of future life which the Church claims, that she would *certainly* meet her child, soon? When I went away, she had only the probabilities of a reunion to depend upon, but now the absolute certainty, if she has knowledge of a future life. She was far advanced in years, and must know that soon she would be united to her child. But instead of that, she refused to be comforted, and in the anguish of her soul she cried, — "She is dead! she is dead!" And she followed the remains of that loved one to the silent grave; and as each successive clod fell upon the coffin-lid, it but echoed back to the mother's heart the terrible words — "Dead! dead!" Her grief was short, for soon the Angel of Death came and unlocked the prison-house of clay, and let her spirit leap forth to join her angel child. This is but a picture of every-day scenes, the world over. The sorrow of the mourner's heart, the dark habiliments of woe, all show that we have been without any tangible, reliable evidence of immortal life; but Spiritualism, thanks to the Infinite, comes in to demonstrate a hereafter, to destroy death, to cheer humanity, and to fill the void in the mourner's heart. And it has done more to fill the world with gladness and joy, in the last ten years, than all the discoveries of science for the last half century.

It has had, too, a tendency to awaken the mind from a long night of lethargy. If, as one great writer says, "the agitation of thought is the beginning of wisdom," then, surely, are we about to be ushered into a new dispensation. For never, in the history of the human race, has the mind been so thoroughly agitated as in the last twelve years. There has been more freedom of thought, more real, independent, unrestricted thought, exercised in this time, than in the two hundred years previous.

I have but little to say in regard to these manifestations. The philosophy of Spiritualism, and its sublime truths, do not rest, altogether, upon these manifestations. All they are calculated for, is to arrest attention, investigation, and inquiry. And I say, further, you can have the same positive proof, the same reliable evidence, of the truths of Spiritualism, that you can of any science whatever; but you, have to conform to the laws and principles that govern them. If they cannot be reproduced here, go where the circumstances render it possible and easy. I would add, that every man who has given it a careful investigation, has gone away satisfied of its truth. You cannot name

a single man who has recanted, and denied the facts, after thorough investigation. You might as well undertake to recant from the multiplication-table as from these facts. Investigate, and you will find that your proof of immortality does not depend upon any book, any history, or the say-so of any man. I know my angel sister stands by my side now, and if others have not such evidence, their negative testimony will never disprove this. Almost daily for the last two years, I have had evidence which renders it as certain as life. This evidence may not be shown you here, but conform to the laws and principles which regulate spirit-manifestations, and you shall have the proof, in your own private circles. And when the mighty truth bursts upon your mind, that you are surrounded by dear friends, you will find, in the hour of temptation, that a gentle mother, and angel sister, will strengthen your heart; and if you are not totally depraved, these silken chords of love will draw you nearer to God. My brother seemed to convey the idea, last evening, that because some mediums have done wrong, therefore these influences can have no power for virtue. That would destroy the doctrine that a mother has any influence over her child. How many children with moral parents do evil deeds. But does that destroy the fact that mothers have an influence? He asks, also, how shall we protect ourselves from bad spirits. Jesus Christ, and the apostles, taught that we are surrounded by good and bad spirits. John tells us to try the spirits; and yet my brother says that we have no means of determining whether spirits are good or bad. Try them by their words and works.

I am sorry, indeed, that my time has expired; but I am still more sorry, if we are wrong, that my friend has not explained a single fact—and so it will go before the world.

MR. GRIMES.

I beg leave to give a fact, as the gentleman gives them so freely. I read from the remarks of a Spiritualist, who was a Spiritualist for many years.

MR. MILLER. — Did he write it himself?

MR. GRIMES. — The gentleman can ask what he pleases, when I sit down.

"The Spiritualists of America, he stated, are not only, as a body, pantheists, rejecting alike the idea of the Scriptures as a Divine revelation, and the existence of a God, but they are gross sensualists and utterly immoral in their conduct in all the relations of life."

Mr. Harris added that, "This was not only true of the Transatlantic Spiritualists as a body, but that it was true of every 999 out of 1,000 of their number. Thousands of persons had died in America during the fifteen years that he had been a Spiritualist, who had notoriously lived most immoral lives, and yet the spirits of every one of these persons affirmed that they were all perfectly happy. The Spiritualists' literature of America, Mr. Harris also stated, was, with one or two exceptions in a thousand cases, Pantheistic, feeble, drivelling, nay, almost idiotic. The Spiritualists were utterly selfish, as well as sensual and grossly immoral. They were destitute of all human sympathies, and never were known to perform a single benevolent action."

Yes, a Spiritualist says this, though the gentleman says not one ever recanted.

"They fully believed that, in a future state, they would live the same licentious lives as they had done on earth. The American Spiritualists were, in reality, a body of pagans, worshipping, like the ancient pagans, ob-scesses, and, in every respect, grossly licentious, deities. And as regards the spirits with whom they held communication, they resembled the sorcerers and demons who took possession of man and women in the days of Christ, and who are so frequently referred to in God's word—that word which is the only sure foundation of our faith, and the only safe rule of our conduct."

Here is a man that never recanted!

"There were a few Christian men who had been deluded into the adoption of the system, but only in a modified degree, and so long as their Spiritualism was kept in subjection by their Christianity, the observations he had made did not apply to them. But these exceptions were so few as to be hardly worthy of notice. He begged to impress on the minds of his audience, that all that he had said of the system of Spiritualism—which he characterized as an *infernal* system—was the result of his own personal knowledge and experience."

My friend told me that they would not let me in and that therefore I could not observe. Here is the testimony of a Spiritualist, a man with fifteen years of observation.

There is only one thing I have to say, in conclusion,—that our friend, here, has given abundant evidence that he is better than his system.

MR. MILLER. — I am not half as good.

MR. GRIMES. — Then Heaven save you!

MR. MILLER.

My friends, the more I think of these principles, the more I feel my own unworthiness to represent them. There is not an hour in my life, that I do not pray to be better in heart, that I may represent them more truly.

Now, one word in regard to T. L. Harris. He does not deny the truth of spirit-intercourse, neither is that article, which the gentleman read, his letter or his speech, but a report published in the *London Advertiser*; and the reporter says he went to the meeting to get something against Spiritualism.

MR. GRIMES. — "Human testimony!"

MR. MILLER. — It is not the testimony of the speaker, but it is a gross misrepresentation, doubtless. Is it not strange that Harris should be among these Spiritualists for fifteen years and just discover that they are so bad? Is it possible he should have associated with them so long, and just found it out? Fifteen long years it took him, to be among them, to discover ninety-nine one-hundredths of them to be gross. In the earliest history of Spiritualism, T. L. Harris set himself up as an inspired vehicle of infallible revelations. He published a paper, and claimed to be the medium by whom Jesus Christ and Paul were making revelations, to the world, of infallible truth. He did not succeed in this. He tried hard to build up a church in New York, and failed. The Spiritualists were afraid that if they built up a church, they would become as corrupt as other churches; for history teaches that when the Church becomes prosperous and powerful, its tendency is to domineer and tyrannize over the mind. He failed to get up a church in New York; and because the Spiritualists would not bow down to him and allow what he claimed to be the spirits of Jesus Christ and Paul to tell them, through him, what they must do and what they must not, he goes over to London and denounces Spiritualism. The report is, undoubtedly a garbled one, as letters which have been received from England, state that Mr. Harris was greatly misrepresented.

A few words, ladies and gentlemen, to you, in these concluding remarks. Our discussion has been continued through eight evenings. Personally, I have no ill feeling towards my brother. He occupies the plane that he does, and perhaps cannot see differently. He has said some hard things, some very hard things, but it has injured himself more than you. He has denounced mediums personally.

MR. GRIMES. — I hope you are not going to make a personal trouble, now.

MR. MILLER. — No, sir.

MR. GRIMES. — For, if you are, I am ready for it.

MR. MILLER. — I desire to have my five minutes.

MR. GRIMES. — You have it; but it is in bad taste to take this opportunity to speak of me personally.

MR. MILLER. — I have no quarrel with my brother. If he has done wrong, if it may seem to you he has been malicious, if he has —

MR. GRIMES. — Oh, apologize for your own indecorum. The word *malicious* is bad, as applied to me. You may talk about any thing else but my personal maliciousness — don't do that.

MR. MILLER. — I would say, friends, if we are traduced by the opposition, and misrepresented, let us remember that those who are for us are greater than those who are against us. And to those who misunderstand and misrepresent us, let us say, in the spirit and language of the Martyr of Calvary, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

MR. GRIMES. — That will do very well.

The discussion was here closed.

It was then announced that Dr. Gardner desired to make a statement of the facts attending the investigation of Spiritualism, in 1857, by the committee generally known as the "Harvard Investigating Committee." He proceeded as follows: —

DR. GARDNER'S STATEMENT OF THE INVESTIGATION OF SPIRITUALISM BY THE BOSTON COURIER'S COMMITTEE.

I purpose to detain the audience but a very few moments; and I should not do that upon my own account, alone. But the matter of the Harvard investigation has been very often called up, in discussions and newspapers, and in the published conversations of the day, for nearly three years; and I have remained silent, with the exception of fairly announcing, after the conclusion of the so-called investigation, something of the facts in the case. I have waited, in vain, for that report which was promised by the gentlemen composing that committee, gentlemen who occupy a position in society, members of the Faculty of Harvard University, an institution of learning, second, I suppose, to no other in this country, gentlemen from whom the community had the right to expect fulfilment of their promise.

Of the circumstances attending that Harvard investigation of Spiritualism, you are all, doubtless, aware. It originated in a proposition from myself, to Professor Felton, to discuss the subject with a medium whom he had denounced as talking nonsense to gaping crowds, by the hour. He rejected that — or the *Courier* did, and it was understood that Professor Felton was the author of the article, and, in return, offered five hundred dollars for the production of certain specified phenomena, before a committee whom he should name, where all manner of imposition or jugglery should be out of the question, and suggested the names of Professors Agassiz, Pierce, Horsford, and Dr. Gould, as that committee. I accepted the proposition, on condition that the trial should be had under the arrangements that were universally recognized, by Spiritualists, as necessary and essential for the production of that class of manifestations. Correspondence took place. A meeting was had in Cambridge, at the house of Professor Agassiz, — I think, the first of June, — I have not my notes by me. Professors Pierce and Agassiz both said they did not like the position in which they were placed, as stakeholders. I agreed with them, but reminded them that they had been placed in that position by their

friend of the *Boston Courier*,—Mr. George Lunt appearing for the *Courier* on that occasion. After that conversation, and an expression of a desire, on the part of the persons present, whom I have named, to investigate the subject, and other matters connected therewith, I stated, to the gentlemen, what I had often said to my friends, and especially to Allen Putnam, Esq., of Roxbury, who was with me, that the five hundred dollars was a thing I wanted to have out of the way, but that I would be glad if these scientific gentlemen would investigate the subject candidly and earnestly. I stated that with the five hundred dollars I would have nothing to do,—that I never had any thing to do with Spiritualism for a wager or any thing of that kind. They expressed themselves highly gratified. Mr. Lunt, and Mr. Agassiz, and Mr. Pierce, I believe, especially, so expressed themselves; and Professor Agassiz said he would even waive other important engagements, and give this matter special attention. Articles of agreement were drawn up, as to the manner in which the investigation should be conducted. They signed their names to it. Now, among other things, it was agreed that I should have the entire arrangement of the circles, or have the management of them, or should be allowed to produce manifestations under the conditions that I should prescribe, to which, if not satisfactory to the gentlemen composing the committee, they should have the opportunity to suggest such alterations as they thought proper, and I would still try to produce the manifestations. Another condition was, that I should have the right to require that all should sit in the circle, except the committee,—Professor Agassiz saying he would not do that. No other member of the committee making any objection to sit in the circles, I inferred that they were willing to do so. It was further agreed that certain specific persons, only, should be present, and that the conduct of all should be such as is due from one gentleman to another in the society of gentlemen; that nothing like scoffing should take place, since that would utterly destroy the manifestations. These conditions were signed by the gentlemen, and, finally, after much labor on my part, the committee met, in the Albion Rooms, on the 25th of June, 1857.

Then, for the first time, though I had seen the gentlemen several times, they said to me, "We come here, not as a committee of investigation, but to judge and decide the case upon the question of the award of the five hundred dollars offered by the *Boston Courier*, for the production of certain specified phenomena." I said, "Gentlemen, I thought that the five hundred dollars was disposed of, long ago; and the fact that I have, at great expense, brought forward mediums to produce other kinds of manifestations, is proof of that." They said, Yes; but the *Boston Courier* had not withdrawn its offer. I said Mr. George Lunt was present at the house of Professor Agassiz, on the day of the first meeting, as the representative of the *Boston Courier*, and cordially approved my proposition to waive the whole matter of the five hundred dollars offered. However, after they had examined the arrangements of the room, tables, etc., we seated ourselves around the table, Mrs. Brown and Miss Kate Fox being the mediums. Raps were made, but the communications did not amount to very much,—that is, they had not much connection. Various experiments were had, to show whence they came. They appeared to be on the table. The mediums were then asked to put their little finger on the box. The raps were produced upon the box, distinctly. Subsequently, the sofa was moved away from the partition against which it stood, dividing the two rooms. It had no contact with the partition; and Professor Horsford and others passed upon the other side, and said the raps were distinctly heard upon the partition, nothing but the little finger of the medium being in contact. After these manifestations, on the first day,—about the time we were about to separate, something was said in regard to re-

viewing the minutes, so that they should agree as to what had taken place, and some little dispute took place between some of the gentlemen; when Professor Agassiz volunteered to say, Gentlemen, we understand, perfectly, how the raps were made, and before these sessions conclude, we will explain it to you so that the truth will dawn upon your mind as the light of the noonday sun. Professor Pierce assented to this. Subsequently to that, in consequence of the ungentlemanly deportment or language of some of these persons on the committee, and in consequence of their violation of their written, specified contract, which I have, and which can be produced when the time comes, there were not other manifestations produced which were satisfactory.

I know I place myself in a very peculiar position, in standing up, a humble individual as I am, and saying what I do say in regard to such men as Professor Agassiz, Professors Pierce, Horsford, and Gould. Let me say, however, in justice to Professor Horsford, that through the whole of these sessions of the committee, his conduct was that of a perfect gentleman, and the impression which he gave that of a man earnestly desirous to investigate, candidly, the matters referred to him. I am sorry I cannot say the same of two others of the professors of Harvard College. Dr. Gould was not a professor. You will, of course, understand to whom I refer—Professors Agassiz and Pierce:—their conduct was not gentlemanly. In consequence of these facts, the manifestations did not take place.

On the second day of July, I had invited the editors of most of the papers in Boston, to be present to witness the production of phenomena by the same mediums, in the same room, under the same circumstances as in the presence of the committee. These mediums had been invited, and Mr. Redman was present. The table was produced, which, according to the certificate of Dr. Bell, was made to weigh double and three times its natural weight, while his fingers were on the under side. The visitors, comprising quite a number of the editors of Boston, or their representatives, expressed themselves satisfied. In the evening, Miss Fox and Mrs. Brown were there. For an account of what transpired, I refer to you the *Boston Post*, of the 3d of July, 1857, a representative of that journal having been present.*

* The article referred to, extracts from which were here read by Dr. Gardner, was as follows:—

"THE SPIRIT QUESTION AGAIN—FURTHER INVESTIGATION.—Notwithstanding the condemnatory report of the 'Spiritual Investigating Committee,' appointed by the publishers of the *Courier*, to investigate the manifestations of Spiritual mediums brought forward by Dr. Gardner,—the substance of which report, being that all of the committee's fair tests had failed of being satisfactorily met,—Dr. G. invited, yesterday afternoon and evening, to room No. 12 Albion House, representatives from the different newspapers in Boston, for the purpose of exhibiting to them, his experiments in spiritual manifestations, and placing through this instrumentality, their practical results, before the public. The press was largely represented, and the strictest attention was given to the proceedings. Without volunteering any opinion on the subject of Spiritualism, we will give a brief statement of what transpired, as it appeared to our understanding. In the afternoon, at 8 o'clock, the mediums, Mrs. Brown and Miss Kate Fox (sisters), were present. At the suggestion of Dr. Gardner, the visitors examined the tables and fixtures in the room. The company, with the medium, then sat round a large table, and in a short time a very brisk rapping, in a variety of tones, assailed the ear. A series of questioning of certain spirits was now commenced through the instrumentality of the 'rap,' and under the direction of the lady mediums. The answers were, in almost every instance, straight and satisfactory, and from the system adopted of transferring the questioning from one to another, a suspicion of collusion between the mediums would be difficult to arrive at by even the most sceptical. This setting occupied about one hour and a quarter.

"In the evening the manifestations were of a different character. Two boys were placed in a box with seats at each end, and the lights put out. It was then desired that 'John' (the spirit) should tie them together, ropes having been placed in the box for the purpose. But 'John' wouldn't do it, and the experiment failed. The boys were then tied together in the most secure manner, with many knots exceedingly intricate, and the lights again put out. The request this time was that the spirit should untie them, and while the investigators held those having charge of the exhibition, the boys were separated amid a great pulling and rubbing, not

The manifestations produced before this committee of Boston editors, were, I believe, satisfactory in every instance; and they expressed an opinion that there could be no collusion. They had an opportunity of examining the rooms, tables, and mediums, to the fullest extent; and still these manifestations were produced; proving that had the committee acted fairly and honorably, the same manifestations would have been produced in their presence; for they were produced in the same room, by the same mediums, on the same material.

In the conclusion of their award, that committee dragged in extraneous matter, and ventured to assert, from observations they had themselves, personally, made, that any connection with Spiritualistic circles, so called, corrupts the morals and degrades the intellect; and that they therefore deemed it their solemn duty to warn the community against this contaminating influence, as surely tending to lessen the truth of man and the purity of woman.

They wrote me a letter, enclosing their award, and, indeed, expressing their entire satisfaction at the manner in which I had conducted the meetings, complimenting me very highly. They expressed their regret that I had been so many times disappointed, etc. But in closing this award, they made this addendum which I have read. I wrote back, asking them, briefly, if it was any thing that they had observed during those sittings, which had brought them to this conclusion which they had thus published to the world. The gentlemen did not condescend to answer.

They did not explain how the raps were made, though they have often, since, been urged to do so, and though they promised to explain them so that it should be clear as the noonday sun.

They promised to report to the world: the Report did not come. And why did it not? I will give you my opinion as to the reason of its non-appearance. I think I am warranted in the belief, by the manner in which they managed the whole affair. They expected, by their great names and influence, to write down the whole testimony of the millions who have witnessed the phenomena of Spiritualism. A few days afterwards, suspecting this trick of theirs — for, after seeing what I had, I suspected they might be capable of almost any thing, — I invited the editorial fraternity to be present, so that if those gentlemen stated any thing not true, the editors of the Boston press would have the matter before them; and if they denied that the manifestations could be produced, the editors of Boston should have it in their power to say they had witnessed them under the same circumstances and by the same mediums. The representative of the *Post* made a report of what occurred at one of the *séances*, and thus the learned professors became aware of the precaution I had taken to guard the cause I represented, from injury by any unfair or garbled report they might make. The day after the publication

(like rattling of ropes), and much to the astonishment of all present, who, with the greatest care, were unable to detect any trickery. This transpired within fifteen minutes.

"The next feat was to tie the boys up, which failed before, and it was accomplished in six minutes. They were examined, and the lights once more extinguished. In accordance with a request, the spirit (and when we say 'John' did this or that, it is only for convenience based on general supposition) closed the doors of the box and bolted them. A tamborine had been placed upon the floor of the box, and upon its top, outside, of course, was a violin. The latter article then fell through, and the two instruments came in contact. In a second they were playing 'Pop Goes the Weasel.' The doors were then unbolted and flew open, and almost instantly the room was lighted. The company rushed towards the scene of action, and, wonderful to relate, found the boys as intricately tied as at first.

"The lights were again put out, and the boys untied in two minutes, the shutting and bolting operation being again performed. This was the last experiment of the evening, and the company departed perfectly bewildered at what they had seen. We submit the whole matter for what it is worth. Another meeting will be held this evening."

of the article referred to, which appeared in the *Boston Post*, was the day on which it was expected their Report would be made. But it never came. Professor Horsford said, sometime afterward, on the floor of the old Melodeon Hall, that they were still pursuing their investigations, which were nearly concluded, and that the Report would very soon be forthcoming.

The *Boston Courier* published a report, well calculated, whether intentionally so or not, to deceive the whole community. It was quite generally supposed to be the Report of the Committee of Investigation. That report was written by George Lunt, a man who reclined on the sofa in the room, during the sitting, and, whenever any thing occurred, scoffingly and insultingly manifested his feelings in such a manner as so to disturb the mediums as to be, in my opinion, a principal cause of the want of success in the production of manifestations. That man, Lunt, gave his account in the *Courier*, and made statements that were not true; and I challenge him to prove them. He has friends, here; I believe the reporter of the *Courier* is here, and I want him to put it down. I feel that the cause of truth has been outrageously abused by these gentlemen, who call themselves respectable men, who occupy the position of teachers, in Harvard College, an institution that has been more largely supported by the taxation of Massachusetts than any other in the state. Those men, I say, are the teachers of our youth. They still stand pledged to make the report which they promised three years ago. And, from all the circumstances in the case, I say they have done violence to the cause of truth and justice. I stand here and boldly and fearlessly make this statement, because I am satisfied that the truth will sustain itself. And I challenge them to meet my statement. The reason the raps were not produced was because the conditions which the committee had agreed upon were violated. The reason the committee did not publish the Report, was because they dared not do it, because the editorial corps of Boston would come out and give them the lie if they said that the manifestations could not be produced under circumstances where there was no possibility of trickery or collusion.

I have taken this occasion to speak of this matter, because I am not accustomed to meet any audience except such as are principally composed of Spiritualists. I wish to make an addendum to this discussion, to let the world know the truth in this case, and the fact that those men have falsified their promise to the community, in failing to produce their report.

MR. GRIMES. — I want to say a single word in regard to that matter. It is stated that the reason why these gentlemen did not publish the report was because they dared not, and did not mean to. I can be a witness in regard to one fact relevant to that; and that is, that after this matter was all over, I knew, from conversation with one or two of these professors, that they were still engaged in investigation. One of them told me they intended to make out their Report. This was a private matter. They called upon me for any facts I might have in my possession, which would aid them in their investigation.

DR. GARDNER. — I have not any doubt, myself, that they did intend to report. There is another reason, perhaps, for their failure, — that is, they have, in their investigations, seen so much of it that they are ashamed to report.

MR. GRIMES. — That is very true!

CONTENTS.

QUESTION FIRST.

FIRST EVENING,	- - -	Monday, March 5th,	- -	<i>Page.</i> 5
SECOND	" - - -	Tuesday, " 6th,	- - -	22
THIRD	" - - -	Wednesday, " 7th,	- -	40
FOURTH	" - - -	Thursday, " 8th,	- - -	58

QUESTION SECOND.

FIFTH EVENING,	- - -	Friday, March 9th,	- -	78
SIXTH	" - - -	Saturday, " 10th,	- -	100
SEVENTH	" - - -	Monday, " 12th,	- -	120
EIGHTH	" - - -	Tuesday, " 13th,	- -	141

Dr Gardner's statement of the investigation of Spiritualism by the <i>Boston Courier's</i> Committee,	- - - - -	162
---	-----------	-----

QUESTION FIRST.

						Pgs.
FIRST	EVENING,	- - -	Monday, March 8th,	- -		5
SECOND	"	- - -	Tuesday, " 9th,	- - -		22
THIRD	"	- - -	Wednesday," 7th,	- -		46
FOURTH	"	- - -	Thursday, " 8th,	- - -		28

QUESTION SECOND.

FIFTH EVENING,	-	-	-	Friday, March 24,	-	-	2
SIXTH	"	-	-	Saturday, "	1901	-	10
SEVENTH	"	-	-	Sunday, "	1901	-	12
EIGHTH	"	-	-	Tuesday, "	1901	-	11

Dr Gardner's statement of the investigation of Espionage by the House Committee.

Instead of

SECRET

1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 26

$\rho_{\text{max}}^{(1)}$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
$\rho_{\text{max}}^{(2)}$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
$\rho_{\text{max}}^{(3)}$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
$\rho_{\text{max}}^{(4)}$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100

$$A((\pm 1)^i) = (-1)^i \sin(\pi/4) = (-1)^i \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$$

22	-	-	det $\nabla^2 g = 1$	-	-	-	-	det $\nabla^2 g = 1$
23	-	-	det $\nabla^2 g = 0$	-	-	-	-	"
24	-	-	$\nabla^2 g = 0$	-	-	-	-	"
25	-	-	$\nabla^2 g = 0$	-	-	-	-	"

[illegible]

INDEX TO PAPERS READ.

	<i>Page.</i>
Notice of Discussion, - - - - -	3
Origin of Discussion, and Rules of Conduct, - - - - -	3
Letter of Mr. H. B. Smith (Spirit-portrait by E. Rodgers), - - -	29
Extract from <i>Laporte Times</i> (Spirit-portrait by E. Rodgers,) - -	30
Extract from Judge Edmonds' "Spiritualism," - - - - -	31
Certificate to manifestations at house of Mr. J. Dimond, Boston, - -	46
Letter from New York (Spirit-portrait by E. Rodgers), - - - -	47
Verses from the Spirit of Eugene Burdette Tyler, - - - - -	53
Report of Committee on Test Investigation, - - - - -	78
Report of Mr. Miller's Committee, - - - - -	82
Spirit-communication from D — A —, - - - - -	90
First Letter from Mr. D. Farrar, (Mediumship of Mr. Squire), - -	90
Communication from the Spirit of Emma Sexton, - - - - -	112
First Letter from Dr. Morris Mattson (Experiments of Mr. Squire), -	114
Second Letter from Mr. D. Farrar (Reply to Dr. Mattson), - - -	124
Extract from <i>N. O. Crescent</i> (Disappearance of Dr. Redman), - -	129
Letter from Dr. L. V. Bell (Mediumship of Dr. Redman), - - - -	131
Certificate to manifestations at house of Mr. F. G. Pope, Boston, - -	132
Extract from <i>Boston Courier's</i> Report of Investigation of Spiritualism by the Harvard Committee, - - - - -	134
Letter from Mr. C. D. Kellogg (Experiments of Mrs. Coan, before Test Com- mittee,) - - - - -	134
Extract from <i>Spirit World</i> (Certificate to manifestations at house of Laroy Sunderland, Boston), - - - - -	146
Extract from <i>Boston Herald</i> (Editorial Report of Test Exhibition by Mrs. Coan and Dr. Bly), - - - - -	149
Second Letter from Dr. Morris Mattson (Reply to Mr. Farrar, etc.), -	149
Letter from Mr. W. L. F. VonVleck, - - - - -	153
Extract from <i>London Advertiser</i> (Report of Lecture of Rev. T. L. Harris),	161

The place of residence of Mr. Miller should be given as Mt. Morris, N. Y., instead of Madison, as printed on page 3.