

TWO VOLUMES IN ONE;
OR THE
QUESTION OF THE SPIRITUALISM
OF THE BIBLE SETTLED,
TOGETHER WITH A SERIES OF
STARTLING CONTRASTS
BETWEEN
CREEDAL CHRISTIANITY
AND THE FACTS AND PHILOSOPHY OF
MODERN SPIRITUALISM.

BY
MOSES HULL,
Author of many Biblical and Spiritualistic Works.

"That which hath been is now; and that which is hath already been."
Eccl. 3:15.

BUFFALO, N. Y.:
MOSES HULL & CO.
CHICAGO:
THE PROGRESSIVE THINKER.
1901.

BF
1275
.BG
H9
1901

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1895,
By MOSES HULL,
In the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.



*As Ener.
Moses Hull.*

edit
Mrs. H. H. Higgins
1/4/54

PREFACE.

THE era of cheap books is here, and the desire has forced itself upon me to give those who are hungry for spiritual pabulum the greatest possible amount of truth at the least cost. Finally the idea of uniting in one *The Question Settled* and *The Contrast* came to me. The former was written in 1868, and for ten years sold at \$1.50. The *Contrast* was written in 1872, and for five years sold at the same price. As soon as I could I reduced the price to \$1.25 per volume. and then to \$1. Now I throw away the prefaces, title-pages and table of contents, and send all the other matter of both books out in one volume for the small sum of one dollar—that is one-third of the original price.

The Spiritual public has, in the past, dealt kindly with these two books, this being the twelfth edition of one and the seventh edition of the other.

I realize the imperfections in this volume, and ask the reader, when he finds them, to remember that when the first half of this was written the author was very young in Spiritualism and in years, and that the second half was written more than a score of years in the past. The issues were not then exactly what

they are now; nor did I have the experience of riper years to assist in my work.

I did think of writing a new volume to take the place of this; but that would mean much hard work and a thousand dollars in money. Even then the book could not be sold at the low price at which this is offered; I hand this out instead.

I hereby promise that all the net proceeds from the sale of this book shall be devoted to the publication of the one book which I think the cause of Spiritualism in its present status needs more than it needs any other book yet published.

MOSES HULL.

Chicago, Ill., 1895.

THE QUESTION SETTLED.

CHAPTER I.

THE ADAPTATION OF SPIRITUALISM TO THE WANTS OF HUMANITY.

No Argument so good as that of Adaptation—Religions must adapt themselves to Men—Religions and Sciences have failed to demonstrate an After-Life—Two contradictory Chains of Thought in the Bible—Law forbidding Consultation with the Dead—Its Effect—Bible Writers in Doubt as to a Future—A Dialogue—Spiritualism convinces a Minister of his Immortality—Dying Minister in Despair—Why this Appetite for a Knowledge of a Future—Counterfeit Spiritualism an Evidence of a Genuine—Spiritualism not a Phantasm—Men love Spirit-Communion—Illustration—Spirits retain their Regard for Mortals—Is it Imagination—Where and What is the Land of the Dead—All Interested in the Question—Sick Healed—Endless Progress—Theodore Parker—Abraham Lincoln—A Proof of the Truth of Spiritualism in its Beauty—Conclusion.

TH**ERE** is no argument so strong in favor of any hypothesis as that which shows unmistakably the adaptation of the theory to the work intended. A religious theory proving itself adapted to meet all the wants of the human soul comes with God's warrant in its hands. Having such *credentials* from the Almighty, but little else is needed to prove it true. As man is the highest type of the creation, yea, "the offspring of God" (see Acts xvii. 28), religions and theories must bend to man: he can not bend to them. They must come to him as he is, in a state of nature, and adapt them-

selves to his wants. The first inquiry which suggests itself is, What are the wants of the human soul? All answer, The first great want of the soul is an evidence of its own continued existence.

With all deference to other systems of religion and philosophy, Spiritualism is the only system which can make man know of his own immortality. Is man immortal? is a question which is now being propounded with more earnestness than ever before. How can the question be answered? If Science be consulted, she stands with drooping wings, looking down into the dark grave, and answers, "The knowledge is not with me. I am educated only in the past: I trace man from the primordial fires, through the granite rock, on through the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms, to the grave: but I can see no farther." Science can not tell the strength of the disease now preying upon my body, nor yet the power of endurance my physical system may have; much less can it dive into the dark future, and grapple from its unwritten pages evidences of man's future condition. Poor blind Science! don't ask it to solve questions so entirely out of its reach. True, we may reason from the great law of design manifest everywhere, and from our reasonings draw the *hope* that this mundane existence will not wind up the course of man; but at best *it is only hope*. The soul demands *evidence* of its immortality. Where shall it be found?

If we recur to the Bible, we find two distinct and contradictory classes of ideas upon this subject running through that book. One chain of ideas comes from certain phenomena which were witnessed among the people; such as Samuel returning and holding a *tête-à-tête*

with King Saul, Moses and Elias talking with Jesus on the mount, John's brother talking with him on the Island of Patmos, &c. See 1 Sam. xxviii. 14-20; Matt. xvii. 1-8; Rev. xxii. 8.

Though these facts are said to have occurred, they were in the most open violation of one of the strictest laws of the Jews, which reads as follows:—

“There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or a witch, or a charmer, or a *consulter of familiar spirits*, or a wizard, or a *necromancer*.”—Deut. xviii. 10, 11.

Here is a law forbidding spirit-communion. It takes more courage than most people possess to enable them to violate such plain laws, with death as their penalty. The result, as might have been expected, was, that cases of spirit-communion were rare. Death they had before them constantly; graves they saw every day: but those who had passed on they did not see, did not dare to see them. The result was, many of them concluded they had no existence. Jacob, when he supposed his son Joseph to be dead, said, “Joseph is not” (Gen. xlii. 36). Rachel, being forbidden to consult her children, naturally enough concluded they were not (Jer. xxxi. 15). Isaiah says of the dead, “They are extinct; they are quenched as tow” (Is. xliii. 17). The writers of the Bible not only supposed, as a result of their being shut away from communication with the dead, that they had no existence, but they believed death to be a state of *eternal* nonentity. It was not Porphyry, Celsus, or “Julian the apostate,” but Job, who said, “So he that goeth down to the grave shall

come up no more" (Job vii. 9). David, the "man after God's own heart," did not leave it for Lord Bolingbroke or Pope to compose the poem which says, "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help; for his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth: in that very day his thoughts perish" (Ps. cxlvi. 1-3). It was thirty centuries before the birth of the author of "The Age of Reason," that Solomon, the wise Jewish king, gave utterance to the following sentiment:—

"The living know that they shall die; but the dead know not any thing." — Eccl. ix. 5.

Not satisfied with uttering the atheistic sentiment of the unconsciousness of the dead, he proceeds to lock the doors of a future against them. Hear him:—

"Neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love and their hatred is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun." — Eccl. ix. 5, 6.

All the above-mentioned passages express the most absolute infidelity concerning the future of man. These opinions can but be regarded as the legitimate result of the embargo put upon appealing to the dead for knowledge. Remove that restriction, let the Jew have the privilege which the heathen enjoyed, of consulting the dead, and how long could his infidelity have remained? Not long enough for Job to have said,—

"The grave is my house: I have made my bed in darkness. I have said to corruption, Thou art my father; to the worm, Thou art my mother and my sister. And where is now my hope? As for my hope,

who shall see it? They shall go down to the bars of the pit when our rest together is in the dust." — Job xvii. 13–16.

If the Bible writers themselves, for whom a plenary inspiration is claimed, who, it is supposed, enjoyed all the evidences of immortality, were so unbelieving concerning the future, is it any wonder that the world to-day has so nearly run into atheism on that subject? If the position assumed be correct, that the elements of the infidelity of the Jews had an origin in their non-intercourse with the dead; that, in proportion as that people transcended their legal rights, and held occasional converse with visitants from the other side, their unbelief was supplanted by knowledge, — then we may safely affirm, that, without Spiritualism, there *is* no positive evidence of a future life.

When traveling on a certain occasion through Canada, the writer was introduced to a Baptist minister. As the prefix "Reverend" was used in his introduction, the gentleman of course supposed him to be an evangelical minister. Being curious to know whether this minister could find any evidence of another world, independent of Spiritualism, he commenced a conversation which resulted in the following dialogue: —

HULL. — How is the cause of religion in Canada?

MINISTER. — All is well. We had glorious revivals through these parts last winter. Of course, matters have cooled down somewhat; yet, with many, the work seems to be deep and lasting. How, may I ask, is the good cause in Michigan?

H. — We are having trouble there. There are a great many thinkers in that State, and among them a

large proportion of materialists who deny immortality ; and we find them hard to meet.

M. — Ah ! I see no trouble in meeting them, especially if they believe the Bible. Why don't you tell them that Samuel returned to talk with Saul ? This he never could have done had not he been immortal.

H. — True enough. That could be used, for aught I know, in Canada ; but it does not do to use it in Michigan. There are in that State about twenty-five thousand Spiritualists ; and, were you to quote that text, every one of them would claim you as being on their side of the question ; for, if the text proves any thing, it proves Samuel was immortal by the fact of his having returned and communicated. We do not wish, when battling with atheists and materialists, to put a club into the hands of the Spiritualists with which to beat our brains out when we undertake to deny Spiritualism.

M. — True ; but could you not tell them of the appearance of Moses and Elias on the Mount of Transfiguration ?

H. — Yes ; but that, too, if it proves any thing, proves the continued life of the parties by their returning.

M. — Yes, yes ; but should we reject a truth because the Spiritualists believe it ?

H. — Certainly not. But is there no way to prove immortality, without resorting to texts, which, if they prove any thing, prove Spiritualism ?

M. — The fact is, my belief in immortality does not hang upon biblical expressions. *I know man is immortal.*

H. — You are the man I want to see. Tell me how you know it.

M. — Last Saturday I was called to the bedside of a dying sister: while we were watching for the last breath, she suddenly brightened up, and said, “See there! do you see?” — “See what?” I said. “There is my sister, and one who I guess is Jesus: they have come for me.” Saying this, she expired. Now I can not think this all deception. God is too good to let one who had trusted him all the days of her life die so deceived.

H. — So I think; but *that* is Spiritualism. And now let me confess that I am a Spiritualist. I have talked thus with you to see if you had any evidence of immortality which would not prove Spiritualism.

M. — I do not see that we are bound to reject a truth because Spiritualists believe it.

This last sentence, though true, does not present the matter fairly. Every system of religion in the land lives and is sustained by its spiritual element. The question was not, “Shall I reject the evidence of immortality presented to my dying sister?” but, “Is there any evidence, except that which comes in such a way, that, if it proves any thing, it proves Spiritualism?”

The world demands to-day, above all things, the evidence of immortality. All demand it. As the mother takes the last look at the cold, dead body of her son, and imprints a kiss on his colorless cheek, she involuntarily exclaims, “*Shall I see my child again?*” Then let the minister point her to some biblical declaration, and her very soul will revolt at it; and she will inwardly, if not outwardly, exclaim, “Such authoritative *ipse dixit*s may do under ordinary circumstances; but they fail to reach a mother’s heart in an extremity

like this." What will convince that mother? "Is there no balm in Gilead? is there no physician there?" She naturally feels, "If my son lives, why does he not take this burden from my heart? Has he lost all interest in me? Oh for one breeze from the summer-land (if there be such a country), just one rap, one test, one evidence, that my son still lives and thinks!"

Now the Spiritualist believes that that boy *can* come back and communicate with his mother; that he *can* say, "Mother, I am alive!" Reader, don't you *wish* it was true? Wouldn't you *make* it true if you had the making of the truth? If these questions were asked of the great body of humanity, would *one single voice* be found to say, "No"?

Once upon a time, we were invited to the bedside of a dying minister, whom we had long known to be a *good* man and a consistent Christian, if there ever was one: to say the least, his daily life was a better epistle than Paul ever wrote. The minister was taken suddenly with hemorrhage of the lungs, and drew rapidly near the gates of physical dissolution. Looking up to us, he faltered out, "Brother Hull, do *you* believe in the *resurrection of the dead*?"

"Why," said we, "you have heard us *preach* on that question many times: did you think we would preach what we did not believe?" He responded, "I was taught to believe it; but I know now, for the *first* time, that I never did. I received it from my teachers and my Bible without investigating. I am now dying; and I frankly acknowledge that I do not believe this body can again be gathered. I can not see that there is a

future for man." After reasoning with the man nearly an hour, we ventured to ask, "Are you now satisfied?" He responded, "I am dying now: I can not talk. My request is for you to preach my funeral-discourse; and don't let one who hears it, die, as I am dying now, without any hope of a beyond."

Under the influence of this scene, we could but exclaim, "If there is *not* another world, what a pity there is not!—and, if there *is*, what a pity that God did not give us a better knowledge of it!" Without *Spiritualism* there *is* no evidence of another world.

Now we would inquire, Is this appetite for a *beyond* the only one God has left ungratified? or, having granted us this boon, has he left us without any possibility of knowing that there is life when the earthly life has ceased, until by experience we know of the better country? It can not be that God, who has done all in his power for man, has left us thus to grope in darkness. No: when every other source of evidence has been set aside as unsatisfactory, *Spiritualism* comes to our relief; thus proving itself, in this respect at least, adapted to the needs of humanity.

Evidences of another life, given through *Spiritualism*, are many of them of such a character, that those who have witnessed them find no room for doubts. That there are cases of deception, that there are lying mountebanks who wear the fair garments of *Spiritualism* as a cloak for their iniquity, does not affect the genuine manifestations more than a genuine bank-bill would be affected by counterfeits issued on its credit. Nay, do not counterfeits prove the existence of a true coin, which is worthy of counterfeiting? Men do

not counterfeit copper coin: it is too cheap. How strangely beside themselves men get when they conclude there is no genuine Spiritualism because they have found a counterfeit! Profound logic that! When such men as Robert Owen, Robert Hare, Robert Dale Owen, and hundreds of others whom we might mention, who have all their lives, up to the time of their communion with the departed, doubted whether there was another life, are, through Spiritualism, so perfectly convinced of it, that no room is left for a doubt, and they are ever after not only believers, but open advocates of immortality, we are led to ask, Is any other argument needed to show that Spiritualism is perfectly adapted to meet that earnest longing of the human heart for a knowledge of endless life?

Now, we ask, Is not immortality a natural want? and, if man is immortal, is not the evidence of the fact a want natural to him? Spiritualism is found equal to the task of supplying that need. Has it not in this proved itself adapted to the wants of man? No other religion has done so much.

Is it objected that the evidence is not real? that only the *gullible* are deceived by it? Admit it, and what is the result? Man is a poor worm, either without immortality, or, if immortal, without any evidence of the fact. All hope pertaining to the future is idle. All our prospects are blasted. Religion is a solemn *farce*, and man of all creatures the most miserable, placed on the earth, given a taste of life, made to enjoy immortality, and yet his highest joys and brightest anticipations all imagination. And is it so? Has not the Giver of all good been able to make the reality as

glorious as man, without any image before him, could paint the ideal? Tell us that day does not follow night, that water does not quench thirst, that it is only fanatics who imagine that the sun shines, that this life is a miserable *phantasm*; but do not tell us that the seeds of happiness sown in the human soul by this beautiful belief will never grow.

Even admitting that man could know of another world without Spiritualism, yet who would not hold sweet communion with those on the other side? We are all social beings. We love social converse; nor is that love confined to the living. The true wife does not cease to love her husband as soon as he passes from her sight: that husband, whose voice was once sweet to her, and whose friendly counsel was her greatest solace, still lives. Is it not natural that the wife should long for communion with the one whose life was almost a part of her being?

To illustrate: a mother had two sons, James and John, whom she loved as her own life; but when traitors fired into our flag, and trampled it under foot, she gave them up to defend their country. In the course of the battle, James was killed; but John, after passing through severe engagements, returns home a triumphant conqueror. How the loving mother hails her son! With what eagerness does she grasp his hardened hand! With what outgushing of soul does she imprint her kisses upon his sun-browned cheek! How proudly she watches his every move! With what heartfelt joy does she welcome him to the place at the table made vacant by his absence! And as he relates his experiences on the battle-fields, in forced

marches, in prison-pens, how her very soul drinks his every word! Now, who can think that she forgets James, who, fired with the same patriotism, went, but never returned? How would her soul rejoice, could James come back from the other side, and fill *his* vacant chair, and relate the experiences *he* has had since his birth into the better world! Is there one on earth who has a friend in spirit-life, but that would like to see and converse with that friend? The spiritual philosophy says, Such communion awaits you. Who does not wish it correct on that point? Then it is adapted to meet the wants of man.

Not only is spirit-communion desirable for lonely ones yet clothed in mortality, but departed spirits themselves must long for the privilege of loving and blessing dear ones whom they have left behind.

Were the angel of death to summon us this moment to the better land, we should leave a wife and four daughters, whom we love as we love our own soul. They may not be very much in the world; but they are all the world to us. We remember that this world is sometimes cold and heartless, especially toward the feminine half of humanity. Woman is not legally, socially, and politically man's equal; often compelled to work for less than half wages, and sometimes driven to the alternative of stealing or starving, or, even worse than either, compelled to sell her virtue for the bread and butter the world owes her. Could we think of going to heaven and singing praises, and our wife and daughters driven to such lives as these, — we not even having the privilege of looking over its battlements, and asking, How fares thy soul? Nay; rather put us

into an orthodox hell, with the privilege of an occasional respite to bless those left behind, than thus to shut us away from those who need a husband's love and a father's counsel. If this communion be not true, we chide with Almighty God. Has he made that false which man needs, and that true which is so illy adapted to meet his wants? Has the Devil beaten God so badly, and got the best and *prettiest* theory after all? Believe it who can: we can not. Nay! the father, mother, brother, or sister who crossed the stream of death before us, *can not* lose their interest in those left behind.

Another reason why the soul longs for Spiritualism is, that each and every one is personally interested in knowing what there is in reserve for him. The realities of another world, if there be another, we must soon taste. How shall we find things over there? is a query which can not be expelled from any mind. How natural the query! Were we emigrating to some distant country, how anxiously would we try to learn something of its location, climate, soil, timber, inhabitants, &c. ! and how should we find out? In no other way than by consulting those who have been there. The truth is, we are all emigrants—to what place? If to a haven “from whose bourn no traveler returns,” how dark the prospect ahead! No wonder that Job said, “A land of darkness as darkness itself.” Certain it is we can learn nothing of that world, only as we learn it from those who have been there. Then how beautiful the thought, that those on the other shore can draw the curtain aside, as did Samuel of old, and give us news concerning their whereabouts and condition!

In hours of weary sadness, when cares are pressing heavily upon us, and we weary even of life itself, how sweet to have such spirits as Miss A. W. Sprague come through such mediums as Miss Lizzie Dotson; and after announcing that —

“ I come, I come, from my spirit-home,
 Like a bird in the early spring,
 To the loved ones here, whom my heart holds dear,
 A message of love to bring,”

and telling us that —

“ The heavens are wide, but they can not divide
 The spirits whom love makes free !
 The green old earth, and the land of my birth,
 With its homes, are still dear to me,”

to go on and give such glowing descriptions of the heavenly country, that, while reading, we sometimes quite forget that we belong to earth !

“ We'll be there, we'll be there, in a little while,
 We'll join the pure and the blest,
 We'll have the palm, the robe, the crown,
 And for ever be at rest.”

Oh, glorious thought ! How our soul fills with rapture as we contemplate the summer-land as described by those who have tasted its fruit, breathed its air, traversed its fields, and bathed in its exhilarating waters !

Spiritualism professes to heal the sick. There are persons (mediums) who profess, under favorable con-

ditions, to come so *en rapport* with the spirit-world as to enter into certain magnetic relations with it, by which, by a touch, they can heal disease. Thus the blind have been made to see, the deaf to hear, and even the insane have, by this power, been restored to sanity. Call this all imagination! How glorious such an imagination! Why can it not be true? Would not a religion which would do what some imagine Spiritualism is doing, just meet the wants of the world? What a pity that such a religion should lack only the element of truth!

One more point: the idea of endless progression, as taught in Spiritualism, is certainly one of the most beautiful thoughts that ever entered the human brain. If that be true, not only are such men as Newton, Locke, Bacon, Washington, Jefferson, Clay, Webster, Douglas, and Lincoln alive to-day; but they live for a purpose. They are interested in matters of theology and jurisprudence as much to-day as when they wore their own bodies. Let two cases illustrate our ideas; and who shall they be? One we will select from the theological, and one from the political world. From the religious world, we could not make a better selection than Theodore Parker. From the political world, Abraham Lincoln will be the man of our choice.

It is unnecessary for us to say a word in Mr. Parker's praise. Most of our readers know with what steady purpose his noble heart was devoted to every reform. Sinners feared him more than all the other ministers of New England put together. He always asked, not, What will bring the praise, honor, or wealth of the world? but, What is right? In the winter of

1857-'58, the people of New England were insane with religious excitement, and yet, in their revival meetings, would publicly rebuke one who dared to remember the poor slave in his chains. Mr. Parker occupied Music Hall in Boston, and, from Sunday to Sunday, preached to the people of "The Revival of Religion which we need," — a revival which breaks every yoke, and tears away every burden; which pays the milliner and dress-maker in proportion as it does the lawyer, doctor, or minister; which would occasionally let a poor servant-girl make a summer tour to Europe, and let her pay go on the same as though she were a minister: in fact, a revival which sanctifies the *kitchen* as well as the *pulpit*. Such preaching was too much for New-England Puritanism; and the result was, the "baptized" and "sanctified" infidels to the purer religion held prayer-meetings to pray him out of the world. And when the news came from the "sunny South" that Theodore Parker was dead, what rejoicing and thanksgiving! "One infidel out of the world!" "We'll hear no more of Theodore Parker. He is dead and gone!" How mistaken!

Theodore Parker is not dead. He is here now. His voice rings as melodiously, truthfully, and harmoniously in behalf of every reform as when he spoke through his own organism. The cause of humanity, which is the cause of God, lies as near his heart as ever. Still he follows the waymarks of those ahead of him, and beckons those behind to follow on. He, with all of us, can spend an eternity in exploring the vast oceans of knowledge. As here, he lives to learn; and after the longest imaginable period, after he has traversed field after

field that he does not now know exists, he will see so much more ahead of him than there is in the past, that he can but use the sentiment of Sir Isaac Newton: "I seem to myself like a little child, picking up pebbles on the shore, while the whole ocean lies unexplored before me."

Now, as to the case of Abraham Lincoln, the lamented martyr, — where is he? He, too, gave his life for the cause of humanity, — gave liberty to more slaves than any other one man in the world. Again we ask, Where is "Honest Abe"? This noble patriot happened not to be fortunate enough to belong to a church. He died out of Christ. The church called him an infidel. He died in a theater, with nothing to recommend him but his intelligence, his patriotism, and his unswerving honest fidelity. Again we ask, Where is he? Church systems can not save him. Do we press the question too close? We will change it, and ask, Where is "Stonewall Jackson" the traitor, the baptized evangelical minister! — one who never went into the battlefield to spill the pure, innocent blood of the North without first getting down upon his knees, and asking God to help him with blood to tighten the chains of slavery on four millions of innocent human beings? He was a Christian after the "straitest sect." Of course, he is in heaven, singing songs, and feasting his righteous eyes upon the sight of Abraham Lincoln in hell. Reader, do you think the groans and shrieks of Mr. Lincoln in the "fiery pit" are music in the pious ears of Stonewall Jackson?

Do you say you do not believe that Mr. Lincoln is in hell? Then where is he? If he is in heaven, away

goes the orthodox scheme of salvation. Men are outgrowing and getting better than their religions, and are not willing to let good men out of the church go where their systems assign them. Look from another standpoint. Is Mr. Lincoln in heaven? What is he doing there? Sitting down and singing songs,

“ Where congregations ne'er break up,
And sabbaths never end ” ?

No. Tell us that Mr. Lincoln is telling stories, and we may incline to believe it; but song-singing or flattering the approbateness of Jehovah is not his business. Then what is he doing? Let Spiritualism answer.

He bade farewell to earthly friends to join the host of immortal statesmen, to assist on the other side in carrying out the work so nobly commenced in this life. At present writing, we seem to be carried back to his birth into spirit-life, and see him clasped in the arms of such men as George Washington. Next he is welcomed to the land where all anxiety is gone, by such patriots as Adams, Monroe, Hancock, Jefferson, Clay, Webster, and Douglas; all bidding him join the host of immortal statesmen, and work in their congress, where his labors will be crowned with tenfold the success which attended his efforts here. Is that all? No. Old John Brown, who went before Lincoln, as John the Baptist went before Jesus, whose soul had been marching on for six years, next extends his hand, and welcomes Lincoln as slavery's last martyr. Look again, and see the tens of thousands of “ brave boys,” whose blood has stained and fattened the fair fields of the South, give him the

right hand of fellowship, and welcome him to their celestial army. But a more affecting sight yet awaits us. The poor slave, whose bitter experience tells more effectually than all things else the horrors and degradation of slavery, approaches the emancipator, the last to drink the bitter cup of martyrdom in consequence of the institution; and, as he throws his black arms around his neck, we seem to hear him cry out, "*Bress de Lord!*" whereupon myriads freed by his Emancipation Proclamation join in bidding him welcome to that land where the servant is free from his master.

Such, dear reader, is Spiritualism. Now, we ask, can a theory be so beautiful, so well adapted to man, and not be true? Has the God of truth been so badly beaten, that man's imagination has painted visions which so far excel the reality? Don't tell it! An omnipotent God who does all he can for man can make the reality more than man, in the highest flight of his imaginings, can paint the future. Have no fear of overdrawing in painting the beauty and reality of the "better country." It can not be done. There is another world, — one of which the present is only a reflection. There joy is great and lasting.

"Its glorious light is the smile of God;
Its brooding atmosphere holy peace;
The breath of its life is the spirit of love;
And earth's warring passions and longings cease.
Touch us, O death, with thy mystic wand,
And bring us into the summer-land."

CHAPTER II.

THE MORAL TENDENCY OF SPIRITUALISM.

A Natural Query—Jesus regarded as a Blasphemer and a Devil—Every new System passes an Era of Calumny—Persecution purifies—What Good has Spiritualism done—Opponents unfair—Immorality in the Churches—Religious Systems not responsible for Errors of their Adherents—None perfect—All are God-makers—Men worship their own Opinions—Shortcomings of Bible Saints—Jewish Church—Testimony of Jeremiah—Of Jesus—Of Paul—Drunkenness and “Free-lovism” in the Early Church—Errors of Noah—Abraham—Isaac—Jacob—The twelve Patriarchs—Moses—Joshua—Samuel—David—Solomon—Jesus—Peter—Paul—Spiritualism a Reform School—Welcomes Sinners—Churches dis-fellowship Sinners—Illustrative Case—“Come and go with us”—Phenomenal Spiritualism—It appeals to our deepest social Feelings—The Theory of Spiritualism the best moral Governor—Its Philosophy—A Contrast—Orthodoxy and Heathenism—Eternal Punishment for Sin—Familiar Story—Is It Just—Living and Dying in Heaven—No Barriers to Sin—No moral Change at Death—Illustration—We are Authors of our Desires—Conclusion.

WHEN a new theological or philosophical aspirant to public favor forces itself upon the people, the query very naturally arises, What is its moral character? This is as it should be. A theory which is morally evil can not be theologically or philosophically good. Still, may we not, in challenging the virtues of new systems, often look at them through glasses colored by old, dilapidated theories, and hence see vice where only virtue exists? It was so anciently. When Jesus presented his claims, the response was, “This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the sabbath-day” (John ix. 16).

Thus, judging by the old Jewish standard, the Nazarene was deserving of nothing better than death. Yet his system has lived long enough to gain a reputation; he has come to be considered more pure than his accusers, who were in such great fear, lest he, by his example or precepts, should corrupt the morals of society. He who was once regarded as a devil (Matt. xii. 24) is now worshiped as a God; thus,

“The demons of our sires
Become the saints that we adore.”

No churchman found it any trouble in the days of Jesus and Paul to prove them guilty of blasphemy. See John ix. 33; Matt. xxvi. 65; Acts xiii. 44-50. So, now, churchmen may see huge “camels” of immorality in the Spiritualism of to-day, when only “gnats” exist. While it is but just to investigate the morals of any new system of religion, the insinuations which popular opinion has thrown out after every system while in its infancy are unjust. Yet the systems thus misrepresented will not by that means sustain a permanent injury. Some will, for the time being, be deterred from investigating; but that will only be transitory. The time will come when the falsehoods of opposers will appear; then men will flock to the standard of the slandered theory with more than double the zeal that otherwise would have characterized them in its support.

Spiritualism, like all other new truths, has been so unfortunate, or fortunate, rather, as to be compelled to pass through the ordeal of calumny and slander. Like gold, purified in the fire, it will emerge from out the

grasp of its persecutors and slanderers, purified, "made white, and tried."

Let an advocate of the spiritual philosophy go to a place where the people know nothing of its teachings, and how soon his preaching is met with the question, What good has Spiritualism done in the world? Some even lack the modesty to present their objection in the form of a question: they usually commence their opposition by roundly asserting that Spiritualism never has done any good in the world; that it is evil, and "only evil continually;" its aim is to overthrow every good institution, and people the infernal regions with millions who otherwise would have entered the world of "celestial glory." Thus every possible effort is made to get the idea "grounded and settled" in the hearts of the people, that there is something in Spiritualism calculated to destroy the morals of its adherents. Cases of immorality among Spiritualists are magnified, and presented to the world as evidence of the downward tendency of Spiritualism.

This mode of argumentation is unfair. The question is not, Are there immoral Spiritualists? but, Does Spiritualism lead men and women who otherwise would be chaste and virtuous to lives of degradation? We claim that it does not; that its tendency is in the other direction. We are willing to pledge ourself to find more cases of immorality in any of the evangelical churches than any person can find among the Spiritualists of America. What shall be done when cases of immorality are found in the churches? Shall they be held up as evidences of the immoral tendency of Christianity? or shall we say, as do others, that "it is human

to err," and look upon their errors as mistakes and shortcomings of humanity, rather than evidence of the damnable tendency of their religion?

If the errors of Christian people are only evidences of the frailty of humanity, may not the errors of Spiritualists be attributed to the same source? The truth is, "there is none good, no, not one." All are imperfect. Men differ only in *degree*; none walk by an infallible standard: yet some come nearer the standard erected by the world than others. No one is absolutely good, even in his own estimation. Not one upon earth but that is "found wanting," even when weighed in scales of his own making. No one ever yet worshiped a God that he did not make himself. "Man makes God in his own image" is a decided improvement on biblical phraseology. Another proverb might be improved by having it read, "An honest God is the noblest work of man."

The truth is, the Infinite never was fully comprehended by the finite; but all have their ideas of Deity. These ideas we worship, and call God; and as the ideas of one have fallen below or reached beyond those of another, so one has worshiped a more pure or impure god, as the case might be, than another. In theology, men have been wont to embody all that they can imagine that is pure, good, true, and lovely, and call that God, and worship it as such. As we strive in our every-day life to imitate the character of the god we worship, we approach, by constant practice, nearer to it yet we are only following on; we can only advance in proportion as our ideal god advances: hence our theory must eternally be ahead of our practice. So, judging every man

by his own theory, he is not exactly correct in his life. The only query then is, Who are nearest the true standard, — Spiritualists or others ?

Were the religion of any denomination to be judged by the shortcomings of its members, what church could stand ? This mode of judging of any religious theory is illogical and unfair ; yet it is that adopted by the opponents of Spiritualism. Try even the religion of Bible times — that of the prophets and apostles themselves — by this standard, and upon its banners will be inscribed, “ Mene, Mene, Tekel.”

As it is no part of our business to hunt out the shortcomings of any sect or party, a few illustrations must suffice. A paragraph or two will sufficiently illustrate the shortcomings of Bible people, living in Bible times. To whom shall we go for evidence ? Shall we consult Porphyry, Celsus, Julian the apostate, or more modern infidels ? Shall Hume, Voltaire, or Paine testify ? No. Let us go to Bible-makers themselves.

Jeremiah, an ancient medium, a preacher of the Jewish religion, in addressing God’s ancient people, said, —

“ Behold, ye trust in lying words, that can not profit. Will ye steal, murder, and swear falsely, and burn incense unto Baal, and walk after other gods whom ye know not, and come and stand before me in this house, which is called by my name, and say, We are delivered to do these abominations ? Is this house, which is called by my name, become a den of robbers in your eyes ? Behold ! even I have seen it, saith the Lord.”
— Jer. vii. 8-11.

Is it so ? Were God’s ancient people, who enjoyed the labors of the inspired prophets, such characters ?

Liars, thieves, murderers, and perjured persons constitute the church of God in the days of Jeremiah! And is this the fountain whence Christianity springs? Good heavens! Let us hear no more of immoral Spiritualists. Allowing that Jeremiah tells the truth, is it any wonder that Jesus said, "It is written that my house shall be a house of prayer; but you have made it a den of thieves"? — Matt. xxi. 13.

Hundreds of quotations from the Bible might be given, showing that these lamentations are not freaks of the imagination of Jeremiah and Jesus, but *real truths*. As the object of this chapter is not to prove that other religions have not made good men, but that Spiritualism has not made bad men, we will, with one more quotation from the Old Testament, close its evidence upon this subject. Hosea, another of Israel's ancient teachers, said of the church of his day, "By swearing and lying and killing and stealing and committing adultery, they break out, and blood toucheth blood." — Hos. iv. 2.

Such extracts from Bible writers need no comment. The religion of the Jews failed to reform them: its tendency may have been good, but was not strong enough to hold a rebellious people. Now, shall we take the shortcomings of the Jewish people as evidence of the immoral tendency of their religion? Such is the course pursued by anti-Spiritualists in regard to the errors and shortcomings of those who believe that heaven and earth are in communion.

Even Christianity, anciently as well as in modern times, failed to reform those who embraced it. The church at Corinth was composed of such a notorious set of drunkards, that it was unwise and unsafe to adminis-

ter to them the emblems of the broken body and spilled blood of Jesus, one of their gods: the first one that got the wine got drunk on it, and others were compelled to go away without any, doubtless not so much regretting their failure to celebrate their Lord's death, as the fact that they were not the lucky one who got the first pull at the wine. Hear Paul plainly state the facts:—

“Now this I declare to you: I praise you not, that ye come together not for better, but for worse. For first of all, when you come together in the church, I hear that there be divisions among you; and I partly believe it. For in eating, every one of you taketh before other his own supper, and one is hungry, and another is drunken.”—1 Cor. xi. 17–21.

Is it true that the ancient church—those who enjoyed the immediate labors of the apostles—could not come together for a religious meeting without quarreling, and finally having their meetings terminate in a drunken row? Shall we say that Christianity led to their drunken quarrels? No. It only failed to prevent them. So Spiritualism may, in some instances, for a time, fail to accomplish the great work designed to be brought about by it; yet those who accuse it of having an immoral tendency accuse it wrongfully.

The chief charge brought against Spiritualism is that of “free love.” By this, opponents mean a promiscuous intermingling of the sexes, opposed alike to the laws of God and man. While we distinctly deny that Spiritualism has any tendency to make man or woman untrue in any sense whatever, we answer, Suppose Spiritualism does tend in that direction; suppose Spiritualism leads to licentiousness, and that in the worst

form that the meanest opponent of Spiritualism can imagine, — is it any worse than that which has ever obtained among the churches? Who can find a case that will compare in vileness with that stated by Paul? Hear him: —

“It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you, *and such fornication as is not so much as mentioned among the Gentiles, that a man should have his father’s wife.*” — 1 Cor. v. 1.

This case is not among the Gentiles, Heathens, Spiritualists, or any other class of sinners, but in the church, under the immediate labors of the apostles. How did the ancient church like such things? Did its members regret that they had such characters in its fold? Not a bit of it: they were proud of it. Paul says, —

“And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you.” — 1 Cor. v. 2.

While the church in its very foundation, under the direct labors of its founders, is proud to acknowledge such lewdness, let its children of the nineteenth century examine the block whence they were hewn, and consider whether they were not “born of fornication,” before accusing others at too great a rate.

A few words on the errors of Spiritualists, if thrown out in the right spirit, may help them to be better men and women. But how would a chapter look devoted to the errors of Bible saints? For instance, parade the following, as a few specimens of the errors of those through whom God anciently manifested himself: —

Noah got drunk, cursed his grandson, and, some think, brought slavery upon a whole race, though guilty of no crime. — Gen. ix. 21–25.

Just and righteous Lot (2 Pet. ii. 20-25) became beastly intoxicated, and committed incest with his two daughters, each of whom had a child by her own father. — Gen. xix. 31-38.

Abraham had a plurality of wives and concubines, abandoned his own son, and left him to die in the wilderness, married his own sister, denied his own wife, and attempted to kill his only legitimate son. — Gen. xii. 13, 19; xiv. 2-4; xv. 2-5, 12; xxi. 10-14; xxii. 1-11.

Isaac followed in the path of his father, and denied his wife. — Gen. xxvi. 6.

Jacob took advantage of his brother's starving condition, and cheated him out of his birthright, by lying to and deceiving his old blind father, and thus succeeded in stealing his brother's blessing; had two wives and several concubines; stole his father-in-law's cattle, &c. — Gen. xxv. 32, 33; xxvii. 19; xxix. 18-30; xxx. 5; verse 40.

His twelve sons followed the example of their father, insomuch that there is hardly a crime in the catalogue of which they were not guilty.

Moses' first public act was to commit a murder. He advises his brethren to steal, or borrow and run away with the borrowed goods, which is the same thing; orders the destruction of innocent babes, and the captivating of females for the purpose of prostituting them to the gratification of the base lusts of the Jewish soldiery. — Exod. ii. 12; Num. xxxi. 17, 18.

Joshua was perhaps the greatest butcher of men and women that ever lived. The sun is ever represented as obeying his command to stand still while he commits wholesale murder. — Josh. x. 13.

Samuel hewed an old, innocent, helpless, and defenseless man to pieces. — 1 Sam. xv. 33.

David had a plurality of wives and concubines; then lived an illegitimate life with the wife of Uriah; caused Uriah to be killed that he might continue his licentious debauchery; put his enemies under saws, axes and harrows, and burned them in brick-kilns. — 2 Sam. xi. 1, 6, 15; xii. 8, 29-31.

Solomon's crimes were so great and numerous, that even orthodox commentators feel a little shaky about holding him up for an example of purity. We should require a larger volume than this to record them.

Passing to the New Testament, we find matters not much improved. Jesus made mistakes, got angry with an audience because they could not answer a question, destroyed a drove of swine, cursed a fig-tree because it did not produce figs out of season, urged men to hate their wives and children, overthrew the tables belonging to money-changers, and by violence drove the Jews out of their own meeting-house. — Mark iii. 5; v. 13; Matt. xxi. 12, 19; Luke xiv. 26.

Peter denied his Lord, cursed and swore, quarreled with Paul, and lived after the manner of the Gentiles, at the same time compelling the Gentiles to live as do the Jews. — Matt. xxvi. 74; Gal. ii. 11-14.

Paul, by his own statement the "chief of sinners," became all things to all men, lied that the truth might abound, being crafty, caught his brethren with guile, and exhorted to obedience to bad laws. — 1 Cor. ix. 22; Rom. iii. 7; 2 Cor. xii. 16; Rom. xiii. 1, 2.

Such, dear reader, is a sample of the spots on the sun of Bible saints. Can Spiritualists exhibit a worse

record? We now come directly to the question, Is Spiritualism in its phenomena and philosophy immoral? If immoral Spiritualists could be found in every village and hamlet in the world, it would no more prove Spiritualism immoral in its tendency than finding an immoral astronomer would prove astronomy immoral. Let it be understood that Spiritualism disfellowships no one on account of his doctrine or conduct. Believing that each one stands or falls to his own master, it is not our province to say who is or who is not worthy to hold communion with the inhabitants of the other world. If Jesus, while on earth, could talk with the Marys and Marthas (earth's Magdalenes), and say to the woman taken in the very act of adultery, "Neither do I condemn thee, go, and sin no more" (John viii. 11), why should the denizens of the spirit-world, who have themselves experienced earth's bitter trials, refuse to hold communion with those who most need it? Let an individual in the church commit a great crime, let him wallow in drunkenness in the mire, and there is not a church in christendom but that will disfellowship him. While they refuse to fellowship a person because of crime, ought there to be a sinner in the church? No. Then what is to become of the poor, church-forsaken sinner? He may wallow in the mire until he grows gray. The priest passes by on one side, and the Levite on the other; neither extending a helping hand, but each saying, "You miserable wretch! Go to hell for all of us; we will not have our church polluted with you. We came not to call sinners but the righteous to repentance." Spiritualism says, "Never was there a man so low but there was something good there. We

must bless such." Hence, it welcomes such to its ranks. It is a reform school; and, if a person needs reforming either doctrinally or morally, he needs Spiritualism. Hence, their doctrines teach them to keep such in their ranks, and labor even more ardently for them than for those whose lives could be squared without it. Ho, ye vile, corrupt, polluted souls! Spiritualism calls. Extending its helping hand to you, it says, as Moses did to Hobab, "*Come and go with us, and we will do thee good.*" More would we give to see one poor, drunken sinner embrace Spiritualism than to see every evangelical Christian in the land flock to its standard, leaving poor outcasts in the cold. If the religious systems of the day can make their adherents good enough, they, perhaps, need no better; but, for heaven's sake, let Spiritualism live to bless those who are out of the reach of those who say, "Sit thou here, or stand thou there; for I am holier than thou."

Phenomenal Spiritualism teaches us that our friends whom we had supposed to be dead "are ever near us, though unseen." Is that immoral in its tendency? There is not a Spiritualist in the world who does not believe that he is surrounded by an angel brotherhood; that good, pure, and noble spirits are watching his every act, ever rejoicing in his good resolutions, and helping in his every effort to carry them into effect, and displeased, grieved, and chagrined with every wicked act. Spiritualists do not believe that they are ever alone. Fathers who have crossed death's "narrow stream," sainted mothers, angel wives, beautiful sons and daughters, all appeal with more than earthly logic and eloquence to the believer to "make strait paths

for his feet." Will that belief make a man worse? Nay, tell us that noonday sun brings midnight darkness, that pure living water creates thirst, and that honey is bitter to the taste; but don't tell us that a belief that we are surrounded by the pure and good will incline us to evil.

Admit that Spiritualism is all false, that no spirit ever did or ever will communicate: is not the belief that they are around us, watching all our doings, and, perhaps, telling not only our doings, but our secret thoughts, to others (for Spiritualists believe that dead men tell tales sometimes), calculated to prompt us to watch our actions, words, and thoughts more closely than ever before? We so decide. We have had experience on each side of this great question, and, with the stake before us, we could not decide otherwise.

Are the dead with us? Do they watch our every act?

"How careful, then, ought I to live;
With what religious fear!"

Taking the above view of the subject, have not Spiritualists at least one stimulant to virtue not known to others?

If we turn from the phenomena to the philosophy taught by Spiritualism, we find that equally as urgently appealing to all there is of man to be true to his manhood. How is it with orthodoxy? There is not an evangelical church, or hardly a person who is a member of one, who does not indorse the sentiment that, —

**"Between the stirrup and the ground,
Mercy was sought and pardon found."**

If the foregoing couplet is not sung by them, they do sing that, —

“While the lamp holds out to burn,
The vilest sinner may return.”

Can any thing be found in all heathenism as corrupting as the above couplet? It teaches the sinner to pursue his sinful course; “for as long as there is life there is hope.” Where is there a person in all orthodoxy who does not believe that somehow, through the suffering of the innocent Nazarene, his guilty soul, all black with crime, will be washed and made white as the driven snow? The dying profligate offers a prayer, sheds a tear, and is immediately ushered into an upper-ten heaven, and, having taken advantage of the bankrupt law for sin, sits down by the side of the Great Jehovah as pure and good as the most sinless angel. Spiritualists do not believe this: they believe that all must suffer the consequence of their own actions.

“There is no bankrupt law for sin,
Though Pharisee may teach it;
No limitation act steps in,
Though Paul himself might preach it.”

There is no “if,” “and,” or proviso in the matter; the violator of the law *can not escape*: he must in his own *proper person* suffer the penalty.

“When you can tread on burning coals,
And never scorch your feet,
Then you may break God’s righteous law,
Its penalty not meet.”

A familiar story will illustrate our ideas on this subject. It is said that in a distant country, almost nineteen centuries since, there were two individuals of directly opposite characters. One of them went about doing good, pronouncing benedictions on the poor, the sad, and the sorrowing. He made it his business to relieve all suffering under his control, whether moral, mental, spiritual, or physical. The other was a low, vile wretch, who made his living by highway robbery. In short, he was guilty of almost every crime in the calendar.

**“Now it happened that these men in their passing away
From earth and its conflicts both died the same day.”**

These men were both assassinated at the same time ; one on account of his crimes, the other in consequence of the prejudice of the people. While in the agonies of death, the murderer turned to the other, supposed by some to be a God, and said, “Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.” The other answered, “To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.”

Now, we are led to ask, Is it so? Is it just? Did the thief go with Jesus to Paradise that day? If so, what is the difference, so far as the next world is concerned, whether a person is a Jesus or a thief? All have the same reward; the only difference being, one has gone into heaven honorably, while the other has taken advantage of a bankrupt law, and gone in on another's ticket.

Spiritualism does not teach that any person ever did or ever will go to heaven at the event called death.

It teaches that the only way to be in heaven when one passes from this sphere of existence is to *die in heaven*, and that the only way to die in heaven is to *live in heaven*, and that the only way to live in heaven is to *truly live, doing your duty toward every body and every thing*. Spiritualists believe that man will find what he carries, either in this or the other world; that he commences living in the other world where he left off here. If he dies a poor God-forsaken wretch, he will find himself such on the other side.

The poet sings, —

“ He wept that we might weep ;
 Each sin demands a tear :
 In heaven alone no sin is found,
 And there's no weeping there.”

But Spiritualism knows of no heaven where “no sin is found.” It wants no such place. We ask, *we demand*, the privilege of sinning to all eternity. Do not mistake us. We do not want to sin; but we do want to prove to angels, to God, and last, though not least, to ourself, that we have no relish for sin: this we can only do by having the gates of sin thrown open, and the privilege of entering extended to us; then, if we refuse, all will know it is because we love the right. If, on the other hand, we are taken into the “heaven where no sin is found,” and compelled to do right by a power *ab extra*, no credit is due us for our rectitude. We were only “the clay in the hands of the potter,” the machine: if we run well, the builder, and not the machine, has the credit. With such an arrangement, Almighty God himself could not tell whether heaven was filled

with angels or devils. Death makes man no better, no worse : each one finds himself, morally and spiritually, on the other side of its stream, where he left himself here. He opens his books where he closed them, commences living where he quit, finds himself surrounded with all the darkness and all the light in the summer-land that he has earned by his life here.

Our religion teaches us, not only that the consequences of our actions must be borne by ourselves, but that there is an *eternal* punishment for every sin, that every act of man makes its mark, that eternity is too short to wipe out the scars occasioned by sin. "Be sure your sin will find you out," is written in the Bible of the Spiritualist; and "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap," is as true to-day as in the first century.

This may be illustrated in the following manner. Two men at the age of forty have to-day passed to the spirit-world. One of them has spent his two-score of years in acquiring a physical, intellectual, moral, and spiritual education, and in living out the principles he has learned : the other has spent his forty years in drunken, carousing debauchery. He enters the spirit-world with his moral, mental, and spiritual faculties all blunted by his negligence and crime, insomuch that he does not realize that he has a spiritual nature. Perhaps it will take him as long after his passage to spirit-life, as he endured this, to wake up to consciousness enough to realize that he has thrown off the animal, and put on the spiritual body. He will learn sooner or later, by experience, if in no other way, that "though hand join in hand, the sinner can not go unpunished." In connection with this, he will soon see the necessity

of progress. But, during the perhaps thrice forty years that he has been getting these lessons, his friend has been overcoming difficulties. Now he finds himself an almost immeasurable distance behind one by whose side he ought to stand. He never can reach his friend. After the most severe struggle, after years of incessant toil, he settles down with the humiliating reflection, "I am *so many* years behind one by whose side I should stand! Time will not help me to catch up: moments are graciously given, one comes as soon as another passes; and, though I improve them all, my friend does the same, and thus keeps his distance ahead of me."

Is not that an eternal punishment? Is it not punishment enough? Who would, who *could*, endure more?

Church systems teach that we are what God makes us: Spiritualism teaches that *we are what we make ourselves*. Patient reader, which of the two theories is the better calculated to urge its adherents forward to seek and put into practice the principles of harmony and truth? You are the juror. May we ask from you a candid and honest verdict?

That all may be led to see and put into *practical use* the pure principles which are being kindly vouchsafed to us by the angel-world, is the devout and earnest prayer of the writer of these pages.

CHAPTER III.

BIBLE DOCTRINE OF ANGEL MINISTRY.

A Common Doctrine—Angels are Spirits—Terms “Man” and “Angel”—Angel Men visit Abraham, Lot, Joshua—The Host of the Lord—An Angel appears to Gideon; to Manoah’s wife; is introduced to Manoah—Writing on the Wall—Daniel a Superior Medium—Gabriel both a Man and Angel—The Stone rolled from the Sepulchre by a Man—Cornelius’s Visitant—Peter a Trance-Medium—A Spirit talks to him—Peter’s Explanation—The Book of Revelation a Series of Spirit-Communications—John sees his Brother—An Angel—God’s Family—Bible replete with History of Angelic Ministration—No Bible-Writer has tried to prove it—All the Angels are Ministering Spirits—Number of Angels—Bible Saints trusted too much to the Angels—Abraham’s Confidence—Angels select Isaac’s Wife—“Murder will out”—Moses and the Angel—Angels deliver Israel—A Whole Nation of Mediums—Conditions must be obeyed—Joshua developed as a Medium—Joshua and the Angel—A Circle—Jericho taken—The *Modus Operandi*—Camels swallowed and Gnats rejected—Angel Ministry vs. Miracle—The Hebrews and the Fire—Nebuchadnezzar sees an Angel—Jugglers play with Fire—Chemicals prevent the Penetration of Heat—Letter from Rev. J. M. Peebles—The Explanation—The Result, an Increase of Faith—Master Frank Goodman—Mr. D. D. Home and the Fire Tests—Daniel and the Lions—Prayers answered by Angels—Jesus’ Prayers—Daniel’s Prayer—Angel’s Effort to answer—Another finally assists and succeeds—The Emancipation Proclamation—An Ancient Prayer-Meeting—Peter let out of Prison—Peter at the Door—Only Spirit-Raps—Modern Mediums released from Prison—Author does not believe—Admonition.

“For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways.”—Ps. xci. 11

TH**ERE** is, perhaps, not a Christian in the world who does not believe, that, in past ages, angels—ministering spirits—came from their heavenly abode to bless and assist the children of God. Tell churchmen

that angels even now are watching over and blessing them, and they will tell you they always believed that. Have they not ever sung—

“There are angels hovering around”?

But when you inform them that God “maketh his angels spirits” (Ps. civ. 4), that they are all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation (Heb. i. 14), some will shrink from you as though you were laden with a contagion which would sweep them from the earth. “What! my father and mother, my dead friends, come back? It is not possible!” Yes, it is possible; and we propose in this chapter to prove it. Not that we are going now to undertake to prove directly that spirits of the departed hold communion with earth’s inhabitants: we have “rods in soak” on that question. We, in this chapter, design to show that “angels are spirits,” and that they ever have and ever will administer to the inhabitants of earth. Perhaps our readers are not all of them aware that the terms “man” and “angel” are in the Bible used interchangeably with reference to those who have passed to the spirit-world. If not, a few references to that book will convince them that it is so. The three men who appeared to Abraham (Gen. xviii. 3) were none other than men whom we call dead.

In Gen. xix. 1, we read that two angels came to see Lot in Sodom; but verses 8, 9, 10, and 12, each state that they were men. Verse 15 again calls them angels; but, as if to forever seal the idea that men and angels are the same, verse 16 says, “The men laid hold

upon his hand, and upon the hand of his wife, and upon the hand of his two daughters, the Lord being merciful unto them ; and they brought them forth, and set them without the city."

In the heading of the fifth chapter of Joshua, we read, " An angel appeareth to Joshua ;" but in verses 13, 14, instead of an angel appearing to Joshua, we have the following : —

" And it came to pass when Joshua was by Jericho, that he lifted up his eyes and looked, and, behold, there stood a *man* over against him, with his sword drawn in his hand ; and Joshua went unto him, and said unto him, Art thou for us, or for our adversaries? And he said, Nay ; but as captain of the host of the Lord am I now come. And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him, What saith my Lord to his servant? "

This man declares himself to be the " captain of the host of the Lord ;" but the Lord's host is an angel host. See Gen. xxxii. 1, 2.

The " angel of the Lord " which came to Gideon in Judg. vi. 11, 12 — that Gideon thought was a man, verse 22 — is undoubtedly the spirit of the Lord, which came upon Gideon in verse 34, enabling him to use such wisdom, stratagem, and power in putting his enemies to flight. — Judg. vii. 19–21.

In Judg. xiii. 3, an angel of the Lord appeared to the wife of Manoah ; but, when she related the matter to her husband, she said, " A man of God came unto me." In verse 8, Manoah prays for the man of God to come back. Verse 9 says, " God hearkened unto the prayer of Manoah, and the angel of God came to him ; then

the lady introduced the angel to her husband, calling him "the man of God;" after which Manoah and this man have a long *tête-à-tête*, in which this man is seven times called an angel.

In Dan. v. 5, it was not said to be the fingers of an angel's, but a *man's* hand, that wrote on the plaster of the wall of the king's palace. May we not reasonably suppose that this same man whose hand did the writing is the one who is called "the spirit of the holy gods," who influenced Daniel to interpret the writing? See verses 11, 14. Certain we are, that the spirit which influenced Daniel was said to be an excellent one (Dan. vi. 3); perhaps the same one who preserved Daniel's life, whom Daniel calls an angel, when he says, "My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths" (verse 22). Daniel was evidently a medium, superior to any other in Babylon. It was for this reason that Nebuchadnezzar appointed Daniel "master of the magicians, astrologers, Chaldeans, and soothsayers; forasmuch as an excellent spirit and knowledge and understanding, interpreting of dreams, and showing of hard sentences, and dissolving of doubts, were found in the same Daniel." — Dan. v. 11, 12.

In Dan. viii. 13, one *saint* is heard talking to another. In verse 16, a man is heard talking to Gabriel, who is himself distinctly called a man (see Dan. viii. 21). The *manhood* of Gabriel does not in the least injure his *angelhood*; for we read in Luke i. 19, that "the *angel*, answering, said unto him, I am Gabriel that standeth in the presence of God."

In Matt. xxviii. 1-3, we have the account of the angel of the Lord descending from heaven, and rolling

the stone back from the door of the sepulchre, and taking his seat on it. He is described as wearing raiment as white as snow, while his countenance was like the lightning. As this event occurred before daylight (see verse 1), it was a good time to exhibit spirit-lights; and perhaps that was what caused the illumination of his countenance. Matthew does not tell us who this angel was: but Mark does. He says, "And, entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long, white garment; and they were affrighted." — Mark xvi. 5.

Cases similar to the above could be multiplied almost *ad infinitum*; but one more must suffice.

In Acts x. 1-8, we have the history of a devout man, one who "prayed to God alway." The writer of the Book of Acts says an angel came to him, and told him to send men to Joppa, to the house of one Simon a tanner, located on the sea-beach; and that he would find one Simon Peter, who had taken up lodgings with him; this Peter would tell him some things he ought to do. So he sent his servants as per order. Meanwhile, Peter went upon the house-top to pray: while in the act of prayer, he became entranced. (As some of our readers may not know what that means, we will invite them to visit a good trance-medium, and they will have its meaning ocularly demonstrated.) Strange visions were presented to Peter during this entrancement — visions which he did not understand: hence a *spirit* came to him to make an explanation. The spirit told him to go to the house, and find three men there who were seeking him, and go with them. From the tenor of this whole subject so far, we con-

clude that this spirit could have been none other than the angel who appeared to Cornelius. Peter followed spirit direction, and went to the house of Cornelius, and asked, "To what intent have you sent for me?" (verse 29.) Cornelius replied, "Four days ago I was fasting until this hour; and at the ninth hour, I prayed in my house, and, behold, a *man* stood before me in bright clothing," &c. (verse 30). Peter, upon witnessing the same phenomena among the Gentiles that he formerly had seen among the Jews, makes the discovery that "God is no respecter of persons;" and hence preached the gospel, and administered the ordinances to them, the same as though they had been Jews. Peter's Jewish brethren, of course, called him to an account for his innovation in preaching to the Gentiles; whereupon he tells his reasons for his course, the first of which was, "The spirit bade me go" (Acts xi. 12). The second was, when he got down there, Cornelius "showed us how he had seen an *angel* in his house, which stood and said unto him, Send men to Joppa, and call for one Simon, whose surname is Peter." — Acts xi. 13.

In this narrative we have, 1st, An *angel* appearing to Cornelius. 2d, This angel goes to Peter on the housetop, but is a *spirit* when he gets there. 3d, Cornelius, in relating the phenomenon which occurred in his house, says, A *man* appeared to me; and, 4th, When Peter rehearsed this matter to his Jewish brethren, he said, "Cornelius showed us how that he had seen an *angel*." Is not this enough to elucidate the fact that the terms "angel," "spirit," and "man," are used synonymously and interchangeably in the Bible? If not, we will

favor our readers with one more evidence, drawn from the Book of Revelation.

The book known as the Apocalypse is but a communication, or rather series of communications, from a circle of seven spirits. (See Rev. i. 4.) We do not know who they all are. Daniel the prophet was probably one of them (see Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 7, 8); Jesus the Nazarene another (Rev. i. 5, xxii. 16). One of them was seen and very minutely described in Rev. i. 14-17. Others were seen several times, but not described so particularly. Seven times in this book, those who have ears to hear are admonished to "hear what the *spirit* saith untō the churches." Would that the churches even now were willing to heed the admonition to listen to spirit-voices!

In Rev. xxii. 8, John gets a view of one of the spirits through whom his book is being given; again his veneration is excited, and he is about to fall down and worship: but we will let him tell his own story.

"And I John saw these things, and heard them. And, when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the *angel* which showed me these things. Then saith he unto me, 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.*" — Rev. xxii. 8.

From the array of testimony already presented, it would seem to be impossible to draw any other conclusion than that angels are inhabitants of the "summerland," who were once earth's children, clothed in flesh and blood.

How glorious the truth that God has a family in heaven and upon earth! — Eph. iii. 15.

“ One family, we dwell in Him,
 One church above beneath,
 Though now divided by the stream,—
 The narrow stream of death.
 One army of the living God,
 To his command we bow;
 Part of his host have crossed the flood,
 And part are crossing now.”

Not a member in heaven but that once inhabited earth, nor a member on earth who will not some day go to help make up the family in heaven.

“ There are little feet I used to meet
 When the world went well with me,
 That I know will bound when the rippling sound
 Of my boat comes over the sea.”

Paul had a view of this when he said, —

“ That in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one *all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth.*” — Eph. i. 10.

We will now advance to the more direct biblical evidences of angel ministry, and we may confess here that we do not know where to open the Bible; indeed, it makes but little difference where we open it. So replete is that book with the doctrine and history of the ministry of angels, that it would be hard work to open to the wrong page. We can not now think of a chapter that does not in some way include that doctrine. Yet not a Bible writer has ever undertaken to prove it: they

have always referred to it in the most familiar manner, as though it were impossible that any one should ever have thought of disputing or questioning it. No writer in the Bible has ever undertaken to prove the existence of Deity. Moses commences his record by saying, "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth;" leaving us to infer his existence from the work he does: so they have always referred to angel ministry in the same way. Not a single occurrence is related as though the writer supposed he was telling any thing strange or new; but, on the other hand, every manifestation is told in such a style, with such an air of open frankness, that one would suppose that the writer supposed such occurrences so familiar, that one would almost as soon think of questioning his own existence as questioning such facts.

Paul's expression, "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" (Heb. i. 14,) is not an argument, but rather a reference to a universally-received sentiment, that not a part, but *all* the angels are ministering spirits. Is it so? Is every one who has passed to the "better land" an angel? and are *all the angels* ministering spirits? Then, by what a host are "earth-born souls" surrounded! Paul calls it, "*An innumerable company of angels, . . . spirits of just men made perfect* (Heb. xii. 22, 23). David calls the host, "Many thousands of angels" (Ps. lxxviii. 17, *margin*). Moses represents these many thousand angels as being "ten thousand saints" (Deut. xxxiii. 2). Daniel and John each saw "*ten thousand times ten thousand angels*" (Dan. vii. 10; Rev. v. 11). Again: John saw a great

company of angels, "which no man could number." These were redeemed from among the tribes of earth (Rev. vii. 9-16). An illustration of the number of angels which may surround and bless each individual may be found in the words of Jesus, "Thinkest thou that I can not now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?" (Matt. xxvi. 53.) The Assyrian army numbered more than one hundred and eighty-five thousand soldiers, for at least there were that many awoke one morning and found themselves all dead corpses (2 Kings xix. 35); yet Elisha the prophet was perfectly confident that the angels that surrounded him would outnumber the soldiers of the Assyrian army (2 Kings, vi. 16).

Our views upon this and kindred subjects, differing as they do from those called "orthodox," have been the cause of the world hailing us as "infidel" a great many times. Now, we care nothing for such charges, knowing that their malignity can only be equaled by their falsity. We never believed so much of the Bible, nor understood it so well, as to-day; and, though we are a Spiritualist from the crown of our head to the sole of our foot, our chief trouble with the Bible has been its unqualified indorsement of every thing spiritualistic. The writers of the Bible, and those who figured most largely in biblical history, placed entirely too much confidence in angel ministry. Not only did they depend upon their angel friends to do for them what they ought to have done for themselves, but they often put their own *individuality* aside, trusting their spirit-guides to do their *thinking* for them. The word with Israel's greatest men was, "Go and inquire of the

Lord." One of her greatest kings lost his life by his unswerving fidelity to what came to him from the spirit-world. (See 1 Kings xxii. 21-33.) A case in point may be found in Gen. xxiv. Abraham had become an old man, and knew that he must shortly pass away; of course, he felt a degree of solicitude about his son's marriage. What did he do but call his servant to him, and make him swear that he would go and bring his son a wife from the land of Canaan, assuring the servant that angels would pick her out? Hear his benediction as his servant is about starting: "The Lord God of heaven, which took me from my father's house, and from the land of my kindred, and which spake unto me, and that swear unto me, saying, Unto thy seed will I give this land: *he shall send his angel* before thee, and thou shalt take a wife unto my son from thence." — Gen. xxiv. 7.

The servant pursues his journey, consulting angels and getting tests, until, by a series of unmistakable signs, Rebekah was signified as the one to be Isaac's wife. Like a good girl, she goes along with the servant, whom probably she had never seen before, to marry a man whom she never had seen. Isaac took her as soon as the medium brought her to him, and went with her to keeping house in his mother's tent; and with one little exception, when he denied her (which may not have been from a lack of affinity, but from a hereditary disease, as his father had done the same thing), got along smoothly with her all his days.

Now, we frankly confess, that, as much of a Spiritualist as we are to-day, if we wanted a wife, we would not take her, "sight unseen," as boys trade jack-knives,

even though an angel did pick her out. We would send no less or greater a personage than ourself after her every time. This, dear reader, was what we meant when we intimated that Bible people relied too much on the angel world.

To give the history of angelic manifestations among the Jews would be to record their entire national history. A few sketches must suffice to illustrate the matter.

Moses' first public act was to commit a murder. The next day after killing an Egyptian, he saw two of his Hebrew brethren in an altercation, and strove, as a good brother should, to create harmony; but the one in the fault said, —

“Who made thee a prince and a judge over us? Intendest thou to kill me, as thou killedst the Egyptian?” (Ex. ii. 14.) The old proverb, “Murder will out,” proved true in this case; and, though Moses was heir to the throne of Egypt, he was compelled to flee his country for his life. He went to Midian, and fell in love with the daughter of a Midianitish priest, and married her, and engaged to act as shepherd, to take charge of his father-in-law's sheep. He took the sheep up into the mountains, and was not there very long, until his attention was attracted by a strange light, a *spirit-light*, such as thousands of Spiritualists have seen. He, of course, not having witnessed such phenomena before, was astonished to see such a fire in the bush, and the leaves remain green: so he turned aside to investigate the cause of this strange manifestation, when he discovered that there was an angel in the bush. By this time, Moses became clairaudient, and the angel enters into a conversation with him; finally, the whole scene winds up with

sundry physical manifestations, by which Moses himself becomes convinced of his medium-power. — See Ex. iii., iv.

From this time forward, not a move was made toward the deliverance of the children of Israel, but that was made under spirit-direction. When the Hebrews became convinced that angels would go with them, and lead them through the wilderness, they started, and not until then. The angel went before them, in the daytime in a pillar of cloud, and at night in a pillar of fire (Ex. xiii. 21, xiv. 19, 20). When they failed to see the angel, they pitched their tents, and tarried until they had a new spirit-manifestation. The spirit-world seemed determined to develop a race of mediums: thus they led them round and round through the mountainous wilderness, for a period of *forty years*, to make a journey that could have been accomplished within forty days. The object was to develop a mediumship through which they could take the land and inherit it.

During this tedious tarrying in the wilderness, they are again and again promised assistance from the angel-world, and urged to yield the most strict obedience to their spirit-guides. One instance out of many we must record. In Ex. xxiii. 20–23, the Jehovah is represented as speaking to them as follows: —

“Behold, I send an angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in him. But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I

speak, then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries. For mine angel shall go before thee, and bring thee in unto the Amorites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites; and I will cut them off."

Here the promise is very positive, "Obey the voice of the angel," comply with the conditions, and you shall conquer the inhabitants of the country where you are going. Fail in obedience, and you will fail to get possession. To carry these promises out, when Moses gets so old he is no longer fit to lead Israel, he ordains Joshua to the work. (See Num. xxvii. 18; Deut. xxxiv. 9.) They cross the Jordan, take the land, and conquer the nations, according to programme; all except the inhabitants of the city of Jericho. Of it the historian says, "Now the city of Jericho was straitly shut up because of the children of Israel: none went out, and none came in." — Josh. vi. 1.

Now the question arises, What can be done? Jericho was surrounded by its towering walls, and Israel had no battering-rams of sufficient power to batter them down, no machinery with which to throw "shot and shell" over the walls. How will they take the city? Joshua walked out one day, and suddenly became clairvoyant, and saw a *man* with a sword drawn in his hand. Joshua, supposing this man to be one yet in the flesh, says, "Art thou for us, or for our adversaries?" — "Nay," says the angel-man, "but as captain of the host of the Lord am I now come." He then proceeds to give Joshua the conditions upon which they can deliver the city into Israel's hands. The substance of the conditions is, *that*

a circle must be formed around the city, which must last seven days: the implements of their religion must be carried with them. The fact is, the atmosphere must become thoroughly impregnated with the magnetism of that mediumistic nation in order to produce a tremendous physical demonstration of spiritual power. The programme was carried out, the people formed their circle, marched around the city, raised a tremendous shout, and the walls fell. Now, we ask, What brought them down? Did the people shout them down? No. If the walls fell at all, it was a physical manifestation of spirit-power. How strange that men will swallow such stories as are found in the fifth and sixth chapters of Joshua, and that without the slightest evidence, the record aside, that they are true, and at the same time utterly refuse to believe stories not a hundredth part as large, that come to us now backed by a hundred times the amount of testimony! However, we are happy to know that it is only in religious matters that people reject common sense. Now, there is not a particle of evidence that these things ever occurred (the evidence is all against it), yet men swallow it down without any scruples, and yet deny hundreds of well authenticated proofs that manifestations, *the same in kind*, though not in extent, occur every day in their own country and among their own neighbors.

Had we the space, and our readers the patience, to pursue this interesting subject *in extenso*, we would examine every so-called miracle in the Bible, and take the miracle out of it, and put angel ministry in its place. But time is precious: one or two instances must suffice.

We have often heard of the miracle of the three

young Hebrews being thrown into a furnace of fire, "made one seven times hotter than it was wont to be heated," and coming out without a hair of their heads being singed, or the smell of fire passing on their garments. The fact is, Nebuchadnezzar said he saw *four men* walking loose in the fire, "and they have no hurt on them, and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God" (Dan. iii. 25). It was a son of God, one of the very sons of God of whom Jesus spoke when he said, —

"But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage, neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels, *and are children of God*, being children of the resurrection." — Luke xx. 35, 36.

Nebuchadnezzar afterwards, instead of referring to this deliverance as a miracle, blessed God, "who hath sent his angel, and delivered his servants." — Dan. iii. 28.

Now, in all candor, we ask, Why not? Who has not seen jugglers put certain chemicals on their hands, and thus "quench the violence of fire"? We have. But all the chemicals used by these men are in the earth and its surroundings. May there not be chemists on the other side who have sufficient power to extract these elements, and envelop their mediums in a tissue of them, so refined, that heat can not penetrate it? We believe, yea, we *know*, that, under favorable conditions, it can be done.

Who of our readers has not seen or heard of Rev. J. M. Peebles, editor of the Western Department of "The Banner of Light"? We remember, when we were preaching Adventism, and he Spiritualism, in Battle

Creek, Mich., to have called on him one morning, (for we confess to have had a strange liking for him, even when we regarded him as the Devil's agent. We thought, "What a pity the Devil selects the best material in this world as his servants!") and he related the circumstance of having seen a man play with fire in such a wondrous manner, that had we not been a believer in the Bible, as well as in the veracity and intelligence of the speaker, we could not have credited it. We have written Mr. Peebles to give us the circumstance. His response is so direct and pointed, that we publish it entire.

HAMMONDTON, N.J., March 31, 1869.

REV. MOSES HULL.

Dear Friend,—Your favor of March 11 lies before me, with contents noted. I cheerfully comply with the request to furnish you a brief statement of a remarkable spiritual manifestation witnessed by myself through the mediumship of Dr. E. C. Dunn, involving a seeming suspension of the laws connected with heat.

These are the main facts:

My friend Dr. Dunn, accompanying me several years on my lecture tours as a healing medium, speaking occasionally under spirit-control, was often entranced in my presence. Our electric atmospheres naturally intermingling, the magnetic sympathy became finally so intensified, that a portion of my circle of spirits could quite easily throw the doctor into an unconscious trance condition.

One of these spirit-guides—a thinker and practical chemist on earth—was Perasee Lendanta, living in the

mediæval ages, and equally conversant with the Christian and Neoplatonic dogmas. Whenever he entranced the doctor, I expected a feast of reason and flow of sound thought.

At the close of a service in Battle Creek, Mich., on a Sunday of June, 1862, inviting and even urging the doctor, he accompanied me home. Soon, while comfortably sitting in my library-room, he became suddenly entranced, and, during the entrancement, this *conversation*, with the manifestation, followed:—

“Owing to the good conditions to-day,” said the spirit, “I was enabled to approach very near you while lecturing; thus infusing much of my own force and thought into your discourse.”

“Thank you. I felt your presence. You are to me like a wall of fire and a shield of brass, imparting a stern, positive, independent feeling.”

“The world has yet to learn the full import of the terms ‘individualism,’ ‘self-reliance,’ ‘independence.’ . . . What inquiries to-day?”

“I desire to ask this question: Were Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego cast into a fiery furnace, coming out with not a hair of their ‘heads singed,’ nor the ‘smell of fire’ upon them?”

“I don’t know, sir. Was not there.”

“Well, do you believe the recorded scriptural account?”

“Most certainly, I do.”

“Why do you believe it?”

“In the first place, because *reasonable*, and, in the second place, because the same and even more remarkable things may be done in the present.”

“ If so (half smiling, half doubting), I should like to see a slight practical illustration of your position.”

“ If you have a large kerosene-lamp in your house, procure, light, and place it before this medium, with the blaze on, high as it will bear.”

Securing the lamp, and placing it before the doctor in full blaze, this controlling spirit thrust the medium's hand into it, holding it there full *five minutes*; the flames streaming up between the fingers. It seemed as though it must be burned to a crisp. Finally, the spirit-intelligence removing it, I wiped the smoke and soot from the hand, and it was not in the least injured by the fire. After a little spasmodic struggling, as usual, the medium became conscious, complaining only of a terrible magnetic pressure upon his head. This soon wore away, when, before leaving the room, he was again entranced.

“ There!” said the spirit, “ you have seen a man's hand thrust into the fire, and not burned.”

“ Certainly, I have: now tell me how you did it.”

“ Owing to the feebleness of the English language in the line of metaphysics and spiritual science, this would be a more difficult task than to seemingly destroy the law of heat. I will try. Aided by others, I gathered or accreted fine, etheralized spirit-substances from surrounding spirit-space, and, polarizing and otherwise preparing them, constructed a sort of electric coating or covering, winding it close around the medium's hand. This covering was just as impervious to heat as is a pane of glass to the beating rain-drops. Furthermore, I could envelop this whole mortal form in this magnetic mantle; and, so long as I could maintain the requisite conditions, the body would not be injured by fire.

“Something very similar is evidenced in the case of the three men cast into the *fiery furnace*. It was an ancient spiritual manifestation. Your Scriptures say, ‘Lo, I see four men loose walking in the midst of the fire; . . . and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God.’ This ‘*fourth*,’ seen by the clairvoyant eye, was an angel, or spiritual being that once inhabited your or some other earth in the universe of the infinite.”

This circle of spirits has given me other manifestations more wonderful than the above, paralleling those of biblical times. Thus the past and present are made to unite in their testimony of spirit manifestation and communion. I have a more clear, logical faith to-day in those *visions, dreams, prophecies, healings, trances*, and other wonderful manifestations recorded in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, than when wearing my clerical robes. And the partially “*hushed*” *infidelity* of Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, Universalist, and Second-Advent Christians, is to me absolutely shocking. By the “*grace of God*,” let us, Brother Hull (aided by the sweet fellowship of angels), continue to pray and to labor for the enlightenment and salvation of those Christians whose impudence is only excelled by their deplorable ignorance of natural law, spiritual science, and the watchful presence of God’s ministering spirits.

Most truly thine,

J. M. PEBBLES.

After such evidence, from such a source, it would seem that nothing further is necessary; yet we find it hard to resist the temptation to present other evidences.

In a late number of “The American Spiritualist,”

we find a lengthy communication from A. Goodman of Columbus, O., giving the history of the mediumship of Master Frank Goodman, a lad of eleven summers. Mr. Goodman says, —

“Next came showing, touching, and shaking of hands; playing on guitar; and raising Frank to the ceiling. All this was done in daylight, except the raising of the medium; that, with the showing of phosphoric lights, requiring darkness. Now, in conclusion, I will only add a few of many equally wonderful manifestations, given since our return to this place. One is the fire-test, in which the medium, while entranced, handles red-hot coals, without the slightest injury; also thrusts his head into the grate among the flames, without a hair being singed. Another is the ring-test. The spirits having made the request, I obtained five copper rings, of different sizes, which Frank keeps with other articles in a small tin box. One day recently, while out on the street, all these rings were put upon his arms and legs, under all his clothing, without his knowledge: and he was obliged to wear them for a week; for, in trying to remove one of them, I gave him so much pain, that I had to give it up. They were taken off by the spirits as quietly as they were put on.”

The writer concludes his article by saying, —

“Any one desiring further information with regard to the same is at liberty to address the writer, or to visit us in person.”

Will our skeptical readers avail themselves of this privilege? It may help them to arrive at a knowledge of the truth.

A London correspondent of “The New-York Times,”

in speaking of Mr. D. D. Home and his mediumship, says, —

“ He was carried horizontally out of a window in the third story of the house of Lord ——, and brought in at the window of another room, some thirty feet distant; having been carried through the air forty feet or more from the ground. Finally, he has on several occasions taken a large live coal from a coal-fire, held it in his hand, and laid it in the hands of other persons, without even the smell of fire or the sensation of heat being perceived by them. My informant showed us where his own finger had been burnt in testing the value of this manifestation. He assured me that he had seen Mr. Home go to a large coal-fire, and lay his face upon the white-hot coals, without singeing his hair or beard. As this is a pretty strong story, I beg to append the following, which I find in ‘The Spiritual Magazine’ for this month. Mr. Hall is the well-known editor of ‘The Art Journal;’ his wife, Mrs. S. C. Hall, is well known as a writer, and has lately received a pension from the queen.

15 ASHLEY PLACE, Victoria Street, S.W

SIR, — I state facts without explanation or comment. On the 27th of December, I was sitting, with nine other persons, in my drawing-room. Mr. D. D. Home left the table, went to a bright fire, took thence a lump of living coal, brought it red to the table, and placed it on my head. Not a hair was singed, nor did I sustain any injury. The coal remained upon my head about a minute. Mr. Home then took it, and placed it in Mrs. Hall’s hand, without injury to her; and he afterwards placed it in the hands of two of our guests. The

gas-light and two candles were burning in the room. I add that the nine other persons present would depose to these facts. Your obedient servant,

S. C. HALL.

“The editor adds the following note: ‘At the conference at Lawson’s Rooms, Jan. 14, Mr. H. D. Jenckin publicly stated the facts here given by Mr. Hall, and added several instances of the kind which he had witnessed. The fire-test, he said, had now been seen by more than fifty persons in the metropolis and its neighborhood.’”

Epes Sargent, in his “Despair of Science,” says, —

“At a *séance* in London, in 1860, in the presence of several persons (whose names are at the service of the curious), Mr. Home, being entranced, did, in the presence of all, lay his head on the burning coals; where it remained several moments, he sustaining no injury: not a hair of his head was singed.” — Pp. 97, 98.

We have already referred to the so-called miracle of the deliverance of Daniel from the hungry lions; but it was only a physical manifestation of spirit-power. Daniel says, —

“My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions’ mouths, that they have not hurt me; forasmuch as before him innocency was found in me; and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt.” — Dan. vi. 22.

While we have strong confidence in prayer, fully believing that prayers are heard and answered, we do not believe that God has any other way of answering prayer but by virtue of angel ministry. It was an angel that administered to Jesus in the Garden of Geth-

semene, when, in the bitterness of his soul, he prayed, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me" (Luke xxii. 43). He could pray to his Father, and, as a result, have more than twelve legions of angels to assist him (Matt. xxvi. 53). It was in answer to prayer, that the angel came to Cornelius (Acts x. 1). In Daniel, chapters ix. and x., we have a very full history of the prophet's three weeks' prayer and fasting. At the end of this time, "a certain *man* clothed in linen," whom Daniel describes very minutely, came to him; spirit hands touched him; "one like the similitude of the sons of men" opened his mouth, and enabled him to speak. There were other parties with Daniel, who were not sufficiently developed to see; yet "great quaking fell upon them." This man, or angel, that came to Daniel, informed him that his prayers were heard long ago; but the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood him twenty-one days, that is, just three weeks, exactly the length of time Daniel was praying (compare verses 2, 3, with 12, 13, of Dan. x.); after which, says the angel, "Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me." This Prince Michael is prince among the angels (see Jude 9; Dan. ix. 21). The two, Michael and this other angel-man, succeeded in working upon the prince of the kingdom of Persia: so that Daniel's prayer was answered. The emancipation proclamation was written and sent out by the prince of the kingdom of Persia, and Israel was again free.

A very important case of the answer to prayer by angels is found in Acts xii. 4-16. The case is so interesting, we give it entire.

"And, when he had apprehended him, he put him

in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him ; intending, after Easter, to bring him forth to the people. Peter, therefore, was kept in prison ; but prayer was made without ceasing of the church unto God for him. And when Herod would have brought him forth, the same night Peter was sleeping between two soldiers, bound with two chains : and the keepers before the door kept the prison. And, behold, the angel of the Lord came upon him, and a light shined in the prison ; and he smote Peter on the side, and raised him up, saying, Arise up quickly. And his chains fell off from his hands. And the angel said unto him, Gird thyself, and bind on thy sandals ; and so he did. And he saith unto him, Cast thy garment about thee, and follow me. And he went out, and followed him, and wist not that it was true which was done by the angel ; but thought he saw a vision. When they were past the first and the second ward, they came unto the iron gate that leadeth unto the city, which opened to them of his own accord ; and they went out, and passed on through one street ; and forthwith the angel departed from him. And when Peter was come to himself, he said, Now I know of a surety, that the Lord hath sent his angel, and hath delivered me out of the hand of Herod, and from all the expectation of the people of the Jews. And when he had considered the thing, he came to the house of Mary the mother of John, whose surname was Mark, where many were gathered together praying. And as Peter knocked at the door of the gate, a damsel came to hearken, named Rhoda. And when she knew Peter's voice, she opened not the gate for gladness, but ran in, and told how Peter stood

before the gate. And they said unto her, Thou art mad. But she constantly affirmed that it was even so. Then said they, It is his angel. But Peter continued knocking: and when they had opened the door, and saw him, they were astonished."

A similar case is found in Acts v. 19-26. We cannot take up any sentence of this lengthy paragraph and elucidate it. We see nothing inconsistent or miraculous in the transaction. The soldiers were, doubtless, thrown into a sound magnetic sleep. The light which shone in the prison was a spirit-light, such as our own eyes have beheld on several occasions. The doors did not, as Peter supposed, open of their own accord: Peter was not sufficiently clairvoyant to see the angel who unlocked them, and swung them back on their hinges. How natural that he should go to the house of Mary! there was a magnet there; there it was that his brethren were assembled for prayers, and angels were collected. When the "raps" were heard at the door, how natural that little Rhoda should be the one who should open it, and, in her joy exclaim, "It's Peter, it's Peter!" But the church had not witnessed enough of the phenomena to be fully convinced: so their first conclusion was, "The damsel is mad," the girl is insane. Soon, however, they change their mind, and conclude that the raps are only spirit-raps: hence they assert, "It is his angel."

Now, we are frank to acknowledge that we believe the whole circumstance. We have seen things so similar, that we should be untrue to ourself to deny this. The same law which produces such things now could have produced them then.

Mr. Rand and the Davenport brothers were once imprisoned in the common jail of the city of Oswego, N.Y., for the crime of demonstrating immortality, without taking out a juggler's license. Mr. Rand himself tells the story of his release; from it we extract the following:—

“They were informed by the spirits that the prison-doors would be opened before their time expired; and, in the evening previous to its expiration, a voice spoke in the room, and said that I was to go out that night. I was told to put on my coat and hat, and be ready. It was oppressively warm in our small room, with the window and door both closed; and I asked if I could be allowed to sit with my coat off, as I did not expect we should be released for more than an hour; but the answer was, ‘Put on thy coat and hat. Be ready.’ I did so, not even then supposing we should be released until the jailer and his family had retired, and all might be still without. But I was disappointed. Immediately, not probably twenty minutes from the time we were locked up, the door was thrown open; and the voice again spoke, and said, ‘Now go quickly. Take with you the rope (for a rope had been in our room, which had been used for another purpose in our former room, as we have previously said), go to yonder garret-window, and let thyself down, and flee from this place. We will take care of the boys. There are many angels present, though but one speaks.’ I hastily passed on, and strictly obeyed the angel. The boys came out with me into the hall, took up the lock which lay upon the floor, and for the first time examined it: spoke of its being warm. The angel told them, as they subse-

quently informed me, to go into the room again; and the door was closed and locked again by the angel, and they were to remain there for the night."—*History of Davenport's*, by Rev. Orrin Abbott, p. 70.

The above case we have investigated quite thoroughly. We know, that, so far as human testimony is concerned, its truth is established beyond a reasonable doubt. Other cases of the same kind have occurred within our knowledge; then, why should we deny such things when found in the Bible?

Now, shall we say we believe in angel ministry? We can not. Taking all these biblical evidences, together with the modern phenomena, including what our eyes have seen and our ears have heard, we can not believe, *we know*, "angels are ministering spirits."

"They come, and night is no more night,
Pale sorrow's reign is o'er;
And death is but the gate of light,
And gloomy now no more."

We have been too often blessed, advised, protected, defended, delivered, and saved by them, to entertain doubts on the subject. We know the angels have taken us out of the hands of ferocious mobs. We know that they are always present, that the thoughts we now pen are influxes from the spirit-world. Angels are even now in the room.

"How cheering the thought that the spirits in bliss
Do bow their bright wings to a world such as this,
Do leave their bright home in the mansions above
To breathe o'er our spirits some message of love!"

Dear reader, would you *know* of this divine communion? Would you enjoy the society of an angel brotherhood? Would you be led in green pastures, beside the still waters? Would you drink from the never-failing fountain of inspiration? Then place yourself in a condition where you can enjoy communion with your "elder brethren." It will open to your soul fountains of happiness the world can know nothing of. That readers and writer may ever be led into the paths of truth and righteousness, and be accounted worthy, even during this life, to associate with the inhabitants of the angel-world, is our most devout and humble prayer.

CHAPTER IV.

THE THREE PILLARS OF SPIRITUALISM.

Spiritual Platform — Three Propositions — Man has a Spiritual Nature — Spirit not immaterial — Spiritual Man — Source of Evidence — Biblical Testimony — Elihu — Zephaniah — Papal Decree — Hard Questions — Can not answer all — Spiritual Senses — Blind and Deaf Man — Illustration — Man Double — Two Fathers — Two Sources of Knowledge — Peter awakened — Two Contradictory Histories of Jesus — Both true — Jesus did not always believe his own Prophecies — Somnambulism an Important Witness — Author's Case — A Lady and the Fine Arts — Dr. Slade and Spirit Pictures — The *modus operandi* — Psychometry — Discourses read from the Hand, the Walls of the House, &c. — Paul's Case — Outward and Inward Man — One perishes, the other endures — Modern Facts — Apparitions of the Living — Mrs. Hauffe — Lady in Albany — Apparition at St. Louis — Hiram Dayton badly mixed — His Father appears — Case in New Orleans — Drowning Persons — Spirit continues after the Death of the Body — Spirit a Conscious Entity — Spirits in Prison — Gospel preached to the Dead — Spirits return — Modern Spiritualism a Repetition of that of the Bible — Samuel and Saul — No Devil or Witch in the Case — Josephus's Testimony — Character of the Woman — Moses and Elias — "Only a Vision" — Various Phases of Manifestation — Child Medium — Written Communication from Elijah the Prophet — Belshazzar's Palace Wall — Elias must come — John the Baptist a Medium — This was Elias — "He hath a Devil" — Ezekiel's Mediumship — Saul a Medium — An Evil Spirit visits him — Modern Evidences — Dr. Johnson's Testimony — Vision of a French Marquis — Prediction fulfilled — Testimony Conclusive.

PERHAPS we have pursued our investigation far enough to hand to our readers a *platform* upon which Spiritualism rests. As we now have the "ball" fairly opened, we may as well proceed to lay down a *digest* of some of the main evidences of Spiritualism, more especially those upon which we as an individual predicate our faith.

The "holy trinity" upon which Spiritualism is built, with which it stands or falls, and which must be attacked by opponents who would inaugurate an honorable warfare upon it, can be represented in the following sentences:—

1. *Man has a spiritual nature.*
2. *That spiritual nature exists and retains its consciousness after the dissolution of the body.*
3. *That spiritual nature, after it leaves the body, can come en rapport with and communicate to those yet in the flesh.*

All must see that with these propositions Spiritualism meets its fate. Take any one of them fairly away from Spiritualism, and upon its banners you write, "Thou art weighed in a balance and found wanting." On the other hand, with the sustaining of this trinity, Spiritualism becomes a *tri-unity*, a "threefold cord," which a wise man has said "is not easily broken." With the sustaining of these three propositions, Spiritualism becomes a citadel of strength, so fortified that its enemies can do but little more than to pick at its microscopic crudities and irregularities. Then let us turn our attention at once to their proof.

Man has a Spiritual Nature.

By this proposition we do not mean that man has an *immaterial* nature. The word "immaterial" has so long been connected with "spiritual," that the world has come to consider them synonymous. Yet one stands opposed to *animal*; while the other can be better represented by the word "nothing" than any other in the English lan-

guage. That which is material is something; that which is the opposite of material is *immaterial*; that which is the opposite of something is nothing: hence *that which is immaterial is nothing*. This being true, those who take the position that spirit is immaterial deny its existence.

By the term "spiritual" we mean what the ancient Greeks meant by the term *pneumatikon*; that is, not animal, not corporeal, a nature not comprehended through the external organs of sense.

As we hold to no theory but that we can prove, either with or without the Bible, we will on this subject draw our first proofs from that book; not that they are true because they are in the Bible, but they are there because those who placed them there regarded them as true. There are thousands in the world to-day who would not dare to say their souls were their own, unless their Bible told them so; who would only require one "Thus saith the Scripture," to convince them that a man was older than his father; that the sun stood still about twelve hours while a Hebrew general marched his army several hundred miles, and fought six battles; that a man caught three hundred foxes, and turned tail to tail, and tied firebrands between them, and by that means burned down thousands of acres of his neighbor's green corn; that a whale got down into the Mediterranean Sea and swallowed a man; that after a three-days residence in the stomach of a great fish, during which time Jonah graduated, and prepared for the ministry, he entered unharmed upon his calling, went as a missionary to Nineveh, and proved himself divinely called, by uttering predictions which never were fulfilled

that fire refused to burn certain Jews; and that sundry miracles were wrought by the Man of Nazareth on purpose to convince the people of his divinity, and yet the divine decree had gone forth, that, "seeing, they should see and not perceive, and, hearing, they should hear and not understand." For the benefit of such, we will first exhibit a sample of the biblical evidences that man has a spiritual nature.

The prophet Elihu has introduced this subject in the following unmistakable language: —

"There is a spirit in man; and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." — Job xxxii. 8.

A more positive declaration of spiritualistic faith could not be made by the most sanguine Spiritualist; nor is this an isolated proof of this position. The Bible abounds in declarations as positive as the above. Zechariah, another of Israel's prophets, said, —

"The Lord . . . formeth the spirit of man within him." — Zech. xii. 1.

In this declaration, we not only have the assertion that man has a spirit, but that it is *formed, shaped*.

Pope Leo X. decreed that "the spirit is the same form as the body." We do not doubt that this decree of the infallible head of the Church is true, not, however, because it was decreed, any more than the rising of the sun to-morrow morning would be the result of a decree of his papal Majesty.

When we get thus far with our subject, we know that some of our readers who do not comprehend spiritual things are ready with a legion of questions concerning man's spiritual nature. May we confess right here, that, probably, we can not answer your questions? That,

however, neither proves our theory untrue, nor our incompetency to rationally reason upon it. Paul says, —

“But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things; yet he himself is judged of no man.” — 1 Cor. ii. 14, 15.

From this we learn that it is impossible for him whose spiritual faculties have not been aroused to understand spiritual things. “*Neither can he know them.*” Then, why should we try to make him comprehend them? While we can not explain spiritual things to the “natural man” (and the spiritual man needs no explanation: he gets his knowledge of these things by intuition, not by tuition), we may be able to call his attention to phenomenal evidences which may convince him, that, though he can not understand them, they may, nevertheless, be true. We can not explain how light passes through a pane of glass without either glass or light being disorganized, yet we can any day, and in any house, point to such phenomena. We can not make the man who was born without eyes understand the difference between red, white, and blue; yet we can make him know that we see a difference which is not tangible to his senses. Discourse sweetest music to a totally deaf man, until the last hair on your head turns gray, and you can not make him comprehend that there is an interval of a fifth between C and G.

We said, and have set out to prove, that man has a spiritual nature. We now assert that man is *double*; he has a *duplex entity*. If Paul understood this question, we all have two fathers. His language is, —

“Furthermore, we have had fathers of our flesh, which corrected us; and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits, and live?” — Heb. xii. 9.

This passage deserves more than a cursory notice. Paul says, “We have had *fathers* (plural) of our flesh; and we gave them (plural) reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection to the *Father* (singular) of spirits (plural), and live?” By this we see that though there may be as many fathers of the flesh of our readers as there are readers, yet their spirits all have the same father. This father is God, who is a spirit. — John iv. 24; Acts xvii. 29.

Man, having two fathers, might reasonably be expected to have two natures, sometimes called two men (see 2 Cor. iv. 16). There are two sources whence men get knowledge. Some things we learn by aid of our five senses; some things we know independent of the organs of sense.

Jesus once said to Peter, “that he must go to Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders, chief priests, and scribes, and be killed.” But Peter did not believe it. He rebuked his Master, and said, “Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee.” Whereupon, Jesus says, “Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offense unto me; for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.” — See Matt. xvi. 21–23.

What other idea can any one glean from this than that Peter was not in a spiritual condition? he could understand the things that came to his fleshly senses from flesh and blood; other things he could not under-

stand. But Peter's spiritual senses are not always asleep. On another occasion, Jesus asks him, "Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?" Peter answered, "Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets." Then Jesus put the question directly to his disciples, "Whom do ye say that I am?" Peter says, "Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God." Jesus responds, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona; *for flesh and blood hath not revealed this to thee*, but my Father which is in heaven." — Matt. xvi. 13-17.

Who wonders that Jesus calls him blessed? He was in a condition where he was receiving knowledge independent of fleshly organs. He was not indebted even to his own fleshly eyes and ears for that revelation.

The two paragraphs above quoted show very plainly that at one time Peter was in a condition that he was not in at another. Once he "savored not the things of God;" at another time was receiving knowledge not from flesh and blood, but directly from the Father in heaven. Such is the history of all spiritually-minded persons; sometimes they seem so infilled with the spirit that all space and time are annihilated. The past is brought up with peculiar distinctness, and "coming events cast their shadows before." They see through solid walls, and at a distance, the same as though there was nothing to obstruct the vision. At other times, the animal man holds the dominion, and they, the same as others, view events from a material standpoint. At such times, they not unfrequently disbelieve what their own spiritual senses have told them; and many dispute what they, in the moments of their illumination, so

clearly saw, that they could have pledged their own existence on its reality. It was so with Jesus: at times, his spirit seemed to reach out and grasp the future, so that he could say, "The Son of man shall be betrayed into the hands of men, and be 'crucified.'" At other times, he did not believe his own predictions, and he would promise his disciples that they should have a hundred times the amount of real estate in this world, for following him, that they could get by any other means; that they should sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel; that they should not taste of death till they should see his kingdom established with power. He even went so far on one occasion as to take the kingdom by violent force; but he saw his mistake afterward, and wept over it. — See Mark x. 29, 30; Matt. xix. 28, xvi. 28, xxi. 9-13, xxiii. 37-39.

Somnambulism is an important witness to the double entity of man. Its facts are so patent, that, perhaps, there is not one who will read this volume who will not remember having heard of persons getting up in their sleep, and performing wonderful feats of physical or mental strength. At the age of fourteen years, we were employed to carry shingles upon a three-story brick house; and several persons now living will testify, that, after the first day's work, we got up in our sleep in the night and took a bunch of white-wood shingles, perhaps five hundred, and carried them up on the house. Half of the number would have been more than we could have carried in our normal condition. When told of it the next morning, though we had been in the habit of sleep-walking ever since we were

three years old, we could hardly believe the report of the witnesses; and we have never, from that day to this, been able to gather the faintest recollection of even dreaming of carrying shingles that night.

We remember to have read somewhere of a lady getting up in her sleep, and, in that condition, painting a picture, which, as a work of art, could not be excelled by the best artists in Europe. This lady was surprised, when admiring the painting the next day, to learn that she herself was its author; that she had done in a few hours, in a state of sound sleep, what she could by no possibility accomplish in her waking hours.

We know that Dr. Henry Slade of Jackson, Mich., when in an unconscious magnetic trance, has, in one hour, produced an exact life-size likeness of his wife, which, as a work of art, could not be excelled on this continent. The picture is in existence to-day, and more than a thousand witnesses in Michigan and New York can testify that the representation is true to life.

How are these things done? We have but one answer. "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." One or the other of these bodies must hold the positive dominion. Ordinarily, in perfect physical health, the animal man is positive. "But, though the outward man perish, the inward man is renewed day by day." As the outward man loses strength, the spiritual, or inward man becomes positive: hence, if the physical man can be put into a perfectly sound sleep, it will be in a perfectly negative condition; then if the spiritual man can take the physical while asleep, and use it without awaking it, it can certainly control it better than it could when the physical was

positive. So with mediumship: an organism that can be put into a sound magnetic sleep, and then used by a spirit-power, without being disturbed or awakened, will always make a good medium.

Psychometry might be presented as another evidence that man has a spiritual nature. We all have senses that we little dream of. Even dumb animals manifest powers which our positive intellectuality prevents many men and women from knowing they possess. The dog tracks the hare or fox with unerring certainty: so he will distinguish his master's track from that of ten thousand other men, by the *peculiar kind* of caloric his master throws off. Every individual is surrounded by a *magnetic aura* peculiar to him or her self: that we read often, without knowing it. Who has not often, upon being introduced to persons, formed an attachment, or taken a dislike, that no future acquaintance could change? Why was it? We answer, "The spirits, unknown, it may be, to the physical organism, sought and obtained an introduction to each other. They saw an affinity, or lack of it, as the case might be, that may require the bodies many months to learn." We have on several occasions met entire strangers, and recognized them by this magnetic atmosphere. We could not tell how we knew them, yet we were as positive who and what they were before as after a formal introduction. "How do you tell?" said a gentleman to us whom we called by name, never having seen him before. "By my feelings," was our response. "It is the most ridiculous nonsense," ejaculated our interrogator. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit, neither can he know them; they are foolishness unto him," was our reply.

Though we never yet took a manuscript into an audience, we have not, in almost seventeen years' constant preaching, delivered as much as one discourse that we did not read. When we get up to speak, we can not look where our discourse is not; we can see it photographed on the walls of the room; we can read it in the countenances of our audience, or in our bare hand, or hear it in the very silence of the room, in pauses between our words.

Of these phenomena we could not even attempt an explanation: all we can say is, there is a spiritual world, and man is endowed with spiritual senses, which occasionally get a glimpse of what is behind the curtain of gross materiality.

We could weary the reader with volumes of such evidences as have been here presented. Indeed, it is more trouble to cease than to write; but we must approach the more direct evidence of the duplex entity of man.

The great apostle to the Gentiles relates an historical fact bearing directly upon this point. He says, "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, *whether in the body or out of the body I can not tell*; God knoweth; such an one caught up to the third heaven, . . . and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful [possible] for man to utter." — 2 Cor. xii. 2-4.

From this emphatic declaration of the learned Paul, we learn that he supposed it possible for a man to exist out of the body. Had man been all body, as certain ones suppose, and Paul understood it so, he never could have used the language, "Whether in the body or out of the body I can not tell." Again: the fact that words were heard which could not be uttered by corporeal

organs of speech is proof abundant, not only that there is a language that fleshly lips can not speak, but that the man which exists sometimes in the body and sometimes out of it can hear when out of the body.

The spiritual nature, upon the existence of which depends the proof of Spiritualism, is, by Paul, referred to as follows :—

“ For which cause we faint not ; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day.” — 2 Cor. iv. 16.

The inward man is certainly not the corporeal or animal man ; for one man of that kind does not dwell within another. Although we are getting ahead of our subject, we must be permitted to say, that this text is a most positive proof of our second proposition, viz., that the spiritual nature exists and retains its consciousness after the body is dead. The outward man perish, and the inward man renewed ? What can be plainer ? Again : when the inward man is out of the body, from the fact of its having perished, or from any other cause, it hears unspeakable words, — words unuttered by fleshly lips. Could we have the framing of testimony to our liking, we could not make the matter more plain than Paul has done in these two instances.

But, to come to more modern facts, who has not read and heard and known of instances of persons leaving the body, even here in this life, and appearing, sometimes at a distance of hundreds of miles from it ; thus giving proof of their double entity ?

Take the case related by Capt. Robert Bruce, of the man on the wrecked vessel appearing at the same time on another vessel, several leagues distant, and writing

on the captain's slate, "Steer to the nor'west." Mr. Bruce himself saw the man write; others saw the writing. They steered as directed, and saved the lives of a crew by doing so. The man who did the writing, it appeared afterward, by a comparison of the notes of the two sea-captains, was in a trance at the time it was done.

If the reader will take the trouble to take the book called "Footfalls on the Boundaries of Another World," by Hon. Robert Dale Owen, and read any two or three of the several well-authenticated cases he records under the heading "apparitions of the living," we feel assured that he will be convinced that man has a spiritual nature, which can exist either in or out of the body.

As the whole spiritualistic argument has been suspended upon this proposition, permit us to carry the argument further. The sin of prolixity is not so great as that of brevity, where there is so much at stake.

Of Mrs. Hauffe, the seeress of Prevorst, Kerner says, "She was more than half a spirit, and belonged to a world of spirits: she belonged to a world after death, and was more than half dead. In her sleep only was she truly awake. Nay, so loose was the connection between soul and body, that, like Swedenborg, she often went out of the body, and could contemplate it separately." — *Despair of Science*, p. 146.

The following, taken from "The Albany Times," seems to illustrate the truth of our proposition:—

"Some two weeks since, a young lady living here, whose father is engaged in mercantile business in this city, awoke from a sleep, feeling distressed and alarmed from the effects of an unpleasant dream. The

gas-light was burning, but had been turned down to the closest point ; thus making a dim light in the room, and rendering portions of it almost dark. Soon after awaking, the young lady's attention was attracted by the well-defined figure of a lady of her acquaintance moving from the door, some ten feet from the foot of her bed, toward it. Impulsively she called the figure by name, on the instant forgetting the improbability of the friend being in the house, and the fact that she was not a resident of the city, but resided in St. Louis. Soon, however, all this recurred to her, and the figure already neared the now alarmed girl. The form and features were perfect and distinct, the expression one of cheerful greeting ; and, as it approached closer and closer to her side, it became dimmer and dimmer, and finally disappeared entirely when it had advanced to about half the length of the bed. The nervousness caused by this incident naturally enough induced the young lady to arouse the family, who ascribed the matter to exciting imaginings. But there was a singular sequel. She had forebodings, notwithstanding all that was said to calm them ; and the next day wrote to her friend, detailing the incident. An answer was promptly received, announcing the good health of the writer, and the fact, that on the same night, and at the same hour, she had been visited in precisely the same manner by the semblance of her friend in Albany, and been alarmed thereby, lest it was the forerunner of evil. The mutual revelation was a relief to both. The circumstance, we think, has few, if any, parallels, and can partially be ascribed to the love the two girls had for each other, and to active nervous temperaments ; but,

as to an entirely satisfactory explanation of it, we think none can be given."

This circumstance is recorded as an historical fact, nothing more; and as such we demand that it be met. It will not do to laugh at these things; they won't be laughed down: they occur, and demand an explanation. Let the *savans* of science look at and explain a few such extracts as the foregoing; and, if that is not enough, here is another taken from "The Banner of Light:"—

"Question, by Hiram Dayton of Cincinnati, O.: I have always entertained strong doubts in regard to the real truth of spirit-communication; but a communication received by me on the night of Oct. 20 places me in a worse condition than ever. I believe, yea, I *know*; yet I do not believe, and *don't* know.

"On the night above referred to, I attended a small circle in the house of Mr. Brayton, on Ninth Street. The medium's name was Josephine Gray, whom I had never seen before; neither was I in the least acquainted with Mr. Brayton. When under the influence, my father came and spoke through her in a wonderfully mysterious manner.

"My father resides in Albany, N.Y., has lived there over forty years; yet he came and told me all about home, describing as correctly as I could have done; even giving names of persons, together with their streets and numbers, with whom I am acquainted; and, lastly, said he was very sick, and quite delirious, but thought he should recover soon.

"I could not gainsay the statement; but of his sickness I could not believe. The following day, I wrote him a letter, detailing all of the circumstances connected with the communication.

“ On the 23d of October, I received a letter from my sister, stating that our father had been very sick, but was now better. But I heard nothing from my letter to him until the 12th of December, when I received a letter, written by his own hand, which states that on the 20th of October he was very sick, and says that my sister tells him he was quite delirious for two or three hours. My father says he has no recollection of what passed during the time referred to by my sister; neither does he remember of seeing or dreaming about me. He says, to him the two or three hours referred to were a perfect blank; and he does not appear to understand how he could converse through another without knowing it. Please explain this strange phenomenon.”

With one more extract we will close this department of the subject.

“ The Spiritual Telegraph ” says, “ A New-Haven gentleman relates the following: Some years ago, a gentleman of the name of Daboll, residing in New London, Conn., who was reputed to possess the faculty of seeing things in distant parts of the country, was applied to for information respecting a sea-captain and vessel which had sailed from that port, and concerning whose fate there was some uneasiness. The old gentleman retired, and shortly afterward returned, and said he had seen the captain at a certain porter-house at New Orleans, in the act of drinking a bowl of punch, and that he was then on the eve of sailing for home. The circumstance was noted down, together with the day and hour of the observation. In due time, the captain returned home with his vessel, and was questioned respecting his whereabouts on the day above referred to. He said, among

other things, that he was at a certain porter-house in New Orleans, and that, as he was regaling himself with a bowl of punch, he plainly saw old Mr. Daboll come in at one door, and go out at another. Many of our readers will recollect an almost precisely similar circumstance related by Jung Stilling about an old seer who resided in solitude on the banks of the Delaware, near Philadelphia."

Such facts need no comment. When they are properly explained, the spiritual nature of man will appear. We ourself have had an experience somewhat similar to the one above related.

We have been so fortunate as to have had the privilege of conversing with several persons who had been supposed to be dead ; some from drowning, some from wounds received in battle, and two or three who had been supposed to die a natural death, but had recovered from their catalepsy. In almost every instance, the subject has related an experience which proves him to have had a conscious existence separate from the physical organism. Some have told where they had been and what they had seen, and, occasionally, one has given an unmistakable test, by which we could know not only that the subject was sincere in thinking he had left his body, but that he had actually seen places and parties many miles away from his body, in some instances giving so many et cæteras, that he could not possibly have learned in any other way, that it would seem impossible to disbelieve his testimony.

We remember one individual in particular, who, being drowned and afterward resuscitated, in giving his experience, said, that while drowning, he *distinctly remembered*

every act of his life. Matters of great and small importance were presented with like vivid distinctness; things long gone out of mind were as fresh to him as at the instant of their transaction. After viewing, as in panoramic scene, his own life, the vision faded before him. He then remembered leaving his body; of viewing himself in the water and out of the water at the same time; of being for a few moments confused to make out which was really himself, or whether it was not all a dream; of discovering a magnetic cord (could with propriety be termed a spiritual *umbilical* cord; Solomon calls it a "silver cord," Eccl. xii. 6) by which he was prevented from getting entirely away from the animal body, &c. The whole circumstance was related to us in such a serious manner, and with such an air of truthfulness, that we could come to no other conclusion than that to the relator it was a reality.

Now we are tempted to ask, What do such experiences mean? They are so many and so varied, that, if they were written, "the world itself could not contain the books." Yet not one who has ever passed through such a scene has had the hardihood afterward to deny his belief in his spiritual nature.

We now approach the second division of the argument, viz., —

The Spiritual Nature of Man exists in a Conscious State after the Body is dead.

Most Bible believers acknowledge this proposition. Some do not. For the benefit of such, we will state that it is a Bible doctrine, that knowledge inheres in spirit.

“For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him?” — 1 Cor. ii. 11.

This text affirms just what our proposition does, — that knowledge inheres in spirit. Paul once more makes the same affirmation. Hear him : —

“For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness [wicked spirits] in high places.” — Eph. vi. 12.

Certainly, wickedness can not be predicated of that which is not conscious ; but it is predicated of spirit : *therefore* spirit is conscious.

No one will contend that the spirit who said to Philip, “Go near and join thyself to this chariot” (Acts viii. 29), was unconscious.

This same spirit gave a physical demonstration of his power when he “caught away Philip that the eunuch saw him no more.” — Acts viii. 39.

The writer of the Book of Acts says, —

“For unclean spirits, crying with a loud voice, came out of many that werē possessed with them ; and many taken with palsies, and that were lame, were healed.” — Acts viii. 7.

Permit us to ask, How could these unclean spirits take possession of media, and cry with a loud voice, if they had no conscious existence ? Such paragraphs as the one just quoted can be found by the score in the Bible. Do they mean any thing ? They do not, unless their writers supposed the spirit to be a conscious entity.

With the elucidation of one more thought, we will pass to the last and most important proposition of this chapter. Peter says, —

“For Christ also hath once suffered for our sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit: by which, also, he went and preached to the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved by water.” — 1 Pet. iii. 18-20.

In this text there are three expressions which should be weighed. 1st, “Christ being put to death in the flesh,” i. e., the flesh being put to death, “but quickened by the spirit.” The best scholars inform us that a better rendering would be, “Christ suffered the stroke of death in the flesh, but *survived it in the spirit.*” How plain! The flesh put to death, the spirit survives.

2d, The next point to which we would call attention is, “By which he [Christ, who survived in the spirit] went and preached to the spirits in prison.”

3d, These spirits were departed spirits of human beings; for they were none other than those who were disobedient in the days of Noah. These spirits, certainly, could not hear preaching if they did not exist in a conscious state. This statement is corroborated by another statement from the same author.

“For this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit.” — 1 Pet. iv. 6.

What sense can there be in using the phrase, “men in the flesh,” if there are no men out of the flesh,—if, indeed, flesh, blood, and breath is all there is of man?

We now come to a consideration of the argument from another standpoint. It is as follows:—

Spirits of the Departed can communicate with the Inhabitants of Earth.

This proposition is the “stumbling-block,” this contains the offensive part, of Spiritualism; drop this, and a majority of our readers will admit the preceding ones. Only keep spirits away from this earth, keep heaven and earth apart, and all is well; but write that spirits in and out of the flesh hold sweet communion, and you are at once a heretic, worthy of nothing better than the fate of Michael Servetus, or the Salem witches.

On this, as on other departments of this subject, our first evidences shall be drawn from the Bible.

After having spent twelve years in the investigation of Spiritualism as an opponent, and almost six years as an advocate, we are compelled to say that modern Spiritualism is but a repetition of ancient Spiritualism, as manifest in the Bible. We can not now think of a form of manifestation in the Bible but that can be duplicated in modern manifestations, and *vice versa*.

The case of Samuel returning to Saul is so irresistible, that we present it first. The historian prefaces his historical fact with the words,—

“Now, Samuel was dead, and all Israel had lamented him, and buried him in Ramah, even in his own city. And Saul had put away those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land.”—1 Sam. xxviii. 3.

But the Jehovah being a “jealous God” (Ex. xx. 5) had become angry with Saul, and left him to manage

his own affairs. In his extremity, Saul had recourse to other gods; for be it remembered, that while this Jewish God is nothing more nor less than the spirit of a dead man, as we will abundantly prove, every spirit that communicated was a god. Thus when a band of spirits, led on by Samuel the prophet, came to the woman, she said, "I saw gods ascending out of the earth." She immediately, in response to Saul's inquiry, proceeds to describe one. Her language is, "An old man cometh up, and he is covered with a mantle." From this description, Saul perceived that it was Samuel. Now, we will, without note or comment, let the historian tell his own story.

"And Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted me, to bring me up? And Saul answered, I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets nor by dreams: therefore I have called thee, that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do. Then said Samuel, Wherefore, then, dost thou ask of me, seeing the Lord is departed from thee, and is become thine enemy? And the Lord hath done to him as he spake by me; for the Lord hath rent the kingdom out of thine hand, and given it to thy neighbor, even to David. Because thou obeyedst not the voice of the Lord, nor executedst his fierce wrath upon Amalek, therefore hath the Lord done this thing unto thee this day. Moreover, the Lord will also deliver Israel with thee into the hand of the Philistines; and to-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me: the Lord, also, shall deliver the host of Israel into the hand of the Philistines. Then Saul fell straight-

way all along on the earth, and was sore afraid, because of the words of Samuel: and there was no strength in him; for he had eaten no bread all the day nor all the night."

We have given this whole history in order that our readers may see the similarity in ancient and modern Spiritualism. There is only one question underlying the whole circumstance; that is, *Is the Bible true?* If so, Samuel not only had a conscious existence after the world called him dead, but he returned to talk with Saul, who was an old acquaintance. If this record is not true, we ask the opponents of Spiritualism, in all candor, how they know that any of the Bible is true? The Bible says, "*Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted me?*" &c. Christians, again we ask, Is your Bible true? If so, the question is settled.

"No," said a minister to us, "the Devil came to this old witch and Saul, personating Samuel." We could but ask, "Who told you so?"

But it matters not whether it was Samuel, the Devil, or an *ignis fatuus*; whether the woman was a witch, a medium, or a member of an orthodox Presbyterian church; to us and all others the evidence is the same. From it, in either case, the following stubborn conclusions are irresistible:—

1. It was the opinion of Saul (who was a Jewish prophet, and ought to know) that Samuel was there, and conversed with him.

2. The woman evidently thought Samuel was there.

3. The Jewish nation, "to whom were committed the oracles of God" (Rom. iii. 2) ever believed that Samuel was there.

4. The writer of the Book of Samuel says, without note or comment, Samuel was there. He makes no reservation, no explanation; records it, not as being a strange circumstance; but as a matter of course.

5. Finally, though we resisted the evidence twelve long years, we fully believe Samuel was there; we find no room to doubt it; as well doubt the fact of Saul or the woman having been present on that occasion.

Josephus, a Jewish historian, has said that the woman was a *necromancer*; that she saw Samuel. His account of the matter reads as follows:—

“She told Saul she saw an old man already, and of a glorious personage, and that he had on a sacerdotal mantle. So the king discovered by these signs that he was Samuel; and he fell down upon the ground, and saluted and worshiped him. And when the soul of Samuel asked him why he had disturbed him, and caused him to be brought up, he lamented the necessity he was under; for he said that his enemies pressed heavily upon him; that he was in distress what to do in his present circumstances; that he was forsaken of God, and could obtain no prediction of what was coming, neither by prophets nor by dreams; and that these are the reasons I have recourse to thee, who always takest care of me.”

Upon this, one of our most pithy writers, W. F. Jamieson, remarks, “Poor, distressed Saul; my soul always sympathizes with him when I read the account. His guardian angel or spirit lord was thrown into a rage because Saul refused to obey him in the conduct of the war with the Amalekites. That Saul may have believed that the God of the universe was his adviser,

and had refused to answer him because of his disobedience, is reasonable. There are people in this day who believe they talk with God. God is often belittled in the imagination as a fretful, passionate, finite being."

But Josephus continues, "But Samuel, seeing that the end of Saul's life was come, said, 'It is vain for thee to desire to learn of me any thing further, when God hath forsaken thee; however, hear what I say, that David is to be king, and to finish this war with good success; and thou art to lose thy dominion and thy life, because thou didst not obey God in the war with the Amalekites, and hast not kept his commandments as I foretold thee while I was alive.'" — *Antiquities of the Jews*, chap. xiv.

Since the opposers of modern Spiritualism are finding the conclusions Spiritualists draw from this irresistible, they have concluded to impede its force by slandering the character of the lady who officiated as medium on this occasion. In addition to calling her "an old witch," there has never been an insinuation made against the character of a modern medium but has been used to injure the reputation of the benevolent lady whom Saul sought in the hour of his distress. The object, of course, is to create a prejudice by which to kill the force of this manifestation. Happily, a Jewish historian has come to her rescue. The character of one medium, at least, finds a defender. Josephus says, —

"It is but just to recommend the generosity of this woman, because, when the king had forbidden her to use that art whence her circumstances were bettered and improved, and when she had never seen the king

before, she still did not remember to his disadvantage that he had condemned her sort of learning, and did not refuse him as a stranger and one that she had no acquaintance with ; but she had compassion upon him, and comforted him, and exhorted him to do what he was greatly averse to, and offered him the only creature she had, as a poor woman, and that earnestly and with great humanity, while she had no requital made her for her kindness, nor hunted after any future favor from him, for she knew that he was to die : whereas, men are naturally either ambitious to please those that bestow benefits upon them, or are very ready to serve those from whom they may receive some advantage. It would be well, therefore, to imitate the example of this woman, and do kindness to all such as are in want, and to think that nothing is better, nor more becoming mankind, than such general beneficence, nor what will sooner render God favorable, and ready to bestow good things upon us."

The case of the appearance of Moses and Elias is positive proof of our proposition. One writer records this phenomenon as follows : —

“ And after six days Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them ; and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him. Then answered Peter, and said unto Jesus, Lord, it is good for us to be here : if thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles ; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias. While he yet spake, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed

them : and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased : hear ye him. And, when the disciples heard it, they fell on their face, and were sore afraid. And Jesus came and touched them, and said, Arise, and be not afraid." — Matt. xvii. 1-7.

Luke's record is even more positive and spiritualistic than that of Matthew. As Luke has made some points worthy of attention, which Matthew did not mention, we quote his record entire : —

" And it came to pass about an eight days after these sayings, he took Peter and John and James, and went up into a mountain to pray. And as he prayed, the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment was white and glistening. *And, behold, there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elias*, who appeared in glory, and spake of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem. But Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep ; and, when they were awake, they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him. And it came to pass, as they departed from him, Peter said unto Jesus, Master, it is good for us to be here : and let us make three tabernacles ; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias ; not knowing what he said. While he thus spake, there came a cloud and overshadowed them ; and they feared as they entered into the cloud. And there came a voice out of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son : hear him. And when the voice was past, Jesus was found alone. And they kept it close, and told no man in those days any of those things which they had seen." — Luke ix. 28-36.

This can not be any thing else than the appearance of those we call dead ; for the Bible says, —

“ So Moses, the servant of the Lord, died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord. And he buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor ; but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day. And Moses was a hundred and twenty years old when he died : his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated.” — Deut. xxxiv. 5–7.

If the record is true, “ there talked with him *two men, which were Moses and Elias.*” How can this be met ? “ Oh ! ” say our materialistic opposers, “ it is only a vision : Moses and Elias were not there.” We can not see how the declaration, “ Tell the vision to no man,” should lead us to dispute the record which says, “ Moses and Elias talked with him,” any more than the record which says, “ They came, saying that they had also seen a vision of angels, which said that he was alive” (Luke xxiv. 23), should cause us to say that angels never come to earth. In this “ vision,” we have not only the talking of the dead to the living, but there was evidently a spirit-light ; for Jesus is surrounded by a cloud so bright, that his face and garments are all aglow. The disciples were evidently unconsciously entranced ; for Peter talked without knowing what he said. A spirit-voice, such as is now heard every day, was heard at this time, saying, “ This is my beloved son.”

We not only affirm that spirits can and do return and communicate, but that every form of the manifestation of modern Spiritualism is found in the Bible. Perhaps there is no form of mediumship now more popular than that of writing. There are now various phases of writ-

ing mediumship. Dr. Henry Slade of Jackson, Mich., and Peter West of Chicago, are, perhaps, the best writing mediums in the circle of our acquaintance. We have often known pencils to write in their presence, in broad daylight, without any visible hand touching them. There is a little girl not yet four years old, in Newton Corner, Mass., who has had the names of deceased persons come in large vivid letters upon her arm, when there was no visible cause for the strange manifestation. The "hand-writing" was never plainer on "the walls of the king's palace" than we ourself have seen it on the walls of our own bedroom. Some of the finest poems and plays we have ever read were written by an entranced medium.

Different phases of writing mediumship can be found in the Bible. After Elijah the prophet had been in the spirit-world at least seven years, we read, —

"And there came a writing to him [King Jehoram] from Elijah the prophet, saying, Thus saith the LORD God of David thy father, Because thou hast not walked in the ways of Jehoshaphat thy father, nor in the ways of Asa king of Judah, but hast walked in the way of the kings of Israel, and hast made Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem to go a whoring, like to the whoredoms of the house of Ahab, and also hast slain thy brethren of thy father's house, which were better than thyself, behold, with a great plague will the Lord smite thy people, and thy children, and thy wives, and all thy goods; and thou shalt have great sickness by disease of thy bowels, until thy bowels fall out by reason of the sickness day by day." — 2 Chron. xxi. 12-16.

This Jehoram was not exalted to the throne until

after Elisha's return from Elijah's funeral, when the two she bears killed the forty-two children (see 2 Kings ii. 23-25, iii. 1, 2); but this written communication from Elijah is the death-warrant of the king, whose wicked reign lasted eight years. Hence there is no escaping the fact that it is a genuine spirit-communication.

In Dan. v. 5, is another written communication. The words of the text are, —

“In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaster of the wall of the king's palace; and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote.”

Shall we believe such things in the Bible, and reject similar modern manifestations? Or, to reverse the proposition, are not modern phenomena a testimony to the truth of such declarations of holy writ?

We are not yet ready to take leave of the communications from and manifestations of the spirit of Elijah. The Jews had a tradition that Elias [Elijah the prophet] must come (Matt. xvii. 11). This tradition was, perhaps, based on the prediction, —

“Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord.” — Mal. iv. 5.

When the birth of John the Baptist was foretold, it was said of him, —

“And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord.” — Luke i. 17.

John does go out in the spirit of Elijah, and manifests

all of his idiosyncrasies ; and, as a result, the Jews exclaim, "He hath a Devil" (Matt. xi. 18). The word "devil," in this instance, comes from the Greek word *daimon*, which the Greeks, who should understand their own language, interpreted to mean the spirit of a dead man. How similar is this to the charge now brought against those under the influence of spirits !

To make assurance in regard to John being under Elijah's influence doubly sure, Jesus, after the martyrdom of John, says of him, "And, if ye will receive it, this is Elias which was for to come." — Matt. xi. 14. Again we read, —

"And his disciples asked him, saying, Why, then, say the scribes that Elias must first come? And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly shall first come, and restore all things. But I say unto you, that Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed. Likewise shall also the Son of man suffer of them. Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John the Baptist."

So far as argument from the Bible is concerned, we must consider the question settled. Though there are hundreds of passages in that book bearing upon the point, there are none more positive than many of those already quoted.

For the benefit of the curious who wish to pursue this part of the investigation further, we subjoin a few scriptural statements without comment. Ezekiel was a great medium, as will be evinced by the following : —

"Then the spirit took me up, and I heard behind me a voice of a great rushing, saying, Blessed be the glory of the Lord from his place." — Ezek. iii. 12.

“Then the spirit entered into me, and set me upon my feet, and spake with me, and said unto me, Go, shut thyself within thine house.” — Ezek. iii. 24.

“Then I beheld, and, lo, a likeness as the appearance of fire; from the appearance of his loins, even downward, fire; and from his loins, even upward, as the appearance of brightness, as the color of amber. *And he put forth the form of a hand, and took me by a lock of mine head; and the spirit lifted me up between the earth and the heaven,* and brought me in the visions of God to Jerusalem, to the door of the inner gate that looketh toward the north; where was the seat of the image of jealousy, which provoketh to jealousy.” — Ezek. viii. 2, 3.

Here is either a physical manifestation of spirit-power, or Ezekiel's spirit leaves his body, and is caught away “in the visions of God to Jerusalem.” In either case, it affords the most positive proof of Spiritualism. The spirits with which Ezekiel deals to so great an extent are several times called men. — See Ezek. ix. 2, 3, 11.

“Afterwards the spirit took me up, and brought me in a vision by the Spirit of God into Chaldæa, to them of the captivity. So the vision that I had seen went up from me. Then I spake unto them of the captivity all the things that the Lord had showed me.” — Ezek. xi. 24, 25.

Death did not change the moral status of men in ancient times more than it does now; hence, the spirits communicating were not always good and truthful. In 1 Sam. xvi. 14–17, we read, —

“But the spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him. And Saul's

servants said unto him, Behold now, an evil spirit from God troubleth thee. Let our lord now command thy servants, which are before thee, to seek out a man who is a cunning player on a harp; and it shall come to pass when the evil spirit from God is upon thee, that he shall play with his hand, and thou shalt be well. And Saul said unto his servants, Provide me now a man that can play well, and bring him to me."

David was the man provided.

"And it came to pass, when the evil spirit from God was upon Saul, that David took a harp, and played with his hand: so Saul was refreshed, and was well, and the evil spirit departed from him." — 1 Sam. xvi. 23.

Lying spirits once got the control of four hundred prophets at one time. — See 1 Kings xxii.

Permit us, in conclusion, to present a few evidences from the pages of every-day life; and we must preface them with the truthful words of the renowned Dr. Johnson.

"That the dead are seen no more," says the great lexicographer, "I will not undertake to maintain against the concurrent testimony of all ages and nations. There is no people, rude or unlearned, among whom apparitions of the dead are not related and believed. This opinion, which prevails as far as human nature is diffused, could become universal only by its truth; those who never heard of one another would not have agreed in a tale which nothing but experience could make credible. That it is doubted by single cavilers can very little weaken the general evidence; and some who deny it with their tongues confess it with their fears."

Had our readers the time and disposition to candidly

peruse the works of Hon. Robert Dale Owen and William Howitt, on this subject, they would find a mine which would richly repay their explorations; besides, it would satisfy those who have brains, and use them, that the dead do return. The following extract, taken from "The Spiritual Times" of London, is to the point: —

"The Marquis de Bamtouillet and the Marquis de Precey were intimate friends and companions in arms. Talking, one day, of the next world, they promised that the one who died first should return to tell the other of the event. Three months subsequently, the Marquis de Bamtouillet started for the seat of war in Flanders: his friend, being detained by fever, remained in Paris. Six weeks later, De Precey was awakened at six o'clock in the morning by the curtains of his bed being drawn aside; and, turning to see who it was, he perceived his friend. Springing out of bed, he tried to embrace him, to testify his joy at his return; but Bamtouillet retreated a few steps, and said, caresses were misplaced; he came to fulfill a promise; that he had been slain in battle the preceding day, and that all that was said of a future life was true; that De Precey ought to alter his present mode of life without delay, for he would be killed in his first engagement. Unable to credit his senses, the marquis again tried to embrace his friend, believing it all to be a joke; but he only grasped the air: and Bamtouillet, perceiving his doubts, showed him the wound which he had received, from which the blood appeared to flow. After this, the phantom disappeared; and De Precey awoke the whole house by his cries. Several persons,

to whom he related what he had seen and heard, attributed the vision to a fevered brain, and, entreating him to lie down, assured him that he must have been dreaming. The marquis, in despair at being taken for a visionary, related all the above-mentioned circumstances, protesting he had both seen and heard his friend while awake ; but it was of no effect until the arrival of the mail from Flanders brought the announcement of the death of the marquis.

“ This first circumstance proving correct, in the very manner related by De Precey, his friends began to think there might be some foundation for the adventure related ; Bamtouillet having been killed on the eve of the day he announced the fact, and there not having elapsed time enough for the information to be received by natural means. The event was much canvassed in Paris, but attributed to a heated brain, in spite of the testimony of some who had examined the case seriously. The prediction was, however, shortly verified ; for on the marquis’s recovery, at the commencement of the civil wars, he proceeded at once to the scene of action, in spite of the urgent entreaties of his father and mother, who dreaded the fulfillment of the prophecy ; and was killed at the battle of Saint Antoine.”

The above we present as an historical fact. As such we demand that it be met. It is only one of a thousand. Philosophers and scientists, such facts demand your attention.

We will only add, the testimony concerning the *anastasis* of Jesus, which Peter calls *infallible*, is not half so good and well authenticated as testimony com-

ing to earth's inhabitants every day, telling them of a "beyond," another side to the river of death, where those we mourn as lost wait with outstretched arms to receive us.

"It is a faith sublime and sure,
That ever round our head,
Are hovering on viewless wings
The spirits of the dead."

CHAPTER V.

THE BIRTH OF THE SPIRIT.

All Subjects Important — “Ye must be born again” — Nicodemus’ Quandary — A Minister’s Opinion — Author’s Objection — Jesus’ Tests — Must be born out of Flesh — Birth of the Spirit a Resurrection — Not of Flesh and Blood — Bible against it (1 Cor. xv.) — Natural and Spiritual Body — Opinion of the Woman of Tekoah — Of Job — Of Jesus — Objections answered — Mortal Bodies quickened — Must eat Christ’s Flesh — Job and the Worms — Job refers to his Recovery — He did see God — Scientific Arguments — Change of Matter — Interesting Dialogue — Is the Mind an Entity — Abraham in the Resurrection — Dust returning to Dust — Resurrection a Birth — Jesus born of the Spirit — Seen by Clairvoyants — He goes and comes like the Wind — His Flesh and Bones — Owasso, the Boots and the Hand — His Explanation — Jesus appears to Paul — Others do not see him — Test from Ananias — Jesus, in showing himself, demonstrated Immortality — Practical Conclusions — Born into the Other World of this — Future Happiness and Misery made by Life here — Alexander Campbell — The Good shall shine — Spirits and Tobacco — Appetites may be our Hell hereafter — Admonition.

THOUGH very popular, it is hardly just to say of any question, “This is important,” as such language implies that there are questions of no importance; which is not the case. Every truth has its bearing on every other truth; every truth received is a light by which we may be enabled to discover kindred truths; every truth rejected is a light extinguished; and darkness is the result.

“Ye must be born again,” is the language of Jesus to Nicodemus: and every one who believes his Bible indorses it; the only question being, What is meant by being born again? There is a difference, “wide as the

world," between our views and those of our Christian neighbors, as to what constitutes the birth of the spirit.

Jesus, in his conference with a member of the Jewish senate, said, "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." This astonished Nicodemus, who could not see how it would be possible for him, under the circumstances, to get into the kingdom; for he was already an old man: and how could an old man be born? Jesus answers,—

"Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again." — John iii. 5-7.

Sawyer renders this, "That which is born of the Spirit is a spirit."

Here the matter is explained. It is the birth of the Spirit that Jesus is speaking of, as much as to say, "You got your fleshly existence, got into this fleshly kingdom, by a birth of the flesh; now, in order to enter upon your spiritual existence, that is, your existence where there is no flesh and blood, you must be born of the Spirit. Don't wonder that I told you you must be born again."

"The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." — John iii. 8.

When but a boy, we once asked a minister for an explanation of this verse. He kindly consented to give us the needed light. "The birth of the Spirit," said he, "is nothing more nor less than conversion. All who

are converted are born again. The Spirit is like the wind ; it comes and goes, and you can not tell whence it comes, or whither it goes. You can not see the wind ; you see its effects, and feel it : so you can not see the Spirit ; but you do see and feel its operations on the heart."

This is substantially the theory of the orthodox world : it may do as a hypothesis ; but it will not do as an explanation of this text. The text does not say, "The Spirit comes and goes like the wind," as this theory would have it, but "The wind bloweth where it listeth [pleaseth], and you can not tell where it comes from, or whither it goes : *so is every one that is born of the Spirit.*" Thus it is the individual born of the Spirit who goes and comes, *and you can not tell where he goes to or comes from.* Is it so with churchmen ? Can they go and come without being detected, more than sinners, who never belonged to a church ? They can not. Then we must decide that they have not experienced the birth spoken of in this text.

We do not deny that Christians may have experienced a change : no doubt they have ; but we do deny that they have been born again. Jesus gives another *test* by which to try those professing to be born of the Spirit. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (is a spirit. — *Sawyer*). Are not churchmen flesh and blood in the same sense as sinners who do not belong to the church ? But those born of the Spirit *are no longer flesh.*

"Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." We might ask, Why ? Paul an-

"—*was* —

“Now, this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.” — 1 Cor. xv. 50.

This whole chapter is an argument showing the necessity of a resurrection in order to get into the kingdom of God, as Jesus shows the necessity of a spiritual birth in order to get into the kingdom. The verse above quoted tells why a resurrection is necessary: it is because “*flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom.*” A resurrection, then, delivers us from flesh and blood: the birth of the Spirit does the same. For this and other reasons, we claim that the birth of the Spirit is the resurrection from the dead.

Here, before arguing this point, we must tell what we mean by the term “resurrection.” We do not, by this term, mean, as many others do, the re-collecting of the particles of matter, and converting them once more into flesh, blood, and bone, and making them live again. That can not be done, as we will show. By the term “resurrection,” we mean just what the Greeks meant by the term *anastasis*, — an elevation. Sometimes they used the term *ex-anastasis*. This will be found in Phil. iii. 11, where Paul says, “If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.” The Greek is, *ex-anastasin ton nekron*, which literally signifies, “resurrection out of the dead.” How plain! The body dies, and man is born out of it. This is the resurrection.

Before attempting to prove that the birth of the Spirit and resurrection of the dead are the same, we will show that the body never will be raised to life.

No one contends that there are any scientific argu-

ments for the resuscitation of the flesh. All science is confessedly against it: yet some say, "The Bible says so; and, though we can not comprehend it, we believe God has power to bring it about." Now, we emphatically deny that the Bible, when rightly interpreted, teaches any such doctrine: on the other hand, it is squarely against it.

The text above quoted is pointed and emphatic. If the kingdom of God is the state to be obtained at the resurrection, and "flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom," then, whatever inference may be drawn from Paul's argument in other places, he has here positively committed himself as an unbeliever in the resurrection of the flesh. This whole chapter is worthy of attention: it is all devoted to this resurrection question. Any one who will read this chapter with the idea that Paul is arguing with Epicureans, who did not believe in any future life for man, will discover that he was simply arguing an existence for man beyond this mundane life, and not urging any particular form of resurrection, or definition of the term *anastasis*.

Paul bases the whole argument on certain phenomena, which he, and about five hundred others, had witnessed. Christ, he argued, had been seen after his assassination; therefore he was not dead. Christ lived after he was killed; therefore others would live after the event called death. He urges that there is life for man, as evinced by Christ being seen alive after his death, unless the witnesses who testified to having seen him were false; but he was seen on so many occasions, and by so many, that it could not have been falsehood or deception. He urges, further, that the witnesses were honest, as was

proved by their jeopardizing their lives for their testimony. In 1 Cor. xv. 32, he says, —

“If, after the manner of men, I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die.”

Thus he stakes his life on his hope of a resurrection, and, at the same time, informs his brethren that flesh and blood can not be raised.

When certain ones ask, “How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?” he answers, “Thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain; but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body.” — Verses 37, 38.

Every seed sown has God’s own body. He continues urging that all bodies are not *earthly*; that there are *celestial* as well as *terrestrial* bodies, and, finally, says, —

“It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body.” — Verse 44.

All agree that a better rendering would be, “It is sown an *animal* body, it is raised a *spiritual* body. *There is an animal body, and there is a spiritual body.*” Now we inhabit an *animal* body; when born of the Spirit, we shall inhabit the *spiritual* body. Then will we have dropped “this mortal flesh,” and been born into the higher life, called, in this text, “the kingdom of God.”

Lest some should continue, notwithstanding the positive Scriptures we have quoted, to think that the flesh is to be raised from the dead, we will quote a few paragraphs from the “Book of books,” which are so emphatic, that their meaning can not be questioned.

The wise woman of Tekoah, who went to David to make a plea in behalf of his rebellious son, in the course of her argument, said, —

“For we must needs die, and are as water spilt on the ground, which can not be gathered up again; neither doth God respect any person; yet doth he devise means, that his banished be not expelled from him.” — 2 Sam. xiv. 14.

In a proper place we shall examine this from the philosopher's point of view. Then we shall show that this is literally true. That which goes to the ground *can not be gathered up again*.

Job, when he thought himself on his death-bed, said, —

“As the cloud is consumed, and vanisheth away, so he that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more. He shall return no more to his house, neither shall his place know him any more.” — Job vii. 9, 10.

Stronger language could not be used. How persons can pretend to believe the Bible, and yet argue a resurrection of the flesh, in the face of such positive declarations, we can not conceive. Comments on such paragraphs would be like holding up a rushlight, by which to view the shining sun.

Again: this same poet has said, —

“But man dieth and wasteth away: yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and dryeth up, so man lieth down and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep.” — Job xiv. 10–12.

Until the heavens be no more is the longest time he

could fix. If this text is true, man never can come out of the grave; for the graves where men sleep are all in the earth: but, when the heavens pass away, earth with all its graves passes too. John says, —

“And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away: and there was no more sea.” — Rev. xxi. 1.

Again: he says, “And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them.” — Rev. xx. 11.

Now, we submit, that if heaven, and earth with all its cemeteries filled with dead bodies, is gone so that *it can not be found*, and the dead are not raised out of the earth until after that time, as Job asserts, the chance for the resurrection of dead bodies is so small, that we do not wonder that Watts said, —

“Great God, on what a slender thread
Hang all eternal things!”

Jesus, in his conversation with the Sadducees, proves the doctrine of the resurrection by the fact that God was said to be the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, after they had been dead several hundred years. “But,” said he, “God is not the God of the dead, but of the living:” so all these patriarchs are alive. His words are, —

“Now that the *dead are raised*, even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; for he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him.” — Luke xx. 37, 38.

Now, in all candid honesty, permit us to ask our readers, Do you believe that *the dead are raised*, as Jesus asserted, and was proved to Moses by the angel in the bush? or do you look forward to a time in the distant future when the dead *shall* be raised? We assert, without fear of successful contradiction, that the doctrine of a physical resurrection is *made for and not by the Bible*.

As the positions of our opposers on this subject can not well come under the head of objections, we will proceed to an explanation of such biblical expressions as are supposed to teach the resurrection of the body.

Perhaps nothing in the Bible is relied on to prove the resurrection of the flesh more than the following: "But, if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his *Spirit* that dwelleth in you." — Rom. viii. 11.

This text says not one word about the *remaking* and *revivifying* of *dead* bodies. It only speaks of the *quicken- ing of mortal bodies*. There is a vast difference between a mortal body and a dead body. Our mortal body has been quickened a number of times, and that by a spirit-power; but there never was a dead body raised to life. It would seem that the theory of a resurrection of the animal body must be hard pressed for evidence when it grasps at such "straws:" truly, it reminds us of the proverb concerning "drowning men."

"You speak," said an opponent in debate with us, "against the resurrection of the flesh. Job says, his flesh shall be raised from the dead: I believe in *taking* the Bible as it reads."

“Very well,” said we, “let us take a paragraph literally. Jesus says, —

“‘I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews, therefore, strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead. He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.’” — John vi. 51-58.

Shall we all turn cannibals because Jesus said, “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you”? It is, according to a strictly literal rendering of this passage, our only chance for salvation. If those who believe in a fleshly resurrection could find as positive a declaration that the flesh should come out of the grave, as this, that Christians must eat the flesh and drink the blood of Jesus, with what eagerness would they grasp it! Do, Christians, in heaven’s name, be consistent! Now, we deny that Job or any other Bible writer said that his flesh should come out of the grave: on the other hand, we have shown that he said just the opposite.

Here is the text supposed to teach a physical anastasis.

“Oh that my words were now written! oh that they were printed in a book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever! for I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth. And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another, though my reins be consumed within me.” — Job xix. 23–27:

If this text teaches a material resurrection, Job squarely disputes in it what he said in chapters vii., xiv., and xvi. This we can not accuse Job of doing. This text has no more reference to the future of this life than though there was no future for man. Let it be remembered that Job was greatly afflicted at this time; his friends had forsaken him, he was covered with sore boils from the crown of his head to the sole of his feet (see Job ii. 7); that his wife advised him to curse God and die (Job ii. 9). This disease was caused by an animal-cule preying upon his flesh: so that Job says, “My flesh is clothed with worms and clods of dust; my skin is broken, and become loathsome.” — Job vii. 5.

In this very speech, he states that his friends, wife, servants, and all, had forsaken him: though he entreated his wife for his children's sake, yet she turned against him. His bone cleaved to his skin, and he escaped with the skin of his teeth. He then breaks out in the language just quoted, expressing his confidence that he will recover, though worms were consuming his flesh. Job did recover, and became a hearty old man.

“Ah, but Job said, ‘In my flesh shall I see God.’ Did he see God?” We answer most emphatically, “He did.” The ancients saw God in bodily health and its attendant blessings. God was anciently in every gentle breeze, in the warm sunshine, the genial shower; in fact, in every pleasant sensation. When God withdrew his face, then the storm, the blight, the mildew, and pestilence raged; then it was that disease preyed upon its victims. By and by the face of God was again seen; and peace, happiness, and prosperity was the result.

Reader, this is not imagination: we are not left to guess on this point. After Job’s recovery, God answers him in such a way, that Job is convinced that he is holding converse with the Infinite. Then Job says, —

“I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear but now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes.” — Job xlii. 5, 6.

Thus every part of the text was fulfilled without a resurrection.

Now, having shown that the doctrine of a physical resurrection is not a Bible doctrine, we propose to take it from modern theologians, by showing that it is an impossibility, and therefore could not be true, even if it were taught in the Bible.

It is now an almost universally conceded fact that the entire matter of the human frame changes as often as once in seven years. Not long since, however, it was our fortune to hold a public discussion with a minister who pretended to some knowledge of science, who denied this fact, and, to prove himself correct in his denial, triumphantly stripped up his sleeve to show a scar on his arm that he had carried nearly forty years.

' There,' said this oracle of antiquated theology, " why do / not that scar go when matter was passing off?" He might as well have asked why his eye or ear did not pass off with other matter. This reminds us that we once made the assertion that there is no *inertia*: every particle of steel in the razor-blade revolves around its fellow particle with all the precision that planets move in their courses. " Why," said an astonished opponent, " that is self-evidently false. I put my razor away, and always find it where I left it, which could not be the case if it were moving all the time." The poor man could not see the difference between particles revolving around each other, and razors moving off in bulk. So with this minister and his scar: the truth is, the scar had passed off several times within the period named, but each particle had retained its place until crowded out by another just like it; so that the size and shape of the scar was not changed in the operation more than a pyramid of apples would change by a purchaser buying an apple from the pyramid, and the grocer dropping another in its place.

For the benefit of Adventists, and all others who can not see any thing of man but flesh and blood, we will review this position at length.

Imagine the following dialogue between an elder of the materialistic school, who can see no future for man other than by a physical resurrection, and a philosopher, whose researches prevent his acceptance of that theory.

ELDER. — " Man is to be raised out of the ground, ' and the sea shall give up the dead which are in it.' "

PHILOSOPHER. — " How can that be, since matter is continually changing, and man does not, any one year of

his life, possess the same body he had any previous year? Beside, is not the spirit or mind the real man? what need of a remolding and bringing to life of the flesh?"

ELD. — "Ah, friend! you err in two points. First, let me inform you that mind is not an entity, as you suppose, it is only a function of the brain. Brain grinds out thought. Mind is the result of the organization, and proper combination with the atmosphere, of the machinery called man, as the keeping of time is the result of the organization and setting in motion of the machine called the watch. Second, that matter does not change as you suppose, I will prove by a scar that I have carried more than forty years."

PHIL. — "As to your first position, it is either true or false. If true, your second argument is not needed. If false, your second argument will only fall of its own weight. If the identity of man is not preserved, there can be no resurrection; possibly there could be a new creation. God could make a man out of every stone in the 'Granite State;' but he can not make Abraham or Moses out of these stones, from the fact that identity consists, in part at least, of the memory of past events; and those men made of stones could not recognize themselves as being the Abraham and Moses of old. Neither could the particles of matter which constituted the physical of Abraham and Moses at any one time be the same Abraham and Moses, for the reason that the *mind* of these men was the result of their organization, and, being dependent on the organism, could not exist after the physical man was disorganized."

ELD. — "Let me interrupt you: you are partly correct, and partly incorrect. The mind ceases to exist

when the brain, its fountain, ceases to act; but when the brain is *re-organized*, of course the mind, which is a result, begins to act as before."

PHIL. — "Not so fast. The old mind was the result of the old organism, and, per consequence, ceased to exist when the old brain ceased its action. The *new mind* is the result not of the old *but of the new organism*; is ground out by the new brain, and, being the effect or function of the *new brain*, — made, for aught I care, of the old material, — can not antedate its existence. *Memory*, being a function of the mind, can not go back of the mind out of which it proceeds; but that mind was the result of the new organism: hence, the man before death can not possibly be connected with the man after the resurrection."

ELD. — "There are difficulties; but God has power, and 'these dry bones shall live.' The identity is not preserved in the mind, as that ceases to exist, but in the particles of matter of which the body is composed."

PHIL. — "Then you have lost your identity even while you live, and at this moment are losing part of it; for you are trimming your finger-nails. These nails are a part of the essential elder with whom I am talking, and, if the particles are all to be raised, must come up in the general resurrection, and be joined to your fingers, lest you should lose your identity. Your hair, which was once short enough, got too long, and you had it trimmed last week. Did you know the hair taken off your head once went into your stomach as food, then went frolicking and frisking through your veins, and from that time forward was a part of your essential identity, and as such claims a part in the resurrection-

body? Again: in your tedious spell of typhoid fever last winter, you lost twenty-five pounds of flesh. Where did that flesh go? It, too, claims a part in the resurrection-body. Notwithstanding your friends supposed you would die, you recovered; that is, all except the twenty-five pounds of you which died and left you. As soon as you became convalescent, your appetite began to return, you ate more heartily than before, and, as a result, found yourself increasing in weight at the rate of a pound a day, until you weighed more than before your sickness. Where did this second twenty-five pounds of flesh come from? Where was it while you were wearing the flesh you lost during your sickness? Let me tell you. Part of it was in the apple-orchard, in the shape of unripe fruit. Some of it was in the garden and potato patch; some swimming in the ocean, in the shape of codfish and mackerel; some of it growing in the coffee and tea fields; other portions were in the air, the water, &c. Now, your present flesh is as much a part of you as that you lost, and *vice versa*. Which will you have raised from the dead, — the first, or the second? One has died, the other will die. Will you have both raised? Then, why not have all the matter that ever formed a part of your body brought back to it? Abraham lived a hundred and seventy-five years: that was long enough to wear out *twenty-five* bodies. Which one of these bodies shall be brought up from the grave? Or shall all of them come up? If so, there will be ‘giants in those days.’ *Abraham will have a beard forty feet long, and can not weigh less than two tons.*”

ELD. — “You ask questions faster than I can answer

them. Some questions can not be answered. We receive certain statements because God made them, not because we can answer every question concerning them. You ask, Which one of Abraham's bodies will come to life? We have an example furnished us in the resurrection of our Saviour. The same body that died was the one raised: so it will be in the case of Abraham."

PHIL.—“But Abraham's twenty-five bodies each died, one no more than another. Not a particle of matter passed from either body till the body had used up all the life it could appropriate, and its very death sent it from the body to feed the life of vegetation; and, as it was resurrected in vegetation, it was eaten by animals and men, and, in turn, took its place in other bodies, *ad infinitum*. If you present the case of Jesus as an *example* to prove that the last body that dies, or the one that dies all at once, is the one to be raised, you are unfortunate: for the case selected proves the contrary. If Jesus' body that was killed came up from the grave, that, instead of proving that others will have a similar experience, proves directly the contrary. Jesus' body was made of what he ate, drank, and breathed; but the corn that he and his disciples plucked and ate on the sabbath day, as well as all other food that ever went into his stomach, had been fattened on the dead: it drew its life from the decomposition of animal and vegetable bodies. Thus all of Jesus' body was made by the death of other bodies; but his body, according to your theory, was brought up out of the tomb, revived, and taken to heaven.

“Now think of the general resurrection, when millions upon millions of bodies shall be called from their beds

of dust. Among them are the martyrs, whose bodies were burned to ashes, and the ashes scattered to the four winds by their persecutors, to prevent their resurrection: thus their ashes have fattened the soil of earth, as our southern battle-fields were fattened by the flesh, blood, and bones of poor soldiers. This soil has produced vegetation, which has been eaten by the 'cattle upon a thousand hills.' The cattle, made fat upon that which was once flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone, have, in their turn, been slain and eaten up to supply other bodies with aliment. The fluids of these bodies whose solids have thus been scattered have a thousand times arisen in the atmosphere, and a thousand times been condensed, and fallen in 'gentle dew and summer showers,' only to be evaporated to again fall to water the earth, wash the shores of the Atlantic, or be drunk by man and beast: thus these particles of matter, after having existed in ten thousand forms, and, for aught we can know to the contrary, in a thousand bodies, at the moment of death must be raised from the dead, when, to say the least, Jesus had taken part of them and gone to heaven!"

ELD. — "I must go. Good-day."

PHIL. — "Don't go yet; I find some figures here made to my hand, which I wish you to hear me read: —

"DUST RETURNING TO DUST. — It is asserted by scientific writers that the number of persons who have existed on our globe since the beginning of time amounts to 36,627,843,273,075,256. These figures, when divided by 3,095,000 (the number of square leagues on the globe), give 11,320,689,732 square miles of land; which, being divided as before, give 1,314,622,076 per-

sons to each square mile. If we reduce these miles to square rods, the number will be 1,853,174,600,000 ; which, divided in like manner, will give 1,283 inhabitants to each square rod, and these, being reduced to feet, will give about five persons to each square foot of *terra firma*. It will thus be perceived that our earth is a vast cemetery. On each square rod of it, 1,283 human beings lie buried ; each rod being scarcely sufficient for ten graves, with each grave containing 123 persons. The whole surface of the earth, therefore, has been dug over 128 times to bury its dead.' From this extract, it will be seen that there is not dust enough now, if all the soil were converted to dust, to remake all the bodies that have existed on earth."

ELD. — "These difficulties are not for me to settle : I only receive the Bible. If you hope to find a theological system with no difficulties in its way, all I have to say is, you are having a bootless search. Good-day."

Yes : the elder thinks *he* has the Bible ; and, like thousands of others who never had a liberal thought, it is all he asks. Those who have read this book thus far, can, perhaps, decide whether it is the Bible, or merely his *ipse dixit*, that teaches his peculiar views of the resurrection.

Now, having shown from the Bible and science, that the *anastasis* must be a *spiritual*, and not a physical event, we will pass to our main proposition, viz., that the spiritual birth is the resurrection.

The resurrection is several times said to be a birth. Paul says of Jesus Christ, —

"And he is the head of the body, the church ; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in all

things he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell." — Col. i. 18, 19.

In Rev. i. 5, John says, —

“ And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first-begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood.”

The word rendered *first-begotten* and *first-born* are the same; thus we have the Bible twice asserting that Jesus was born from death. “ But,” says the objector, “ Jesus was the *first-born* from the dead: how can that be, if every one who had died before him had experienced this resurrection?” We answer, “ There are two senses in which the word ‘ first ’ is used; sometimes it signifies the first in numerical order, and sometimes first in rank or importance, as, for instance, ‘ The lieutenant-general is the first military officer in the United States.’ ‘ The office of President is the first office in the power of the American people to bestow.’ The word rendered *first-born* and *first-begotten* in these two instances is the Greek word *prototokos*, which Greenfield defines to be, ‘ chief,’ ‘ principal,’ ‘ beloved,’ &c.”

The idea of the text is not that Jesus was the first one born from the dead, but that he is chief among those who have experienced this birth. Paul gives as a reason why he was the first-born, “ that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell.” John uses the term to signify that he is “ prince of the kings of the earth.” As Jesus stood in the front ranks of reformers in this life, as he led their van, so, on the other

side, in the kingdom to which he is now born, he occupies the front position. In this sense, and this alone, he is *first* among those born from the dead.

Jesus gives two tests by which to try those born of the Spirit.

1st, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."

2d, "They who are born of the Spirit, like the wind go and come, and you can not tell where they go, or whence they come."

Now, let us apply these rules to Jesus after his resurrection. The various appearances of Jesus are enough to convince the candid reader that he did not bring his flesh up from the grave. Had his flesh been made alive, he could have been seen by the whole Jewish nation; and thus they could have been convinced of life and immortality. But he was not seen by all. Peter says, —

"Him God raised up the third day, and showed him openly; *not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God*, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead." — Acts x. 40, 41.

How could Jesus have escaped being seen by the multitude, had he been flesh and blood, especially if he was openly among them? "Chosen witnesses" alone, who evidently were clairvoyant, had the privilege of seeing him. Mark says, —

"After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country." — Mark xvi. 12.

Physical bodies do not change their form in such a way as this text represents; but clairvoyants of every

age of the world testify that spirits do assume different garbs and forms to suit the occasion.

Permit us now to devote a few words to Jesus' second test. Does he, after his birth from death, come and go in such a manner that it can not be told whence he comes and whither he goes? He does. Luke says, —

“And, behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs. And they talked together of all these things which had happened. And it came to pass, that, while they communed together and reasoned, Jesus himself drew near, and went with them. But their eyes were holden that they should not know him. And he said unto them, What manner of communications are these that ye have one to another, as ye walk, and are sad?” — Luke xxiv. 13–17.

Where did Jesus come from? The first his disciples knew, he was journeying with them, talking with them, “reasoning out of the law of Moses and the prophets.” “But their eyes were holden that they should not know him.” The “holding” of their eyes consisted in his appearing in a form that they could not recognize, as stated in Mark xvi. 12.

Those born of the Spirit are not only to come in this mysterious manner, but they are to go quite as unaccountably. Luke, in this same narrative, proceeds: —

“And they drew nigh unto the village whither they went; and he made as though he would have gone further. But they constrained him, saying, Abide with us for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent. And he went in to tarry with them. And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them, he took bread, and blessed

it, and brake, and gave to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight." — Mark xvi. 28–32.

Here Jesus has *vanished* or *faded* out of their sight, as spirits vanish from the sight of media every day. Now he has gone, and they could not tell whither he went. Has he in this proved himself born of the Spirit? But Luke proceeds: —

“ And they said one to another, Did not our heart burn within us while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the Scriptures? And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon. And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known of them in breaking of bread. And, as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself. Handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have. And, when he had thus spoken, he showed them his hands and his feet. And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of a honeycomb. And he took it, and did eat before them.” — Mark xvi. 32–43.

One point in this, that of fastening the doors, we will leave John to bring to light. It is enough for us at

present to know, that, when they first saw Jesus, they only saw dim, shadowy outlines; for it is not until Jesus calls attention to his hands and feet, that they saw them.

“Ah,” said Elder G——, “you have the wrong text here; for he *was not a spirit*, as his disciples supposed, and as you suppose; *but he had flesh and bones*: so the text is positive proof of the physical resurrection.”

Not so fast. If the rendering of the text is correct, the disciples supposed they had seen a spirit, which is positive proof that they believed not only in the existence of spirits, but that they could return, and make themselves manifest. So far, we will set the text down as a positive proof of Spiritualism.

Now for a few words of criticism. If the reader will turn to the margin of Greenfield's Greek Testament, or to Griesbach's Greek Testament, he will find the word rendered “spirit,” in this instance, is not the word *pneuma*, which is rendered “spirit” more than a hundred times in the New Testament, but *phantasma*, which is defined to be a phantom; that is, an appearance, something not real, some such spirit as the drunkard sees when he has the delirium tremens. With this interpretation, which no scholar will dispute, Jesus does not deny being a spirit: he only denies being a *phantom*, “the stuff that dreams are made of.” “But he claims to have flesh and bones, so he must have had a physical body.” No, dear reader: you have not read that correctly. He does not claim to have flesh and bones, but claims to *appear* to have them. The text does not say, “A spirit has not flesh and bones as I have,” but “as *ye see me have*.” The word rendered “see” in this in-

stance is *theosia*, a word which signifies an appearance, and not a reality. The idea of the text is, that the flesh and bones were not a *reality*, but *an appearance* for the occasion. Do you ask how this can be? We frankly acknowledge we can not tell: we only know from this text and from experience, that it is so.

It has been our good fortune to travel some with Dr. Henry Slade, an individual whom we can recommend anywhere as being a medium through whom satisfactory evidence of immortality can be given to any honest inquirer. Early in the month of October, 1864, we staid all night with the doctor at the Waverley House in Rochester, N.Y. The moon was shining brilliantly; and the windows and blinds, in consequence of the excessively warm evening, were opened. Not long after we had been in bed, the manifestations, as usual, commenced. Soon we saw our boots walking about the room with no visible feet or legs in them. We at once addressed the power thus propelling things about the room, and said, —

“I have seen your manifestations often. I know you exist, I know you have power; but why do you never let me see you? I want to see the power by which these wonderful things are done.”

The intelligent power to whom we addressed this language said, “I will try. If conditions are such that I can gather a body from the elements, I will let you see me.” We waited long and patiently for the promised manifestation. By and by, however, we heard a strange sound, and looked in the direction whence it proceeded, and saw a hand and arm coming toward us. We raised up in bed, reached out our hand and

took hold of the hand, grasped it with a firm grip, determined to hold on, and, if possible, keep it as a trophy. It was to all appearance flesh and bone; at least we would have sworn it to be just such a hand as our own, only very much darker, and at least one-third longer. Soon we discovered that the arm began to grow shorter. As we saw it vanishing, as Jesus did from his disciples, we grasped the fingers more firmly; but, notwithstanding our determination, the arm, then the hand, then the fingers, dissolved, leaving us to grasp the air.

In a moment, the Indian was laughing at us, and said, "You didn't hold the hand, did you?"

"No," said we; "but we would like to know how you did that." He responded, "I tried to gather a body from the elements; but conditions were not favorable: I could only gather a hand and arm." Now, when this phenomenon is explained, we can explain Jesus' producing hands and feet that could be seen and felt.

We must record one more sentence from Luke concerning Jesus: "And he led them out as far as to Bethany; and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven." — Luke xxiv. 50, 51.

Here Jesus was parted from the disciples in a way that physical bodies are not separated from each other. He was born of the Spirit. John says, "Then the same day, at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus, and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you; and when he had so said, he showed unto them his hands

and his side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord" (John xx. 19, 20). Again: "And after eight days, again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you."—Verse 26.

Here the doors were shut against the Jews, fastened to keep them out; but Jesus appeared in the midst of a room fastened to keep intruders out. How does he get there? It is all told in one sentence, He was born of the Spirit; like the wind he could go and come unperceived by mortal vision.

With one more appearance of the man of Nazareth, we will take our leave of this department of this subject.

"And, as he journeyed, he came near Damascus; and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven. And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he, trembling and astonished, said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do. And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man. And Saul arose from the earth; and, when his eyes were opened, he saw no man: but they led him by the hand, and brought him into Damascus."—Acts ix. 3-8.

Here was a spirit-light, here were spirit-voices, and Jesus was seen by Paul, but not by those who were

with him. Paul was one of the "chosen witnesses" to whom "he showed himself alive after his passion." This event occurred several years after the assassination of Jesus. Ananias, in referring to these phenomena, says, —

"Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost." — Acts ix. 17.

The testimony is positive : what more can be required ? Jesus was born of the Spirit. After his appearance on so many occasions, under so many circumstances, and presenting again and again such varied and unmistakable evidence of a life after death, who can but agree with Paul when he says, —

"But is now made manifest by the appearance of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." — 2 Tim. i. 10.

If his numerous appearances have not been enough to demonstrate immortality to those who saw him, they are beyond the reach of evidence.

If the foregoing is true, and its truth can not be questioned by the believer in the Bible, each one at death is born into another world, — born with the education, ability, and experience obtained in this. Who has not thought, as he has grown old, and worn himself out in learning the lessons of life, "If I could only be placed back to the days of my childhood, with the experience I have gained in this world, what a man I would be by the time I arrived at my present age a second time!" Take, for example, such statesmen as Daniel Webster

and Henry Clay, men who spent a lifetime in picking up an education : must such enter the spirit-world as ignorant as an infant of days? Alexander Campbell spent a lifetime in gathering pebbles from the ocean of knowledge, until, finally, he gained the best knowledge of the Bible, its history, the country where it originated, the people among whom it originated, and all connected with it, of any person we ever met who viewed it from his standpoint. When he died, did that knowledge die? Did he live more than eighty years to pick up a few of the lessons of life, and then die and forget all? No. He lived long enough to learn well some things pertaining to man, and then was born again, — born into a better, higher life, in a country where he could use the knowledge he pursued so ardently in this world.

Not only is the resurrection a birth, but all are born into the other life with the peculiarities which attached to them in this. Paul teaches, that as there are different kinds of flesh, as there is one glory of the sun, and another of the moon, as star differeth from star in glory, so is the resurrection of the dead. Daniel says, —

“And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever.” — Dan. xii. 3.

In the world beyond, no one shines with a borrowed light. Each one in the hereafter reflects what his life here makes him there. This is exhibited in no one place as prominently as in spirit manifestations. Take, for example, those in the Bible. Elijah the prophet, while on earth, was always cursing; cursed Ahab, cursed Jeze-

bel, cursed over four hundred of his fellow prophets. He was as perfect a misanthrope as ever lived: he lived the life of a hermit, preferring the society of wild beasts and ravens to men and women. By and by he passed to the spirit-world, and it seemed to be his mission to curse after he got there. The written communication which he gave to King Jehoram seemed to be as full of denunciation as any thing he could have written with his own hand or uttered through his own organism while upon earth. When he influenced John the Baptist, he made him manifest all of his idiosyncrasies, even to that of making his home in the wilderness, and denouncing everybody to whom he preached; insomuch that the Bible hardly needs to state that "he shall go out in the spirit and power of Elias."

We have witnessed the same in modern manifestations. Many have made merry because spirits have influenced modern media, and made them beg for tobacco and whisky; but it is a solemn truth, and one against which we should not close our eyes, that those who are slaves to tobacco and whisky here, must, hereafter, be tormented in the flame of that appetite.

O reader! could you realize this as we see it and know it, you would strive ardently to overcome the baser parts of your nature now. Do, we beseech you, think of the question, Must I, when I return from the "land of the so-called dead," to influence media, make them call for tobacco and whisky? Must I have that longing follow me through many years of spirit-life? Must I be set back years and years in the hereafter by ungoverned appetites and passions? Must I enter the

other world a slave to sin, and spend years of eternity in fighting that I never resisted in this life?

Angels help you to realize these things, and assert your manhood now, so that, when the time comes for you to be born into the higher life, you may enter mansions prepared by your daily devotion to duty here.

CHAPTER VI.

ARE WE INFIDELS?

Rapid Growth of *Is*piritualism—The “Mad-Dog” Cry—Charge Ignored—Proceeds from Infidel Hearts—Truths and Errors in the Bible—Dialogue; Minister wants a Bible—All believe Parts, and no one believes All, of the Bible—Illustrative Cases—How shall we decide who the Believers are—The true Test—Works—The Commission—End of the World not yet—Jewish and Christian Age—Preaching, Baptism, and Signs go together—Is Christ in the Church—Signs follow; did Jesus tell the Truth—The Day of Pentecost—Holy Ghost, Definition of—Opinion of Opposers—Peter’s Explanation—“What shall we do”—This Power for all—Abrahamic Promise—Holy Ghost for all—Gifts not to cease—Churches acknowledge some of the Gifts—Covet the Best Gifts—When will the Gifts cease—Advice of James—Elijah’s Prayer and the Rain; two Positions—Mind will control Matter—All Things under Man—A Lightning-Tamer—Philosophy of Rain—Rain on Battle-Fields, &c.—Yankee Climate-Regulators—Sick Lady—A Dialogue—God not changed by Prayer—Effect of Prayer—Sickness the Result of Sin—Prayer and its Equivalent—Philosophy of Disease and Cure—Impressions Mental and Physical—Philosophy of vomiting—Disease created and removed by Impressions on the Mind—Death from Excitement—Whence the Power of Volition—Spirit-Writing—Cause of Paralysis—Positive and Negative Disease—Philosophy of Controlling a Patient—Electric Currents pass from the Nerves of one to another—The Spirit-World supplies the Operator—Author’s Experience in healing—Cause of Failures—Jesus sometimes failed—His Disciples do—Author has been healed—Blind see, Deaf hear, &c.—Statement of Abraham Clarke—Letter to “The New-York Dispatch”—Peter Manning’s Case—Another Dialogue—The Devil did it—Devil not so good, after all—Another Evidence—Jesus’ Logic—Was his Mission divine—Coming of Christ—Symbolic Clouds and Horses—Death has lost its Sting—Challenge—World’s Convention.

SPIRITUALISM has stood before the world and claimed a hearing at its bar for twenty-one years. It has, in that space of time, succeeded in getting such a hearing as no other religion has ever obtained. We

do not mean that no other religion ever gained such a hearing in twenty-one years as Spiritualism ; but we do mean, that, though it is only twenty-one years since the attention of the American people has been called to Spiritualism as a religious system, it now has such a hold of the popular heart as has not been obtained by any other religious system. Indeed, it is the spiritual element contained in the churches and other organizations, that has held them together thus far.

A play is not worthy of going before the public, unless Spiritualism forms an important part of its attractions. A novel must embody Spiritualism in some form, or its publishers will never get their pay for printer's ink and paper. A poem is hardly read, unless, in some manner, it gives utterance to the all-absorbing sentiment of Spiritualism.

Spiritualism has not only made a few millions of converts, but it is working its way into the popular heart as none of the *creedal* systems of the day can. Once the churches said, "Let it alone! it will die of itself, and scarcely a grease-spot of it will remain." But that grease-spot has spread far and wide through the texture of human life. The "let alone doctrine," as it was called, would not work ; and so the churches have decided to imitate the example of the Quaker, who, having a spite against a dog, said, "It is wrong for me to *kill* thee, but I will give thee a *bad name*, and let thee go ;" and forthwith he cried out, "*Mad dog!*" so effectually, that *others* pursued the animal and dispatched him.

The mad-dog cry now raised after Spiritualism is "Infidelity." It is now conceded on all hands that Spiritualism can not be killed. Like "Banquo's ghost,"

it obstinately refuses to "down," even though bid to do so by churches and ministers. There is no alternative left but to fall in with it, or give reasons for rejecting it. As no reasons can be given that will satisfy the reasoner, the only course left for them is to deal in *ad captandum vulgus*: so they have raised the cry of "Infidelity!"

Spiritualists and Spiritualism have pursued "the even tenor of their ways," paying but little attention to the charges brought against it; knowing that they, for the most part, originate in an incapacity to comprehend its sublime truths.

Now we propose, in this chapter, to review the infidelity charge; and may we commence by saying it is a *slandorous libel*, made, often, for no other purpose than to disguise the infidelity of the heart whence it proceeds? It does happen that persons sometimes think they are looking at others, when they are only looking into a mirror, and seeing themselves reflected. That this is the case with those who accuse Spiritualism of being infidelity, we intend now to prove.

In order to follow out this course, we must have a rule by which the matter may be decided. Such a rule we believe we have found. There is not one person in the world who believes *all* that is contained in the Bible. If we were to take a lighted candle, and search through modern Christianity, we should not find one who believes it *all*. The infidel says, "I do not believe the *errors* in the Bible." — "Neither do *I*," says the Christian. Upon that ground, they meet in common. We read, and all Christians and infidels believe *as* we read, "The grass withereth, the flower thereof faileth;" but, when we see it recorded that Ahaziah was

two years older than his *father*, the fact is denied by every one as a natural impossibility. Christians and infidels agree, that a man *can not* be older than his father. Therefore, one of the texts all allow to be true, and the other all reject as false.

The above is sufficient to illustrate that no one believes *all* the Bible. Every one believes *some* of it. How, then, shall we tell who the true believers are?

This case can be illustrated by an incident in our own history. Once upon a time, we engaged in conversation with a minister, who took occasion to admire a copy of the Bible then in our hand, when the following dialogue ensued:—

MINISTER.—“That is a very fine Bible you have,—just such as I have always wanted; but I never could get hold of one. How much will you take for it?”

HULL.—“The book is not for sale. I bought it in Canada for my own use, and I do not know that I could get another without going there for it; and that would be hard to do in these war times.”

MIN.—“I will pay you twice what your Bible cost you for it: that will pay you for using a poorer one, or waiting until you can get another like this.”

H.—“The truth is, I can not spare this book. I have kept it until it is filled with my own magnetism; and it would be too much like parting with a part of myself.”

MIN.—“Now, see here. You don't believe the Bible: why can't you let me have this one?”

H.—“Would you take away the last Bible I have, because I do not believe it? Is there any evidence of the truth of the Bible? If so, where should it be found

but in the Bible itself? Surely not in Lardner, Horn, Watson, Paley, or McIlvaine. Where are the evidences of geology but in the earth? To what book but to the starry heavens do you go for your evidences of astronomy? Now, reverse the matter: let me be the believer, and you the unbeliever, and I would give you the book, asking no other reward, only that you would investigate its pages, and try to ascertain their truth. But, my brother, it is easy for one party to accuse another of infidelity. Now, I believe part of the Bible, and part of it I do not believe. Part you believe, and part you do not believe. Parts of it I believe, that you do not; parts of it you believe, that I do not; and parts of it we both believe, and parts of it we both reject."

MIN. — "I do not wish to get into a discussion with you, sir: when you reply to a book which you yourself have written on that subject, it will be time for me to debate with you."

H. — "But the book you ask me to answer admits there are errors in the Bible, and that is all I now claim. There is a text in this Bible which says, —

"For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one' (1 John v. 7). Do you believe that text?"

MIN. — "No: that is an error. Dr. Clark says it is not in the oldest manuscripts. It was perhaps inserted by St. Augustine, merely as a glossary, but was copied by an ignorant transcriber into the text."

H. — "I am not now inquiring how errors got into that book. You acknowledge this text to be an error, and that is all I claim: so your Christianity and my infidelity are exactly alike on that text. There is another text

that says, Samuel, after he had been dead some months, said to Saul, 'Why hast thou disquieted me to bring me up?' Do you believe Samuel did visit Saul, and use such words?"

MIN. — "No, I — I — I think — well, the Devil personated Samuel. He is a great deceiver; beside, the Bible plainly says, 'The dead know not any thing.' Samuel, being dead, could not have been there."

H. — "Very well. Your *belief* says the text is false; my *unbelief* says it is true."

MIN. — "I prefer not to talk with you on these subjects. You know that a positive, 'Thus saith the Bible,' on any subject, in the absence of any other testimony, is not enough to convince you of the truth of a position. It would convince me: so that settles the question."

H. — "Perhaps it does. There is a positive declaration in 2 Kings viii. 26, which says, —

"Two and twenty years old was Ahaziah when he began to reign; and he reigned one year in Jerusalem. And his mother's name was Athaliah, the daughter of Omri, King of Israel.' Do you believe that?"

MIN. — "Let me see that text. Yes: the Bible says so, and I believe it. Do you believe it?"

H. — "I do not know whether I believe it or not."

MIN. — "There, that fixes the whole question. You acknowledge the Bible reads just as you have quoted; but, because you have no corroborative evidence, you do not know as you believe it. I know it is true, because the Bible says so."

H. — "Here is another text I will ask you if you believe. It says, —

"Forty and two years old was Ahaziah when he began

to reign, and he reigned one year in Jerusalem. His mother's name also was Athaliah, the daughter of Omri' (2 Chron. xxii. 2). Do you believe that?"

MIN. — "Wha — wha — what does that text say? Let me see it."

H. — "It says he was *forty-two* years old at the time the other text sets him down at *twenty-two*. He could not have been forty-two and twenty-two at the same time; and you have committed yourself to the former text: in doing so, you committed yourself *against* the latter; so your amount of fidelity over mine in one instance is made up by your amount of *infidelity* over mine in the other. The statement concerning Jehoram, the father of Ahaziah, is, —

" 'Thirty and two years old was he when he began to reign; and he reigned in Jerusalem eight years, and departed without being desired.' — 2 Chron. xxi. 20.

"Now, if Jehoram reigned eight years, and was thirty-two at his ascending the throne, he was only *forty* years old at his death; and his youngest son, Ahaziah, was forty-two: that makes the youngest son only two years older than his father. There are a great many sons in 'Young America' more than that much older than their parents."

This minister was "one of a thousand." It will always be found that the man who believes so much of the Bible, and finds nothing but infidelity in the opinions of others, is one who either has no comprehension of the opinions of others, or knows but little of what the Bible contains. Now, since no one believes *all* of the Bible, and every one believes *some* of it, how will it be settled as to who the believers are? Shall we tell them

by the length of their prayers, or by the length of their faces? Will their having attached their name to a religious creed be sufficient to prove them believers, or must we decide by the sacredness they attach to certain days of the week, or the rigor with which they enforce certain religious ceremonies? None of these rules will do. There are thousands of baptized infidels to-day.

Jesus has laid down a rule by which to test this matter. He 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.”—John xiv. 12.

This language can not easily be misinterpreted. Jesus set out to tell us who believers are. He does not test them by their *professions*, by *forms* or *ceremonies*, but by their *works*. Christians, are you willing to be tested thus? “*He that believeth shall do the works that I do;*” yea, even *greater works*. Did Jesus, or did he not, tell the truth? Do you, or do you not, believe? Will you do yourselves the favor to heed Paul’s admonition? —

“Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves.” — 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

James says, —

“Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works; show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works.” — James ii. 18.

These Scriptures can not be misunderstood. You are not only admonished to “prove yourselves,” but told how, — show your faith by your works. What works? “The works that I do, and even greater, shall he do.”

We ask again, Do you believe? Oh, would that we had the power to ring the question in every ear!

After Jesus' *anastasis*, he said to his disciples, —

“Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.” — Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

Here Christ promised to be with his disciples. This means something. He is not going to be with them and not make himself manifest. The only way the Church can know that Christ is with them is by certain manifestations. Mark records the fulfillment of this promise in his day as follows: —

“And they went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following.” — Mark xvi. 20.

When Paul and Barnabas preached at Iconium, Luke says, —

“Long time, therefore, abode they, speaking boldly in the Lord, which gave testimony unto the word of his grace, and granted signs and wonders to be done by their hands.” — Acts xiv. 3.

The text does not promise to be with the disciples merely to the end of their generation, but “*always, even to the end of the world.*” Though many are looking for the end of the world very soon, and almost innumerable times have been set for old Father Time to cease his rounds, he, not daunted in the least by the notices that he will cease to bring the seasons around, trudges along as usual. Then Christ is to work with his disciples yet,

or the text is not true. Does he do it? Is there a church to-day that has the signs by which to prove that Christ is with it? Said a minister to us, "If the word 'world' signified all time, as you seem to think, your remarks would be just; but the Greek word *aion*, rendered 'world' in this instance, only signifies age or dispensation. This language was used in the Jewish, and not in the Christian age: therefore it only means that Christ will be with his disciples to the end of the Jewish dispensation." "When did the Jewish age end, and the Christian age commence?" we asked. "On the day of Pentecost," was his reply. Very well, the preaching did not commence until the day of Pentecost. They were not to set out immediately on their mission. Luke says, that Jesus, after giving their commission to preach, said, —

"And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high." — Luke xxiv. 49.

This enduement came on the day of Pentecost, the very time where the beginning of the Christian dispensation is located. Jesus is to work with his disciples to the end of the dispensation where the preaching is to be done. Is the command to preach binding yet? and are persons now baptized in obedience to this text? Then, if Jesus is not with the Church to-day, it is either because he did not tell the truth, or its members are infidels.

A representative of modern infidelity, falsely called theology, informed us that Christ was with the Church until it was established: from that time forward, he had not been with it. This was admitting the whole ground: their Church was composed of Christless infidels!

Mark represents Jesus as saying, —

“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.” — Mark xvi. 17, 18.

Here again the language is positive and emphatic. “These signs *shall* follow them that believe.” There is no proviso in the case. Do the signs follow those who accuse Spiritualists of infidelity? If not, are they not, when they make such charges, speaking of the abundance of their own infidel hearts?

The disciples were requested to tarry at Jerusalem until they were endued with power from on high. They did so. On the fortieth day after they first saw Jesus after his martyrdom, they saw him for the last time. They then formed what Spiritualists call a *circle* in an upper room in the city; and there they sat for ten days, waiting for this power. At the end of that time, they began to have manifestations, such as are of common occurrence among modern Spiritualists. The writer of the Book of Acts describes it thus: —

“And, when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. **And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout**

men, out of every nation under heaven. Now when this was noised abroad, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language. And they were all amazed, and marveled, saying one to another, Behold, are not all these which speak Galileans? And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?" — Acts ii. 1-8.

Here is a foreign power lighting upon the disciples in cloven, or a diversity of tongues, literally *split* tongues; that is, tongues that speak a number of languages. These illiterate Galilean fishermen fluently speak seventeen different languages, not one of which they understand. The power thus using these mediums is called "the Holy Ghost;" that is, *pneumatos hagion*. One of the definitions which Greenfield gives the word *pneumatos* is "human souls;" and we know of no better definition of the word *hagion* than "good." A "spirit power lights upon them, that the Bible designates as the good spirit." Whose spirit it was we do not know. Of two things we are sure: first, it fulfills the Christ prediction, "I am with you;" second, it was just such a power as works on modern media.

These manifestations of course astonish the people, who were worshipping dead forms and ceremonies, instead of having any living evidence of their religion.

"And they were all amazed, and were in doubt, saying one to another, What meaneth this? Others, mocking, said, These men are full of new wine." — Acts ii. 12, 13.

This last charge brings Peter to his feet. Here the gospel commences: —

“Ye men of Judæa, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be this known unto you, and hearken to my words; for these are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day. But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy.”—Acts ii. 14–18.

This is a complete refutation of those Jewish rabbis. Peter thoroughly exposes their theory of the men being under the influence of wine. It was too early an hour. The wine they drank then was not such drink as men indulge in now-a-days. Men could drink all day, and by nightfall they would begin to be intoxicated: hence the proverb, “They that are drunken, are drunken in the night.” Beside, wine does not teach men seventeen different languages they never heard. After refuting the position of these exposers of ancient spirit-manifestations, Peter proceeds to state his own, which is, that this is a fulfillment of a certain prediction. His reasonings so perfectly commend themselves to the people, that they are convinced, and at once cry out, “What shall we do?” Do for what? we ask. “To be saved,” nearly the whole world responds. Not a bit of it. They, in this question, had no more idea of salvation than they had of going into Noah’s ark. No: they had witnessed certain *phenomena*; and they were interested in knowing how they could be

produced. Now the question is, What shall we do to have the power manifest here? Peter's answer is pertinent:—

“Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.”—Acts ii. 38, 39.

It was the gift of the Holy Ghost that enabled the disciples to work the wonders which were exciting the people. Now, Peter tells them they can have the same power on certain conditions: “for the promise is to them; not to them only, but to their children; and not them alone, but all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.”

A kind friend once volunteered to enlighten us upon this subject. “This promise made to them and their children *et al.*,” said he, “was the Abrahamic promise.” The promise made to Abraham was in the following words:—

“And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward and southward, and eastward and westward; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth, so that, if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered.”—Gen. xiii. 14–16.

What reference this text could have to this promise it would take at least a divine to imagine. No: here is the promise:—

“Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear.” — Acts ii. 33.

Now, this promise of the Holy Ghost *is to all who are called*; but the Holy Ghost enables those under its power to do what was done on the day of Pentecost.

“But,” says the objector, “these signs were to cease.” Then all the Scriptures quoted in this chapter thus far are false. Here we venture the assertion, that not an argument, except the fact that the churches do not enjoy the gifts, can be brought to prove that they should have ceased: that, instead of proving the gifts should cease, proves the relapse of the Church into infidelity. Churches themselves do not believe in the cessation of all the gifts. In Rom. xii. 6–8, Paul says, —

“Having, then, gifts differing according to the grace that is given us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth, on teaching, or he that exhorteth, on exhortation: he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that showeth mercy, with cheerfulness.”

The gifts all go together; yet the Church denies the gift of prophecy, and acknowledges that of the ministry, teaching, and exhortation.

In 1 Cor. xii. 7–11, Paul says, “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, faith by the same Spirit; to another, the gifts

of healing by the same Spirit; to another, the working of miracles; to another, prophecy; to another, discerning of spirits; to another, divers kinds of tongues; to another, the interpretation of tongues: but all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will."

Does Paul tell the truth? If so, every man is entitled to some form of the manifestation of the Spirit. One would think, by the way opposition to spirit-manifestations rages in the Church, that that, too, was a gift of the Spirit. Here, this Spirit that gives the power to teach and preach the word to one gives to another the power to heal the sick; to another, the power to prophesy; another, the power to work miracles (marvels); another, the discerning (seeing and describing) of spirits; and to another, the power to speak in foreign languages.

But Paul continues: "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? But covet earnestly the best gifts; and yet show I unto you a more excellent way."—1 Cor. xii. 28-31.

The Church now has its teachers, helps, and governments; then why deny it the other gifts mentioned in this chapter, which it has an equal right to claim? Nay, why charge infidelity upon the only people in the world who, by the exercise of spiritual powers, prove themselves legitimate Christians?

In chap. xiv. 1, Paul admonishes his brethren to "follow after charity, and *desire spiritual gifts.*"

But the Church, having lost both charity and gifts, spends its time in ardently wishing others were in equally as doleful a situation. Truly, the words of the Judæan reformer, "The kingdom shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof," are more literally fulfilled than many imagine. Verse twelve of this same chapter, instead of teaching that the gifts shall cease, admonishes Christians to "be zealous of spiritual gifts, and seek to excel."

"But there is a text somewhere," said an objector, "that teaches that the gifts shall cease." Yes: there is just one. Here it is:—

"Charity never faileth; but, whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But, when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." — 1 Cor. xiii. 7-10.

Here the matter is stated clearly. "When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." When

"Hope shall change to glad fruition,
Faith to sight, and prayer to praise,"

then, and not till then, will the gifts cease. While there are sick, the gift of healing will remain; while persons do not all understand one language, the power to speak in others will remain. Until then, if the gifts cease, it is because of infidelity.

We will now turn our attention to one particular de-

partment of this subject. We will select that of healing. James says, —

“Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and, if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him.” — James v. 14, 15.

Christians, you who take the Bible for the rule of your faith and practice, do you follow James's injunction? Will you? Dare you undertake to show your faith by your works? James did not counsel to send for a doctor: an ancient Christian would as soon think of sending for a lawyer as a doctor. “Send for the elders,” is the injunction; let them pray for him: the prayer of faith shall save the sick. Is there faith enough in all professed Christendom to save one patient?

But James continues to argue the case: —

“Elias was a man subject to like passions as we are, and he prayed earnestly that it might not rain; and it rained not on the earth by the space of three years and six months. And he prayed again, and the heaven gave rain, and the earth brought forth her fruit.” — James v. 17, 18.

James's argument in reference to the sick is based on the fact that Elijah controlled the elements. This he did, or the statement made here, and in 1 Kings xvii, 1, is not true. There is only one of two ways in which this could have been done: first, by interceding with an especial power which controls the elements; or, second, working in harmony with some law which produced such an effect. In either case, the power that can con-

trol the elements so as to regulate the falling of rain can certainly control enough to drive disease from the human system. If James argues that it was done as an especial favor in answer to prayer, then his position is, God will hear prayer as in the case of Elias; otherwise, his position is, man can control the elements as in the case of Elijah.

The world is now beginning to understand that mind must control matter. Man will yet control all the elements. This idea is found in more than one place in the Bible. David says of man, —

“Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet.” — Ps. viii. 6.

Paul quotes and comments on this text as follows: —

“But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of thy hands. Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For, in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him.” — Heb. ii. 6-8.

So it is. All things — yea, all the elements — are, *prospectively*, under man; but all things are not yet, *in fact*, under his control. As man obtains a knowledge of science, the elements, one after another, become subject to him. We do believe, with James, David, and Paul, that man will yet control them all.

“My friend,” said a good mother in Israel to us, “that is blasphemy. You talk of making it rain: that

is taking God's business out of his hands. You must not assume to be God." "Yes," said we: "there are a great many blasphemers in the world. In the last century, there was one, Benjamin Franklin by name, who undertook to take the lightning out of the hands of the Almighty, and succeeded; corked it up in a bottle, carried it in his pocket, and exhibited it as a trophy of the triumph of science. The world which scoffed and laughed at the 'insane blasphemer,' at once began to worship him as a semi-god. If the lightning, the most subtle of all the elements, can be even partially controlled by man, certainly the grosser elements can be made to yield to his power."

There are laws regulating the falling of rain; and man needs but to understand and apply them to produce a shower. Every one knows, that, if a lump of ice be put into a pitcher of water on a very hot day, the result will be, that water will soon cover the whole outside of the pitcher. The philosophy of the phenomenon is simply this: the atmosphere outside of the pitcher is warm; the cold water and ice inside the pitcher change the temperature; the vessel, being a conductor, conveys the cold temperature to its surface; there it meets the heated atmosphere; and the result is a condensation; the hydrogen of the atmosphere in immediate connection with the vessel settles upon it. Thus a small shower has been produced. Apply this law on a larger scale, and a heavier rain-storm is the result. Rains have almost always followed as a result of hard battles, where there was a great deal of heavy cannonading. It has been remarked in this country that a shower is more apt to come up on the afternoon of the fourth day of July

than any other day of that month. The celebration on that day of our nation's birth, which is done by burning powder and jarring up the elements, is undoubtedly the cause. Atmosphere, as it is heated and disturbed, expands, and, of course, in proportion to its bulk, becomes lighter; the result is, it rises, and the colder, heavier atmosphere sinks; as the heated air rises through the cold, the condensation occurs; and, as a result, we have a shower of rain.

Now, we venture to say, give a Yankee a furnace of sufficient magnitude to heat a sufficient portion of air, and an engine of sufficient power to send the heated atmosphere through the colder stratum, and he will produce a shower any time on twenty-four hours' notice.

If it were possible to bore down five miles into the earth, we would find a heat sufficient to melt the hardest substance known. May not the time come when man will be able to dive down into the bowels of the earth, and from its eternal fire regulate our climate, both as to temperature and moisture? But if the elements can be controlled, as James insinuates, why may not the other portion of the text be true, and disease pass under the control of man?

Permit us now to examine this from a scientific standpoint. And, first, we must inquire after the philosophy of disease and cure. To illustrate: suppose a lady, the mother of four children, to be taken ill. She decides to send for the elder, as per direction, and have him pray for her. A philosopher chances to meet the elder at the lady's house, and the following dialogue ensues:—

PHILOSOPHER. — “What is the cause of the lady's sickness?”

ELDER. — “ Ah! ‘ the Lord hath greatly afflicted her.’ You know that

‘ God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform :
He plants his footsteps in the sea,
And rides upon the storm ! ’ ”

PHIL. — “ Why has God afflicted her ? ”

ELD. — “ Because, in his wisdom, he sees it to be the best.”

PHIL. — “ Then why pray for it to be removed ? If it is best for her to be afflicted, do not ask God to remove that which she needs. The superior wisdom of the Almighty knows that she needs affliction : hence he has sent it upon her. Now, will you ask Infinite Wisdom to give place to your folly, and heal her, when he knows that it is not for the best ? and will he obey you ? That makes God a time-serving demagogue, whiffing about to suit the thousand and one notions of his creatures. When you prove that position, I will cease to believe the world is governed by Infinite Wisdom, but by the caprices of his people : so, if God has afflicted the lady, my advice to you is to let him manage the matter. What did God make her sick for ? ”

ELD. — “ Oh ! he intends to take her to himself.”

PHIL. — “ He does ? Well, he is abundantly able to carry out his determinations. He undoubtedly thinks it is best that she should die, or he would not kill her ; and if God, who, you will admit, ought to know, thinks it best that she should die, I will not ask him to revoke his decision to take her life : for, the moment he yields to my judgment, he is *un-God-ed*.”

ELD. — “ She has four children, who will be left without a mother. It is a pity that she should die : I will tell God all, and ask him to restore her.”

PHIL. — “ Then you think, when you lay all the facts before the Author of the universe, that he may *reconsider* the case. Perhaps he has not thought that these children will be left in so destitute a condition.”

ELD. — “ Well, the fact is, I do not think we can change the mind of the omnipotent God ; but I will ask him, if it is in harmony with his will, to raise her up. I think he intends to restore her to health.”

PHIL. — “ Very well : if he intends to restore her, he will accomplish it. Why do you interfere ? If the lady is restored to health, it is in accordance with the predetermination of God, and not in answer to your prayers.”

ELD. — “ You must be an infidel : don't you believe in praying for the sick ? ”

PHIL. — “ I most certainly believe in praying for the afflicted ; but convince me that God has any thing to do with the matter, one way or another, and I will never pray. God is abundantly able to attend to his own business.”

ELD. — “ What do you mean ? Has God nothing to do with the case ? ”

PHIL. — “ Nothing at all. The lady has violated the laws of health, and is now paying the penalty. Jesus, if he were to administer to her needs, would say, ‘ Daughter, thy sins are forgiven thee.’ Sin, a violation of the law, and nothing else, has made her sick. ‘ God, in his providence,’ does not send dyspepsia to one who has not been intemperate either in the quantity or quality of

food and drink taken into the stomach. I have known many dyspeptics to charge to God what they owed to greed. Rheumatism and all the ailments of mankind come as the result of sin against the laws of health; and all that is wanted to remove disease is to restore the broken laws."

ELD. — "But will prayer do it?"

PHIL. — "In many instances, it will. It would do it in almost every case in the days of James; and now, in cases where prayer will not remove disease, there is an equivalent in something else."

ELD. — "What is it? I do not understand you."

PHIL. — "I will explain. Disease is under the control of mind, — partially the mind of the operator, and partially, it may be, the mind of the patient. In order to effectually remove disease, the patient must be not only negative to the operator, but in magnetic *rapport* with him: so, if the one to be healed is a great believer in prayer, her confidence is inspired, and she passes into more perfect communion with the operator by that than by any other means. If, on the other hand, the patient is a philosopher, largely developed in the region of causality and comparison, he will be disgusted with the insane verbiage generally handed out as prayer; and his disgust, if nothing else, will cause him to repel all the health-giving power, which, otherwise, might have been imparted. In such a case, three minutes of philosophy would be worth more than three months of prayer; for, be it understood, the power must pass from the operator to the patient."

ELD. — "This may be infidelity, but it is strangely interesting: please proceed."

PHIL. — “ Disease and cure are always the result of impression, — sometimes mental and sometimes physical. There are cases where it is necessary to produce a physical impression in order to operate on the mental faculties. It is well known that lobelia will produce vomiting. The philosophy is this: lobelia is a foreign substance, does not belong to the stomach. As soon as it is thrown into it, the whole system learns there is an unlawful tenant there, and sends its fluids to neutralize it: the stomach cramps, has spasms, and, as a result, disgorge its contents. In this case, vomiting was produced as a result of a physical impression. Now, this effect could be produced by producing a *mental* impression. Make the patient *know, beyond a doubt*, that he has taken any kind of medicine, and the same result as though he had taken the medicine will follow. Speak to a very sensitive lady in a positive manner, so as to make her believe, beyond a doubt, that she has swallowed a fly, and vomiting will be the result. The stomach will not retain a fly; and the effect of making a person believe that a fly is in the stomach is the same as though it was there. Criminals condemned to death have been put on clean, nice beds, and been made to believe that persons had recently died with small-pox on the beds on which they were to sleep: the result was, they took the contagion, and died. In hundreds of instances, mental impressions have created disease by which patients have lost their lives. A man was once lying on his back, unable to move, from inflammatory rheumatism, when he saw his father fall from the top of a cherry-tree in the yard, and, he supposed, kill himself. The invalid jumped from his helpless position, and picked up his

father, and carried him into the house, and was perfectly surprised to find himself restored to health."

ELD. — "What removed his disease?"

PHIL. — "The excitement of the occasion. Now, man should look from such phenomena to the law which produces them, and he might apply it with beneficial results."

Our philosopher is correct. The excitement started the electric fluid, and that started all the fluids of the system into action: the result was a complete change for the better. We personally knew of an individual, who held a county office by the suffrage of the people, who went to a political meeting of the party whose sentiments he did not indorse; and upon being called a liar, knave, and villain, and accused of stealing, and several other such crimes as politicians usually accuse the party in power of committing, the individual became so excited, that he took an apoplectic fit, and died. Whatever doctors and coroner's jurists may have decided, this man was killed by the abuse heaped on him by the speaker. Now, the law by which this man was killed might be used in many cases (perhaps not to so great an extent as was here used) with beneficial results. There are thousands of hypochondriacs to-day who need nothing more than to have their anger thoroughly aroused to effect a cure. The system can not remain diseased where the electric fluid flows properly; and, where it does not, disease must be the result.

Will some philosopher tell the power by which our pen now moves in obedience to our will? All acknowledge that *somehow* mind is the propelling power. All volition inheres in mind or spirit. The mind wills the

pen to move ; but the mind can not operate upon the pen without a medium : it uses the hand as the medium by which to move the pen. But the mind can not touch the hand : it must operate on something it can touch. The muscle can operate on the bones of the hand, and all other bones ; but the mind can not operate on the muscle : the blood, however, can. Now, all would be right if the mind could operate on the blood ; but that it can not do. The nerves, or rather the electric currents flowing through the nerves, can operate on the blood ; and the mind operates directly on these currents. Hence we have it as follows : the mind, or spirit, which has its throne in the brain, which is but the termination of all the nerves of the system, operates on electricity, uses it as its agent ; the electricity operates on the nerves, the nerves on the blood, the blood on the muscle, the muscle on the bone, the bone on the pen, and thus the spirit writes. If other spirits could become positive to the spirit controlling this organism, they could control this spirit, and through it the entire organism.

Now suppose, while writing, our pen suddenly drops from our hand, and the hand to our side, totally paralyzed : where is the disease ? No scalpel can find it. Cut the body into inch pieces, and the right side, though utterly unable to move, would, to all appearances, be found as healthy as the other. Then why does not the right hand move as well as the left ? We answer, When the mind wishes the hand to move, it *telegraphs* from its office in the brain along these nerves to the hand to move ; and the hand always does its bidding. But when there is an obstruction in the nerves, so the electricity can not flow, the hand can not receive the

dispatch, and hence can not know that it has been requested to move. Remove the obstruction from the nerves, so that the electricity can flow properly, and all is well.

All disease is either positive or negative, and always lights on the weakest part of the patient. Load a wagon too heavily, and the weakest part will break : so, if a person is weaker in the knees than the lungs, his disease may be inflammatory rheumatism ; if weakest in the lungs, it may be lung fever ; if, perchance, the kidneys are the weakest, all other portions of the organism might escape, and the patient be afflicted with inflammation in those organs. If the currents flow too rapidly, the disease is positive ; and the result is fever, acute pain, and sometimes insanity. If, on the other hand, the currents do not flow rapidly enough, the result will be cold extremities, dull, stupid feelings, partial or total paralysis, &c. In either instance, all that is needed is to set the currents of electricity into proper action. How can this be done ? As our philosopher intimated, sometimes by prayer, sometimes by anger, and sometimes by excitement.

In order to remove or control the disease of a patient, the operator must at least have a partial control of the electric currents of the system : those he can control by controlling the mind of the patient ; and that must be done by the electric currents of his own system. These currents, especially so far as the voluntary organs are concerned, must be under the control of his will-power : he must by will-power overcome the will of the patient ; to do this, the patient must be kept in a receptive or negative condition. This is easily done by gaining and

retaining the confidence of the patient ; so, if the patient is a great believer in prayer, the surest method will be to pray. If not, some other means must be devised.

The electric currents flowing through the nerves can be made to pass through the nerves of any number of persons by their joining hands. Witness where a dozen or more form a circle, and those at the ends hold on to a battery, all in the circle will receive the same shock at the same time. The nerves of those having hold of the latter are filled with electricity ; and electric currents, like all things else, seek their equilibrium, and hence infill the nerves of all who are in contact with those in connection with the battery. Now, let patient and operator come in contact, either mental or physical, and the electric currents at once seek an equilibrium : when that has been obtained, the cause of disease has been removed. Now, in proportion to the operator's mediumship, he is interwoven with a circle of spirits, who can impart to him the needed life and health giving influences ; and in proportion as he passes into magnetic *rapport* with his patients, will they be brought into connection with a health-imparting influence from the beyond. This we know, both as a matter of science and history. Having spent near six years in the study and practice of this mediumship, our faith takes hold of the wonderful cures wrought by prophets, Jesus, and his comrades of olden time. We know there is a law by which such things are being done now : that law, being as old as heaven, reaches back over the first case of healing, and is more eternal than the "everlasting hills."

We frankly confess, that, in our healing efforts, we

have failed to perform a perfect cure in three cases out of five ; but does that prove there is nothing in this mediumship, or that it has not been vouchsafed to us ? No : it only proves that in cases of failure we did not get *en rapport*, either with the *fountains* whence we drew our supply, or with the patient to whom we humbly sought to impart the needed blessing. The best healers in the world fail sometimes. It was so anciently ; and it is so to-day. Jesus often failed. In his own country, his brethren became offended with him : the result was such an antagonism that he could not do any thing. The Evangelist says, —

“ And they were offended with him. But Jesus said unto them, A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country and in his own house. And he did not many mighty works there, because of their unbelief.” — Matt. xiii. 57, 58.

In Mark vi. 4-6, we read, —

“ But Jesus said unto them, A prophet is not without honor, but in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house. And he could there do no mighty work, save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk, and healed them. And he marveled because of their unbelief. And he went round about the villages teaching.”

In Mark ix. 17-29, we have a full history of the failure of Jesus' disciples in one case, and of his statement as to the cause. Even after the young man was healed, the friends pronounced him dead. In this case, Jesus would not operate until he saw that the father, who was *en rapport* with the patient, with tears in his eyes avowed his entire confidence in the healing power of the Nazarene. The case is so interesting, we give it entire : —

“ And one of the multitude answered and said, Master, I have brought unto thee my son, which hath a dumb spirit : and wheresoever he taketh him he teareth him ; and he foameth, and gnasheth with his teeth, and pineth away ; and I spake to thy disciples, that they should cast him out ; and they could not. He answereth him, and saith, O faithless generation ! how long shall I be with you ? how long shall I suffer you ? bring him unto me. And they brought him unto him : and when he saw him, straightway the spirit tare him ; and he fell on the ground and wallowed foaming. And he asked his father, How long is it ago since this came unto him ? And he said, Of a child. And oft-times it hath cast him into the fire, and into the waters, to destroy him ; but, if thou canst do any thing, have compassion on us, and help us. Jesus said unto him, If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth. And straightway the father of the child cried out, and said with tears, Lord, I believe : help thou mine unbelief. When Jesus saw that the people came running together, he rebuked the foul spirit, saying unto him, Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him. And the spirit cried, and rent him sore, and came out of him ; and he was as one dead, insomuch that many said, He is dead. But Jesus took him by the hand, and lifted him up ; and he arose. And when he was come into the house, his disciples asked him privately, Why could not we cast him out ? And he said unto them, This kind can come forth by nothing but by prayer and fasting.”

This case is sufficient to show that in ancient times, where one medium failed to remove disease, another could sometimes afford the needed relief.

In this chapter we have briefly gone through the New Testament, and shown that believers should exercise the same power Jesus used. We have also shown, from science, the probabilities that such things should occur. It remains, that we present a few historical facts, showing that the Christ-power is yet on the earth. We have so often been relieved of distress in our own person, and have on so many occasions witnessed it in others, that it would take a larger volume than the one we are writing to hold every narrative we could bring. From the hands of Dr. J. R. Newton of Boston, Dr. J. P. Bryant of New York, Drs. Freeman and Wilbur of Milwaukee, we have experienced such sudden and perfect relief, that we could not question the power. We have seen persons, within five minutes of the time they have hobbled into the presence of Dr. Newton or Bryant, on crutches, leave their crutches, and go away perfectly well, in many instances "leaping, and raising God." We have witnessed the opening of blind eyes, and have heard tongues long silent lisp the praise of the power by which they were loosed. We, ourself, have, by the word or touch, cured nearly every ailment that overtakes the flesh.

A few statements from those who have been healed may not come amiss here. We have seen an autograph letter, of which the following is a true copy:—

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., NOV. 30, 1868.

DR. J. R. NEWTON. *Dear Sir,*—Duty impels me to give you a plain statement of my life's sufferings, and cure by you; which you may publish.

I, Abraham Clarke, of Indianapolis, Ind., twenty-

one years old the 25th inst., having been a paralytic cripple ever since I was three months old, unable even to lift my hands up to my head, or walk without great difficulty, and so nervous I could hardly stand or sit still, and at times suffering so great pain that my wailings were intolerable to those around me, on Saturday last, Nov. 28, went with my mother to see if you could cure me; for I had heard so much of your wonderful power of curing all kinds of diseases, without medicine, which all other doctors said were incurable, that I had faith you could.

To make a short story, I say, *you cured me perfectly*, with one treatment. I arose upon my feet, walked without limping, with a firm, easy step, raised my hands above my head; then I took a large, heavy chair in either hand by the leg of each, holding and balancing them above my head as few well men can do. And, to sum it all up, I say that I am made whole and sound as any other living man, as far as I know or others discern, and for the first time in my life am in the full enjoyment of health. And I thank my heavenly Father that I am a well man. My former life and suffering seem like a dream.

In gratitude, I am your friend,

ABRAHAM CLARKE.

INDIANAPOLIS, Nov. 30, 1868.

Personally appeared before me Abraham Clarke, who deposes under oath that the foregoing statement is every word true.

Subscribed and sworn before me, J. P. Pinkerton, a Notary Public, in and for the County of Marion, State of Indiana.

J. P. PINKERTON, *Notary Public.*

The foregoing statement of my son, Abraham Clarke, is all true.

ISABELLA CLARKE.

Dr. Newton is now operating at No. 23 Harrison Avenue, Boston, where there are on exhibition faithful photographic likenesses of this young man, taken immediately before and after his treatment: the difference in his looks could not be imagined by one who had not seen them.

The following we copy from "The New-York Dispatch:" —

A JUST TRIBUTE TO DR. J. R. NEWTON.

NEW YORK, Oct. 2

DEAR SIR, — Having seen in "The Tribune" of Sept. 10 an account of "Healing by Magnetism," I can not, in justice to Dr. Newton or to my own feelings, refrain from giving a true statement of the most wonderful and impressive scene that I have ever witnessed in my life of nearly fifty years. The daughter of my brother, a farmer residing in New Boston, N.H., has, for the past three years, been one of the greatest sufferers, and for six years an invalid, suffering from spinal disease and other ailments. Her father has labored by day and night to secure for her the services of eleven of the best physicians in the neighborhood of his home: but her disease has defied their utmost efforts and skill: and they had left her to linger and die, declaring they could do no more for her.

The father, in agony of heart, wrote me that he knew not what to do. Deeply sympathizing with him, and being about to visit some friends in Vermont, I wrote

to inform him that I had heard of one Dr. J. R. Newton (but I had never seen him), who was reported to have performed some wonderful cures ; and if his daughter wished to come, and could bear the journey of two hundred and fifty miles, and would write me while in Vermont, I would go to his house, and bring her home with me to see Dr. Newton. The answer was in the affirmative, and I went to see my niece ; but when I entered the chamber of the sick girl, and looked upon her wan and emaciated body, that had wasted, since I last saw her, from one hundred and twenty-five pounds to less than seventy ; when I recollected that she had lain in that situation for two long years, depending for every motion upon kind and gentle hands, my faith left me : I did not believe she could be moved, much less cured.

She was, however, willing and anxious to make the attempt ; and when we laid her carefully upon a narrow bed, and carried her down stairs, and placed her in a carriage to ride eighteen miles to the cars, it seemed the height of folly to start on such an undertaking with such a charge, with such a faint hold on human life. When she reached the cars, she said it seemed as though all her strength was gone, and that she could not live much longer. She was, however, restored by the use of stimulants ; and we went on. She was taken one hundred and seventeen miles by railroad, and one hundred and fifteen by steamboat, and arrived in New York on the morning of Aug. 30. The patient had suffered intensely through the whole of the journey. It was with great difficulty that she was carried on a stretcher to the house of her friends. She reached them, however, but

not to greet them. Her father and two weeping sisters, with others, stood around what all supposed to be her dying bed.

Dr. Newton had been informed of her case; and, in the unbounded kindness of his heart (contrary to his practice), he left his house, and hastened to the sick girl.

The solemnity and impressiveness of that scene will for ever be remembered by all who were present, but it can never be described. In a manner (as the doctor truly says) peculiar to himself; he treated the unconscious and apparently dying patient; and in less than three minutes she sat up in bed. She then arose to her feet, and walked the floor with the doctor's assistance.

Her pain and suffering had all gone. Her spine, which had not been touched for years without giving her intense pain, could now be roughly handled by all present. Food was immediately ordered; and amid the solemn silence of the room, where there was no sound save the sobs and fast-flowing tears of joy, she partook of the food. She ate heartily, and relished and enjoyed such a meal as she had not done in five years.

I am forced to look back with wonder and amazement at the above-described scene, and bound to acknowledge that it is beyond the reach of my mind to understand. I have only to say that her pleasant voice and cheerful smile greet us at the table of the family circle daily: she has continued to improve from that hour, and stands to-day a living witness, ever ready to testify to the power and goodness of her heavenly Father, as extended to her through the kind-hearted and benevolent Dr. Newton.

MOSES CRISTY,

No. 380, Pearl Street, New York.

As we spoke of seeing blindness cured, we will give one affidavit.

Peter Manning, being sworn, deposes and says: I live in Bordentown, N.J. On the 30th of October, 1862, I called on Dr. J. R. Newton. I was blind two years and three months. When I came to Dr. Newton, I was so bad that I could not see a gaslight in front of me; after ten minutes' treatment, without pain, I was enabled to see to read and write, and have kept my own books ever since.

PETER MANNING.

Sworn and subscribed before me, this fourth day of March, 1863. W. M. P. HIBBERD, *Alderman*.

Hundreds of testimonials such as the above could be gathered; but it is unnecessary. These cases are of such frequent occurrence, that the reader can very easily supply himself with all the documentary evidence necessary.

Now, in all candor, permit us to ask, What can be done with such cases as the above? They are before the world, and demand an explanation. Jesus said, "These signs shall follow them that believe." Are they not sufficient to prove, to those who think, that there are true believers, at least, among the Spiritualists? A conversation once occurred between ourself and a lady of the Advent faith, which sufficiently illustrates the point:—

LADY. — "I saw you operate on Mrs. ——— last evening; and, though we supposed her case to be hopeless,

she was perfectly restored in a few minutes: but it was the Devil that cured her."

HULL. — "Pretty fine old gentleman, that Devil of yours. If that is a specimen of his character, he has been grossly slandered: what a pity that churches and ministers misrepresent everybody, not excepting even the Devil himself!"

L. — "The Devil is not so good, after all. He made Mrs. — sick, and then sent you, his agent, to cure her."

H. — "Then Satan's kingdom is divided against itself, and can not stand: so we can begin to hope to soon get rid of his Majesty."

L. — "Not at all. They are all parts of the same work. The Devil made Mrs. — sick, and then sent you, his agent, to make her well: he knew that she would see the *benevolence* manifested in curing her, rather than the *malevolence* of making her sick. He is removing disease from the lady for the sake of getting possession of her soul."

H. — "In your remarks you have given me another evidence that I am a disciple of Jesus; for he said, —

"It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?" — Matt. x. 25.

"If such charges were brought by the popular church against a former healer, what better could we expect now?"

L. — "But *his* mission was divine: yours is not."

H. — "Spiritualists prove the divinity of their mission in the same way that Jesus proved his was an

errand of mercy to humanity. If you will turn to Matt. xi. 2-6, you will read, —

“ ‘ Now, when John had heard in the prison the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples, and said unto him, Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another? Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see : the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached unto them.’ ”

“ Now, I ask, in all candor, Was Jesus’ logic good? Did he prove the divinity of his mission by such works? Then will not the same works prove the divinity of the power by which they are wrought? How startling your logic! you prove Jesus a God by his good works, and healing-mediums Devils by the same! ”

L. — “ I do not choose to argue with you. Christ is coming shortly to destroy the works of the Devil : then these questions will be settled.”

H. — “ Christ came once in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, and through him did many great works ; but he was, according to promise, to come again, not in the person of *one* reformer. Jude says, —

“ ‘ Behold he cometh with ten thousand of his saints.’
— Verse 14.

“ The Greek word rendered ‘ with,’ in this text, is *en*, and should be rendered ‘ in.’ The Christ-power came once in one reformer ; now it has come in *ten thousand* mediums : so that almost every hamlet on the continent has the evidence that the second coming of the Christ is accomplishing more than was accomplished through the mediumship of Jesus.”

L. — “But where are the clouds? He was to come in the clouds.”

H. — “So he was to come on horseback. John says,—

“‘And I saw heaven opened, and, behold, a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True; and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew but he himself. And he was clothed in a vesture dipped in blood; and his name is called, The Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS.’— Rev. xix. 11–16.

“But who looks for ‘the King of kings and Lord of lords’ on an old gray horse, because of this declaration? May not the clouds, like the horses, be symbols? Clouds of witnesses are mentioned in the Bible; and to-day it is said that there are *eleven millions* of witnesses of the living Christ-power manifested on earth at the present time. I tell you Christ is here: you have had a demonstration of it in the healing of this lady.”

L. — “But the grave is to yield up its victory, and death its sting, when Christ comes: I do not see as that is done.”

H. — “I do. Once I regarded death as a dark and

cruel foe. When my friends were taken from me, if they were not stung, I was. Now the grave into which I used to look for my mother holds her no longer. *I know she is not there.* I have seen her and talked with her. She lives to-day; and, for myself, death has lost its sting. I do not dread it. It is natural; it is right: but I never could see it so until it was manifest in the second coming of Christ."

This chapter has already grown beyond the limits intended; but we can not conclude without issuing a challenge to the theological world. Not for words, but *deeds*. We call for a convention of the religious world, the object of which shall be to ascertain where the true believers are, the matter to be tested by their works. Jesus says the believers shall accomplish even greater works than were wrought through his mediumship. Are the churches believers? Will they try it? If they will go into convention, and do the works Jesus did, we propose, in behalf of Spiritualism, to acknowledge them believers. If they can not, will they be honest enough to confess themselves infidels? After they have all tried and failed, as fail they will as sure as they try, we are willing to be one of twenty mediums (that is one hundred less in number than they had on the day of Pentecost), who will go upon the same rostrum, into the same assembly where the churches failed; and if we do not, in a less space of time than ten days, accomplish all that was done by the disciples within the first ten days after the ascension of Jesus, we will acknowledge that Spiritualists are like the churches, — they are infidels. If, however, we accomplish the work, will the orthodox world take back the slanderous, libelous

charge of infidelity? We hand out this challenge in all sincerity, yet not with any hope that it will be accepted.

That all strife and sectism may give place to the pure doctrines and practices which make men better, and prove them humble followers after *the* truth and virtue, is our most earnest prayer.

CHAPTER VII.

ARE WE DELUDED?

A Common Cry—Contradictory Positions—Order of Batteries—They fire into each other—"Kettle Story"—Result of the Warfare—Dialogue—God and Mediums deceiving the World—Are God and the Devil Partners—Is it just to damn the World for Unbelief—Author loves God more than Bibles—Lying Spirits sent out—Did God do it—Case of Jeremiah and Ezekiel—Ezekiel's Explanation—Spiritualism a Delusion—The Lord coming—Reasoning in a Circle—Wonderful Success of the Opposition (?)—Spiritualism will not "down"—"Old Split-foot"—Toe-joint Theory—Hidden Meaning in appointing these Committees—The Machinery Argument—Arguments of Opposers suicidal to themselves—Human Testimony rejected—Conditions required—Conditions of Sleep—Conversation with a Photographer—Conditions of Photography—Telegraphy—Arguments against Spiritualism would overthrow the Bible—An Infidel Deacon denies his Bible—A Giant Delusion—Spiritualism Twenty-two Years ago and now—A prospective View—Spiritualism Positive and Aggressive—Reasons for going to Church—Churches not Proselyting—Why do Persons become Spiritualists—Rev. A. J. Frishback's Reply—Suffering for Spiritualism—Ministers' Wives in the Lunatic Asylum for Spiritualism—Author's Experience—The Quality of Converts to Spiritualism—Our Evidence as to the Number or Intelligence of Converts—Giant Minds yield—Atheism and Materialism give Place—Hon. N. P. Talmadge and J. W. Edmonds—"The Kings of the Earth"—Opposers fall before the Power—Gamallel's Opinion—A charming Delusion—Efforts to convert a Spiritualist—Death-bed Scene—"Oh, happy Delusion!"—It is not a Delusion—Child Medium.

FOR more than a score of years the opponents of Spiritualism have been following it with the cry of "*delusion!*" The only thing our opponents have ever been able to agree in, is, that Spiritualism is some kind of a delusion. Notwithstanding all agree so far, it excites the mirthfulness of a Spiritualist who is posted up as to its evidences to hear the various contradictory

positions taken by those whose bread and butter depends upon putting it down. Indeed, we ought not to laugh at their calamity ; for if their *lives*, instead of their *living*, depended on writing and preaching Spiritualism down, they could not succeed any better.

Not long since, it was our privilege to attend a discussion where five men affirmed that Spiritualism was a delusion. They succeeded admirably in agreeing so far : but here the agreement ended ; for, before they had finished their arguments, they had taken every one of the nine contradictory positions usually brought to bear against it and each other. Each speaker succeeded in placing himself on as many sides of each of the contradictory positions usually brought to bear against each other as his limited time would allow. As we listened to the logic of these *killers* of Spiritualism, we thought, What a wonder it does not die, men shooting at it from *nine* different directions ! There are only two reasons why opponents have failed to kill Spiritualism : one is, they have ever fired more shots at each other than at their common enemy ; the other is, Spiritualism is " iron-clad." Bunker-Hill Monument could be battered down with pop-guns easier than the monument erected by the angel-world to show its existence, power, and victories, could be overthrown by the artillery of infidel church-members.

If the batteries pelting at Spiritualism were named and numbered, they would be about as follows : —

Battery No. 1. — " And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie ; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." — 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12.

" Spiritualism is God's delusion."

Battery No. 2. — “ Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish ; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.” — 2 Thess. ii. 9, 10.

“ For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty.” — Rev. xvi. 11.

“ Spiritualism is Satan’s last and greatest delusion.”

Battery No. 3. — “ The manifestations are produced by machinery.”

Battery No. 4. — “ They are all wicked spirits.”

Battery No. 5. — “ It is electricity.”

Battery No. 6. — “ There are no manifestations. Spiritualists are for the most part idiotic or insane. Those who are not are lying knaves, dealing out deceptions to the credulous.”

Battery No. 7. — “ Spiritualism is a contagious disease, working on the mind as small-pox or cholera does on the body.”

Battery No. 8. — “ God anciently made laws against it: it is therefore wicked to have any thing to do with it.”

Battery No. 9. — “ It is new: we should inquire for the old paths, and stick to the religion of our fathers.”

One would naturally think, that, under the fires of *nine* as formidable guns as these look to be, Spiritualism would be compelled to surrender; but, when the smoke and fog occasioned by this contest clears away, we assure all that not a shell has entered the *arena* of Spiritualism. God-delusions and Devil-delusions have been

shooting at each other, and both are the worse for the battle. The machinery and wicked-spirit arguments have, after pitching into all the other theories, fallen from blows received from each other. The electricity and juggler theories have annihilated each other. The last-mentioned battery — that it is *new* and therefore untrue — has, after silencing the battery stationed where God anciently made laws against Spiritualism, surrendered to fires from eight directions.

Really such a jumble of absurdities reminds us of the “lawyer’s kettle.” A noted member of the bar, in summing up the evidence in defense of a client who had borrowed a kettle and returned it broken, said, “May it please the Court, we have proved, first, that the kettle was broken when we borrowed it; second, that it was whole when we took it home; and, third, that we never had the old kettle anyhow.”

The answer to the most of these objections must be reserved for another chapter. We only design here to note the consistency, or rather inconsistency, of opponents. This bushwhacking mode of warfare has resulted, as might have been expected, in converting people to Spiritualism by the million, until now the number of Spiritualists can not be computed; even our opponents, some of them, setting it as high as *eleven millions*. Were there eleven millions of Spiritualists two years since, when this computation was made? If so, they were eleven millions of evidences that the batteries erected against Spiritualism have slain that many more in their own ranks than in ours.

Once, in traveling through the Western States, we fell into the company of a minister who was perfectly sure

that Spiritualism was a delusion. The substance of what passed between us may be embodied in the following dialogue:—

MINISTER. — “I have not a doubt but that Spiritualism is the delusion spoken of in 2 Thess. ii. 11.”

HULL. — “Then Spiritualists are God’s servants, and you are fighting against him.”

MIN. — “No. How can that be?”

H. — “The text asserts that ‘God shall send them strong delusions.’ If your interpretation is correct, *God has sent several thousand mediums into the world, with a delusion to deceive the world; and they would accomplish it, if it were not that you are exposing the plans of God and the mediums.*”

MIN. — “God has nothing to do with it; he is opposed to it: it is Satan who is working, with power, signs, and lying wonders.”

H. — “Your first text said it was God who was after the people with a delusion: now you have quoted another verse of the same chapter to prove that it is the Devil. Must I understand that the Devil is God’s agent, — that he is working among the people because God sends them a delusion? or is God and the Devil each after them with a deception called Spiritualism?”

MIN. — “There is the text: make of it what you can. God will damn the world for unbelief; and Spiritualists have departed from the faith, and denied every cardinal doctrine of the Bible.”

H. — “And so you are going to have the world damned for unbelief, are you?”

MIN. — “I am not: God is.”

H. — “Is there any justice in that? Do I make

my own faith or want of faith? Can I govern my own belief more than I can the color of my eyes or hair? Is not God my Author? and is he not the Author of truth? If I fail to harmonize with truth, am I, who neither made my common sense, nor yet the stories I can not believe, to blame? But your text asserts more than that. It does not simply say that God will punish unbelief; but it declares that God will send strong delusion after them, *that they may believe a lie*, that he may damn them. I say this is unjust."

MIN. — "If you loved your Bible, you would not dare to speak as you do."

II. — "I love my Bible, and believe more of it each day than I did the day previous; but, dearly as I love the Bible, I love God more. I could not see his *character* sacrificed in this manner for any book. I find it much easier to believe Paul could be a little mistaken in an hypothesis, than to think God stoops thus to deceive his own children."

MIN. — "You should not reject the Bible because of an isolated expression like that. There are spots on the sun."

H. — "Though I by no means reject the Bible, I assure you this is not an isolated expression. If you will turn to 1 Kings, xxii. 19-23, you will read, —

"And he said, Hear thou therefore the word of the Lord: I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him, on his right hand and on his left. And the Lord said, Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. And there came forth a spirit, and stood be-

fore the Lord, and said, I will persuade him. And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said, Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also: go forth and do so. Now, therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee.'

"Now, there is a sense in which I believe this paragraph, and a sense in which I do not. If you ask me if I believe God sent a lying spirit, I answer, No. If I believe a lying spirit operated on all the prophets, including Micaiah, I say, Yes. But God does not stoop thus to conquer. Those disembodied wags who influenced the prophets perhaps thought their predictions were correct, and knew they would have more weight upon a self-conceited, ignorant king if they professed to come from Almighty God. You will remember, there were four hundred of these, all bearing testimony the same way, except Micaiah, who crossed his own track. Now let me ask, Do you believe God did it? Is it not more charitable, to say the least, to believe the Bible writer correct as to fact, and mistaken as to hypothesis?"

MIN. — "These prophets were false prophets: no true prophet was ever led astray in that way."

H. — "There is no evidence that these prophets were any more false than all the others. Jeremiah and Ezekiel were each deceived in the same way. Jeremiah says, —

"O Lord, thou hast deceived me, and I was deceived: thou art stronger than I, and hast prevailed: I am in derision daily, every one mocketh me.' — Jer. xx. 7.

“ Now, I frankly acknowledge I do not believe that text; but do not misunderstand me. I grant that Jeremiah was deceived; yes, deceived by lying spirits: but, when he accuses the Ruler of the Universe of deceiving him, I think he was mistaken. Again I say, ‘Let God be true, though it make every man a liar.’ As to Ezekiel, though he was one of the best physical and clairvoyant mediums in the world, he never uttered a truth in any of his predictions. His prophecies, more than all others, were the cause of a proverb to which he refers as follows: —

“ ‘ And the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, what is that proverb that ye have in the land of Israel, saying, The days are prolonged, and every vision faileth? Tell them, therefore, Thus saith the Lord God: I will make this proverb to cease, and they shall no more use it as a proverb in Israel; but say unto them, The days are at hand, and the effect of every vision. For there shall be no more any vain vision nor flattering divination within the house of Israel. For I am the Lord: I will speak, and the word that I shall speak shall come to pass; it shall be no more prolonged: for in your days, O rebellious house, will I say the word, and will perform it, saith the Lord God. Again the word of the Lord came to me, saying, Son of man, behold, they of the house of Israel say, The vision that he seeth is for many days to come, and he prophesieth of the times that are far off. Therefore say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God: There shall none of my words be prolonged any more; but the word which I have spoken shall be done, saith the Lord God.’ — Ezek. xii. 21-28.

“Here the spirit acknowledges the truth of the proverb, but says he will make it to cease; that is, there shall be no more any vain visions, nor any prophecies which applied to the distant future, but the effect of every vision is at hand. Again Ezekiel accounts for his false visions and prophecies as follows:—

“‘And if the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I the Lord have deceived that prophet; and I will stretch out my hand upon him, and will destroy him from the midst of my people Israel.’—Ezek. xiv. 9.

“Once more I will confess, I do not believe the Lord deceives. I find it easier to believe Ezekiel was a little mistaken in supposing that influence came from ‘the Father of Lights with whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.’”

MIN. — “Aren’t you off the track? We commenced to talk about Spiritualism, and you have gone off into a tirade of abuse of the Bible. Why do you not stick to the question?”

H. — “I have not abused the Bible, only your interpretation of certain portions of it; but I will hear what you have to say about Spiritualism.”

MIN. — “I say, and can prove, that Spiritualism is the delusion spoken of by Paul.”

H. — “How do you prove it? You know there never has been a religious theory which has dared to drive out of the beaten track, but that this text has been quoted to prove it a delusion.”

MIN. — “I prove my point thus: This delusion is to come up in the *last days*. The Lord’s coming is after the working of Satan with power, signs, and lying won-

ders. Signs are so ominous that there is no room left for doubt. The coming of the Lord is right upon us; but we look for the Devil's work, — the great delusion, — and find Spiritualism, and that alone, coming at the right time, and answering the other specifications of the prophecy. We are, therefore, justified in the conclusion that Spiritualism is the delusion."

H. — "That would do if you could prove your major proposition, that the coming of the Lord is near."

MIN. — "That is easily proved; for, when Spiritualism comes up, the coming of the Lord follows immediately after."

Here the call of "Change cars for Madison!" terminated our conversation. We wanted to dissect our friend's logic for him, but had not the time. The logic comes in thus: —

Proposition No. 1. — "The Lord is coming."

Conclusion No. 1. — "Therefore Spiritualism is a delusion."

Prop. No. 2. — "Spiritualism is a delusion."

Con. No. 2. — "Therefore the Lord is coming."

What accommodating logic! The conclusion of the first proposition forms a basis for the second; and that of the second quite as accommodatingly "wheels into line," and forms a basis for the first. If this is not a fair specimen of what logicians call "reasoning in a circle," we acknowledge we never saw one.

We now come to the direct question: Is Spiritualism a delusion? A brief examination of its history will answer the question. If the arguments of the opposers of Spiritualism be true, then verily is "truth stranger than fiction." Its statement would be about as follows:

Twenty-one years ago, two little girls, members of a respectable family, one of them *nine* and the other *eleven* years old, undertook, without any motive whatever, to delude and deceive the world. We say without motive; for certainly there was no money in the deception, and there could not possibly have been any honor gained by it. These youths would have succeeded, had it not been that the ministers, doctors, and some of the lawyers, organized a warfare against them, in which their talents, books and learning were brought into such effectual operation that, at the end of nineteen years, according to figures made by those making the attack, the children had only succeeded in making about eleven millions of converts!

“A stitch in time saves nine.” Perhaps the reason of the success (?) of the opposition was their early, unrelenting, and untiring warfare. For the battle was commenced before a test was given. It is also an acknowledged axiom, that “in union there is strength.” The opposition was certainly united in one position, if no more; that is, Spiritualism must be put down at whatever cost. They paid the cost, “quitted themselves like men,” sacrificed all, in many cases not excepting their honor; but Spiritualism proved to be a “Banquo’s ghost:” it would not “down.”

Before any intelligence had been derived from the mysterious noises, we remember to have heard it suggested that it was the Devil. Indeed, that charge was so common, that, long before they learned there was any intelligence connected with it, the little girls used to address it as “Old Split-foot.” By an accident it was ascertained that this power was intelligent, could answer questions, and give other signs of knowing what was said to it.

As soon as a communication was received containing an undeniable test, committees were appointed to investigate and put it down. The first committee very readily and learnedly came to two conclusions: The first was, Spiritualism is a delusion. The second related to the *modus operandi* of that deception. The world was informed that the facts were simply these: The little girls, in going to school, got their toes frozen. When that was ascertained, the mother wet some linen in turpentine, and wrapped the toes in it: there was a connection between the toe-joint, the linen, and the turpentine, that produced the concussions. This expose of the delusion did not last very long. The opposers had too many toes, and there was too much turpentine and linen among them. With all these implements for producing manifestations, they failed to produce one single rap.

This made it necessary to appoint another committee; and here, permit us to say, there is a world of meaning in the appointment of this and other committees. It means, first, there are phenomena there which demand investigation; second, other committees, learned men as they were, failed to give us a proper solution of these manifestations.

Other committees soon came to several conclusions: the first always was, that Spiritualism was a delusion; and the second generally was, that all previous committees were deluded. The knee-joint theory, machinery theory, and all other systems of opposition to Spiritualism, had their day. Spiritualism lived to bury them all. "There is machinery in the table," was the cry raised by Prof. Matteson, and hundreds of others who would have been professors, but lacked the ability to

cope with this learned blackguard. Many attended circles on purpose to detect the machinery, when, lo! the raps were heard not only on the tables, but on chairs, stoves, stove-pipes, the walls of the house, the floor, the ceiling, and even sometimes on the hands, feet, heads, and teeth of sitters. Thus the warfare went on; the world *exposing* its folly in attempting to expose Spiritualism, and the angel-world daily handing out new demonstrations of power.

There is a proverb, that "the gods first make mad those whom they would destroy." In this case, it is literally true; for there has never yet been an argument adduced against Spiritualism, but that weighs with all of its force against the religion, science, or profession of the one making the argument. The mocking priests demanded that Jesus should come down from the cross, and they would believe; but he could not come down to satisfy a scoffing mob: so priests now, often with as much audacity and little sense, throw themselves back on their dignity, and demand the production of manifestations impossible under the circumstances. One of these specimens of the *genus homo*, in a discussion with us, positively forbade the introduction of human testimony. Human beings were liable to be deceived, and some would lie; so he would not take even *sworn* testimony that tables had been seen to move, concussions heard, and pencils seen to write without any visible agency. Nothing would do but the production of such phenomena in that audience, at that time. Our reply was, that certain conditions were necessary, which could not obtain in a promiscuous assembly; that any person proposing to do any thing had a right to state the con-

ditions upon which he could do the thing, and no one had a right to demand the production of the phenomena until all the conditions had been obeyed. "If it can be done anywhere, it can be done here," was his reply; "and now is the time. We do not care what has been done elsewhere: produce your manifestations here, and we will believe."

To illustrate the absurdity of his position, suppose sleep to be the phenomenon in question. A hundred witnesses swearing that they had slept, and seen others sleep, would not convince him: he would demand of the one who affirmed that one-third of every healthy person's time is spent in sleep, that he should lie down on the rostrum, and go to sleep in the presence of the audience to convince him. Is there one who reads this book who could do it? We think not. The conditions of sleep do not obtain under such circumstances. The fact of trying to go to sleep as a test would keep one awake if he had not slept in six months. The light in the room, the magnetism of the audience, and all other conditions, would go to prevent sleep. Any one can sleep better in the dark than in well-lighted apartments. Now, if the opposers will learn that conditions for good spirit-manifestations are required to be quite as negative as for sleep, they will cease to exhibit so much folly in their opposition. There is not an opposer of Spiritualism in the world to-day, who does not require conditions for certain manifestations in his daily business that he obstinately refuses to give to the spirit-world.

The following incident faithfully illustrates the absurd position taken by a majority of opposers. We

were invited by a friend, a photographer, to go to his gallery, and sit for a picture. We had hardly entered the room, when our friend, in a good-natured way, commenced a tirade against Spiritualism. A dark circle he would not sit in under any circumstances; and, as to other conditions, they were only an excuse behind which to hide fraud, deception, and falsehood. "In fact," said he, "I get mad every time I hear the word 'conditions.'" — "And yet," said I, "you require conditions every time you take a photograph. I can take a better likeness with my printing-press than you can with your *camera*, if you will permit me first to destroy your conditions. You first require the subject to sit passive and quiet. He must be willing you should take a picture; your *camera* must be properly adjusted; you require just such an amount of light; and it must come from the right direction. Then, by having your chemicals prepared with mathematical precision, and your plates just right, you can do part of your work; yet you are compelled to go into the dark before you can develop a picture.

"Now understand one thing: the chemicals spirits use in coming in communion with earth are as much finer than those used by yourself as heaven is higher than earth. You, who require such implicit yielding to such subtle conditions, are the last one who should fall out with that word, or object to the idea it contains. Now, you ask mediums to go into a hall, and on the rostrum produce certain kinds of spirit-manifestation: they will do it when you go to the same hall, on to the same rostrum, and, under the same circumstances, produce genuine and good photographic likenesses."

Thus it is: the man could not see until shown by this illustration that his argument weighed quite as heavily against his own occupation as against Spiritualism.

The man who enters the telegraph-office, tears the batteries from it, cuts the wires, and then demands from the operator communications from distant cities, is quite as sensible as those, who, after destroying all the conditions of spirit-manifestation, tauntingly demand spiritual phenomena. How much better to humbly sit in the quiet, and receive influxes from "over the river"!

We repeat, the Bible itself can not stand under the argument which kills Spiritualism. The whole Bible, with its stories a hundred times as large as any told by Spiritualists, is received on human hearsay testimony; and yet *living witnesses*, who can be questioned and cross-questioned, are disbelieved.

We were once, at a dinner-party, introduced to a deacon. Soon the conversation turned upon Spiritualism. Having just read the debate between Prof. Leo Miller and Prof. J. Stanley Grimes, we decided to borrow one of Mr. Miller's bomb-shells. After relating several incidents known to persons present, all of which were stanchly denied by the deacon, — for he felt that the life of his religion hung upon his zeal in disputing every thing he himself had not witnessed, — at length we addressed ourself to Bro. R. (who was sitting by our side), as though we wanted no one else to hear, yet determined that all at the table should hear. "I read the history of a very strange manifestation this morning, which, if it proves true, ought to set men to thinking," said we. "Ah! what is it?" said R. "It happened in

the old country," we replied. "A man was sick, and sent for a healing medium. Though he was not very sick, he thought he was going to die; and so the medium thought at first. Soon, however, he obtained a communication, stating that he would recover; whereupon the man demanded a *sign*. Well, said the medium, as an evidence that you shall get well, logs of wood, stones, and heaps of earth, shall move without any visible agency. And the document adds that these things did move, — that stones, and heaps of earth, of many tons' burthen, moved, to all appearance, of their own accord; and the man got well." We had hardly got through with our story, when our deacon asked, "Where did you say that happened?" — "In the old country," we responded. "I would like to see the papers for that," ejaculated the deacon: "I know it never occurred. If such things can be done anywhere, why not here? why locate them so far from home? No one but an insane person could swallow such a story."

We permitted him to blow until his ammunition was spent, and then coolly responded, "Deacon, if you will turn to 2 Kings xx., you will find the story. Hezekiah was the sick man; Isaiah was the medium; and the whole earth moved backward ten degrees to convince a man that a boil would not kill him. Now do you believe the story?" His only response was, "It is unfair to catch a man on a pin-hook." It may be unfair; but we have to do just such work occasionally. It serves to illustrate the admixture of credulity and incredulity in the religions of the day.

We now affirm, that, if modern Spiritualism is a delusion, it is a *giant* delusion. Not only has it utterly

baffled the skill of opposers, whose cry has been, "Away with it!" "Let it be crucified!" but who can take a retrospective view of its work without an inexpressible degree of surprise? Twenty-two years ago, it was nothing, — not a book except the Bible written in its behalf, and that was regarded more as a dead letter than any thing else; not a press to advocate its claims; not a lecturer in the field; not a medium in the country; not a believer in the world. At that time one figure, and that a cipher, told all there was of Spiritualism. Not a quarter of a century since, it commenced amid the most determined opposition, has waded through it, and marched steadily on, until now its mediums are counted by thousands, and it would require a column and a half of "The New-York Ledger," set in *agate* type, to hold the names and post-office addresses of its public lecturers. Its weekly and monthly periodicals, scattered like autumn leaves, are read with more enthusiasm and delight than ever before. New volumes are continually being issued from its presses; its literature is being written and translated into foreign languages; and thus it spreads with a rapidity unequaled by any religion ever known before.

Now, considering the machinery already in running order for spreading Spiritualism, — its local, county, state, and national associations; the mediums and talent already in its ranks; and the number of living witnesses there are to its truths, — where will it be on the day of its fiftieth anniversary? *Where won't it be?* Another question: Where will its opposers be at that time? They will be where Pharaoh's "fat kine" were, after coming in contact with "the seven lean kine."

Modern Spiritualism, though born in a manger not twenty-five years since, is now the only *positive* religion in the world. All other religious theories live upon their negative elements. Ask almost any member of a popular church why he belongs where he does; and, if you get a true answer, it will be about as follows: "Oh! I must have somewhere to go: I have nothing to do, and there is no other place of amusement for me to attend on Sunday; and so I go to church. Why should I not? My father and mother always did the same thing; my friends and associates go there; we have good music, and a smart preacher, who preaches smooth things to fashionable ears: in fact, the current sets that way, and I drift with it." Another goes to be in fashion; another to exhibit fine clothing; another to get the custom of some one who attends; another to see how church-people dress, hear who is married, who is dead; and so forth, to the end of the chapter.

Ask again, "What were you before you were a Methodist, Baptist, or Presbyterian?" and you will probably be answered, "Why, I wasn't any thing: I never belonged to any other church or party." If you find one of a thousand who has left one religious church, and joined another, he has, as a general thing, done it without any change of faith or opinion. Some local disturbance or jealousy has been the cause of the change. Not more than half of those who belong to the church to-day know what the peculiar tenets of their church are; and six out of eight who do can not give a rational reason for their belief.

Now, go out among the Spiritualists, whose millions of converts have come from atheists, infidels, and *every*

church in *Christendom*, and ask any one of them why he or she is a Spiritualist, and you will be pointed to some peculiar test, or some beautiful clause of our philosophy which arrested their attention, led them to a further investigation, and finally *forced* them out of their church. One said to us, "When my spirit-mother came and talked with me, and when I had learned that my wife, whom I regarded as dead, was still alive, my religion, my church, my friends, my popularity, and my prejudices were not all strong enough to hold me."

When Rev. A. J. Frishback turned his back on his church and salary, to preach these heaven-born truths, he was asked why he did it? His reply was, "I have seen the angels." Glorious privilege! Is it not enough to requite all our toil?

Ministers have left large congregations and fat salaries to become fellow-servants with angels. Lawyers have renounced their profession for the sake of these heaven-born truths. Husbands have been compelled to leave their wives, and wives their husbands, children have been turned away from their own homes, and parents forsaken in their old age, for their communion with those on the other side. Students, filled with all the ardor and vigor of youth, with the most flattering prospects ahead of them, have been driven from their colleges in disgrace, because of their allegiance to these higher powers.

Thus Spiritualism proves itself a positive philosophy, enabling those who embrace it to forsake all, and stem the flood of opposition, for its truths. The author of these pages is personally acquainted with two ladies, one of them the wife of a Presbyterian minister, who were

by their husbands driven to the alternative of renouncing their Spiritualism or going to the lunatic asylum. They both, though more sane than their husbands and church-going neighbors, chose the latter, preferring a life of imprisonment among the insane, rather than one of ease and luxury based on their want of fidelity to their risen friends and the God who spake in their own souls.

The flames of slander, calumny, and persecution through which we have passed in consequence of our having turned from a former belief, the poverty we have endured because of our allegiance to our friends on the other side, could not have been borne, had it not been for the *living* evidence which almost hourly came to us, of the truth and divinity of our cause. That, together with the angelic forces backing us up, would enable us to "run through a troop or leap over a wall."

"A scrip on my back,
And a staff in my hand,
I march on in haste
Through an enemy's land:
The road may be rough,
But it can not be long;
I'll smooth it with hope
And I'll cheer it with song."

A word on the *quality* of the converts to Spiritualism might not be amiss, although the argument drawn from *quantity* or *quality* is not relied upon to prove it true. The evidence of its truth to us is the same whether there were another believer in the world or not. Nor does our faith hang on the intelligence of those who

believe, but upon a combination of biblical and modern facts with a philosophy which adapts itself to the wants of the human soul: so with every Spiritualist. The number and intelligence of those slain by its power only proves to us that facts which we perceive are universally adapting themselves to the intelligent everywhere.

The myriads who have flocked around the standard of Spiritualism have, in many instances, been men and women of giant intellect. It will not be disputed that Robert Hare, Robert Owen, Hon. Robert Dale Owen, Hon. Joshua R. Giddings, Hon. N. P. Talmadge, Hon. J. W. Edmonds, Hon. B. F. Wade, and Wm. Lloyd Garrison, are men of brains. They are among those slain by its power.

Robert Hare, Robert Owen, and Robert Dale Owen, were thoroughly posted with regard to all the theologies as well as the literature of the age. They were known the world over to be stanch and rigid atheists. They had withstood the batteries of all the pulpits in the land; and bundles upon bundles of quills were used up in trying to write their atheism down: but all to no purpose. Robert Owen had put to flight all the ministers in the land; but he, as well as his son, and Prof. Hare of the Smithsonian Institute, was at last compelled to yield to spirit-voices. Two of these sires are traveling on in the sunshine of the spirit-world, while the other is filling places of trust in our own government, and writing and lecturing on Spiritualism.

N. P. Talmadge and Joshua R. Giddings have also left the Indian summer of this life, and gone to help form a battery in the brighter summer-land. While these "noble dead" are thus employed, Judge Edmonds

is writing alternately on Spiritualism and Jurisprudence.

Were we to leave this country, and go to the Old World, we should find the Queen of England always having a place fixed at the table for her departed consort. She has not a doubt that he occupies the "vacant chair" which she causes to be provided for him. On the authority of "The New-York Sun," we can state that the Empress Eugénie attends circles every day; while it is well known that Louis Napoleon is a Spiritualist, even in person attending the circles held by the brothers Davenport, and giving them fine presents as tokens of his appreciation of the powers manifesting through them. Thus Spiritualism proves itself adapted alike to the king on his throne and the beggar in his hovel.

Still another argument on the power of Spiritualism might be based upon the fact of its opposers, one after another, laying down the weapons of warfare, and finally, many of them, taking up their line of march with it. The weaker and less strategetic power in every battle must yield to the stronger. The test of strength in the powers engaged in this warfare can be told in the fact that there are few able advocates of Spiritualism to-day, who did not graduate in the field of opposition. Prof. Leo Miller used all his talents and education, and spent several of the last years of his life, in assailing Spiritualism. E. V. Wilson was told by spirits who appeared to him as Jesus did to Paul, that he must ground the weapons of his rebellion. Dr. P. B. Randolph got tired of the warfare, and concluded he would sail with the popular current. He tried to write and preach Spiritualism into its grave; but "found it hard

to kick against the pricks." His efforts recoiled on his own head: he was compelled to return to the religion he so grossly slandered. Dr. J. B. Dodd wrote a book against Spiritualism; but the printer's ink had scarcely dried on it, when he had renounced it, and declared himself a Spiritualist. We ourself went into a twelve-years' crusade against Spiritualism (those who read our writings, and listened to our sermons and debates, can judge with what amount of ability); but, like others, we were compelled to surrender. D. W. Hull, our brother "after the flesh," after spending six years in preparation to whip our Spiritualism out of us, whipped himself into it, and has become an eyesore to all opposers. Thus it is: the "Sauls of Tarsus" are permitted to carry the warfare just so far, when, lo! they find themselves smitten with blindness from the spirit-world.

With all these facts staring us in the face, who can doubt that Spiritualism, whether true or false, is a giant well worthy the steel of Orthodox ministers and Harvard professors? No position, no learning, no religion, no power, has been a match for it. It has gone on from conquering to conquest. As we view its onward march, we are reminded of the language of Gamaliel of old to the opposers of ancient Spiritualism, —

"And now I say unto you, Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for, if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, ye can not overthrow it, lest, haply, ye be found even to fight against God." — Acts v. 38, 39.

Spiritualism has indeed, if this test be taken, proved itself of God.

Though Spiritualism is a giant, it is not a huge, un-

comely *monster* to be dreaded. If a delusion at all, it is a *charming* delusion. On this division of the subject, it is needless to remark at length, as our first chapter is a sufficient elucidation of this department of the subject. We would only ask, Who would not enjoy the consolation of knowing that his friends whom the world calls dead still live? Where is the devoted wife who would not enjoy social intercourse with the companion recently departed from her embrace? Spiritualism has opened the eyes of many thousands to see the beyond; and myriads who once groped in darkness are now receiving messages of love and wisdom from the angel world. Is that delusion? Then let us live and die, charmed with just such delusion!

In a Western city was a railroad-station agent, who was known, wherever known at all, as a Spiritualist. Persons of all grades of belief tried to persuade him to renounce his allegiance to his spirit-friends. They displayed before his view, in glowing colors, the transitory glories of earth, which he might enjoy if he would only say nothing of his offensive Spiritualism; but all to no purpose. He was finally told by a minister who could not resist the power of his honest logic, that such doctrine did very well to live by, but would not sustain a soul in the moment of dissolution. "If," said the reverend, "I could be present at your death-bed, I would see you wring your hands, and cry for mercy; then you would call for the consolations of the religion you now spurn for the effervescent bauble of Spiritualism."

Said the brother, "If you are in the city when I am called to exchange worlds, you shall see whether your words are true."

In a few days from that time, upon a cold and icy morning, when coupling the cars together, his feet slipped, and the cars passed over his thighs, severing his limbs from his body. When, in a few moments, he was informed that his earthly career was drawing to a close, and if he had any thing to say, now was his last chance, after appointing one to attend to his business, he sent for his friends who had urged him to renounce his acquaintance with the angels. When they were all assembled, he spoke to the minister substantially as follows:—

“You expressed a desire to see a Spiritualist die. My time has come: now you shall be gratified. I have believed Spiritualism, and rejoiced for the past ten years in its consolations. Now I know, as I never did before, that it is true. As the flesh grows weaker, the spirit gains strength. *I see the angels, I hear them sing: they are waiting for me.*”

After a moment's pause, he continued,—

“Some of my family belong to your church, and will want you to deliver my funeral-address. Will you promise to tell the audience that I was a Spiritualist, and died such; that Spiritualism afforded a consolation which sustained me in a dying hour?”

The minister promised, and kept his word. After the dying man obtained this promise, he seemed perfectly resigned. He talked of his hope while strength lasted. Finally, after lying motionless and speechless, with his eyes closed a few moments, he opened them, and gazed on his friends for a brief period. His eyes sparkling all the while with an unearthly luster, he said, “They are calling; I must go. Good-by!” And in a

moment his spirit was borne into the country where disputes on such questions are settled.

Is this delusion? Then let us live and die deluded! If it is a delusion which has made us happier and better for the last six years of our life; if a delusion has sustained us amid trials and troubles, and enabled us each day to say, "Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil," — then, welcome, delusion! May thy cords be lengthened, and thy stakes strengthened, until thy banners wave over the ruins of error and superstition, and every heart is made glad with a knowledge of angelic communion!

" Whispers of Eden given
Greet mine ear,
As if nearer bringing heaven, —
Still more near;
Calling upward, sweetly calling
To the sky,
Wait, my weary soul to welcome
By and by.

Oh! how my longing soul will spring
To rise and join them on the wing."

Now, we affirm that Spiritualism is not a delusion. On this, as on the last division of this subject, we will do but little more than to refer our readers to the foregoing pages of this volume. If the evidences already presented can be avoided, any amount of just such evidence is worthless.

If Samuel, Moses, Elijah, Jesus, and others returned in the ages gone, then they proved that the dead can return. If our friends who loved and visited us while in the flesh love us still, they will come to us with bless-

ings. If the history of the one and twenty years last past is correct, they have, they do come.

We have received so many tests, in so many ways, under so many varying circumstances, — many of which preclude the possibility of deception, — that we can not doubt.

We know a little girl not yet four years old, who occasionally has the name of a departed friend come in raised letters on her arm. She is not old enough to think of deceiving, much less is she capable of deciphering the names of friends, or of writing them if she knew them. Such evidences are unmistakable proofs of a supermundane power.

CHAPTER VIII.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

Objections usually the Result of Ignorance — A British Lord and the Steamboat — Objections to the Telegraph — Objections to Abolitionism — God legislated against Spiritualism — Necromancy; Definition of — The Objection proves Spiritualism — Hebrews inclined to apply to the Dead for Knowledge — Law Indorsed Spiritualism — This Law abolished — Other Precepts of this Law not binding — Jesus violated this Law — Paul and John violated, and hence deserve Death — The Law good in its Place, and for its Time — Men inclined to worship Spirits which communicated — The Jewish Jehovah not an Infinite God — He incited the Jews to Crime — Jehovah jealous of other Spirits — God goes to Babel to find out concerning a Report — Moses a better Man than his God — Heathen Gods once Men upon Earth — Spirits should be Helps, not Masters — Jews worshiped Spirits; Abraham, Lot, Joshua, Peter, John — Law against Spiritualism had evil Results — Materialism the Results of that Law — Elihu a Clairvoyant Medium — Men not Clay — “Old Paths” — Contradictory Objections — Consistency a rare Jewel — All Things were once new — Protestantism once new — Catholic Argument against Protestantism — All Religions have run the same Gantlet — “Fanatical Methodists” — Novelty not against Truth — Men in this World are learning; may not others progress — Spiritualism not new — Martin Luther and the Spirits — Wesley and the Spirits — They are Devils — An old Charge — John the Baptist and Jesus had a Devil — Every Reform was instigated by the Devil — Devil left the Church — Devil is Synonymous with Hatred of Progress — The Telescope, Fanning-Mill, Printing-Press, and Vaccination, all of the Devil — Devil discovered the Circulation of the Blood — Devil and Michael Servetus — Martyrdom of Servetus — The Devil and Vaccination — The Devil figuring as an Abolitionist, Geologist, &c. — Has God sent a Scorpion for a Fish — What a God — The Existence of a Devil can not be reconciled with that of a good God — The Devil always proves himself right — Author of Progress — Devil a Myth — Conclusion.

WE believe it was Mr. Horn who said, “An objection can be stated in three lines, that it requires thirty pages to answer.” Such is the fact. It is an easy matter to object to any thing; but when a position

is fairly proved, then to present objections shows more frequently the stupidity than the erudition of the objector. It requires no learning, logic, or tact to frame objections; while it often requires even more than *demonstration* to remove them. A British lord could prove that it was impossible for a boat to navigate the water without the aid of wind or tide; and so positive was he in his objections, and they were based on such absolute knowledge (want of knowledge), that he proposed to eat the first steamboat, captain, crew, and all hands, that crossed the Atlantic. Men, however, nothing daunted at the threat of this old musty foggy, launched their boats; and, even to this day, steamboats float on British waters.

When the magnetic telegraph was first talked of, there were thousands of persons in this country who could prove the thing impossible. Long lists of objections were presented; "the letters could not get around or through the posts." Even if this objection could be removed, there were hundreds of others quite as formidable. The telegraph, even including the Atlantic cable, has gone into successful operation; and now there is hardly a man in the world who did not always know it could be done.

Thirty years ago, there were thousands of church people who could prove that slavery was a "divine institution," and abolitionism an insane, infidel, dangerous heresy, originating under the direct influence of his Satanic Majesty, and leading the people by thousands to the bottomless pit. We should now expect objectors to know as much of Spiritualism.

To a few of the most popular and strong objections, we will now pay our respects.

Objection No. 1. — God anciently made laws against getting knowledge from the dead.

The precepts to which objectors refer may be found in the following words: —

“When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations. There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord; and because of these abominations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee.” — Deut. xviii. 9–12.

“Regard not them that have familiar spirits, neither seek after wizards, to be defiled by them: I am the Lord your God.” — Lev. xix. 31.

“And the soul that turneth after such as have familiar spirits, and after wizards, to go a whoring after them, I will even set my face against that soul, and will cut him off from among his people.” — Lev. xx. 6.

“And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead? To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” — Isa. viii. 19, 20.

We have quoted all these paragraphs in order to give the reader the full force of the objection; for, if we can read our own heart, we have no design to keep back a

word or thought that could in any way assist the objector. These Scriptures can not easily be misunderstood. The first paragraph emphatically forbids necromancy, or the consulting of familiar spirits. Necromancy comes from two Greek words, *nekros*, which means "dead," and *mantia*, the definition of which is "divination." Divination, Webster defines as follows: "the act of divining, a foretelling of future events, the discovering things secret or obscure by the aid of superior beings or by other than human means."

It will be seen by these definitions, that the Mosaic law forbade those under its jurisdiction getting knowledge from the dead.

God is, or is not, the author of this law: if he is not its author, it should no more be quoted as authority here than though it occurred in the Mohammedan Koran. The laws against Salem witchcraft have as much authority in the investigation of Spiritualism as this, unless God is directly or indirectly its author. But, if God is its author, it follows that he made laws against obtaining knowledge from the dead. Now, God certainly will not be accused of legislating against an *ignis fatuus*. If, as some suppose, the dead are totally unconscious, there would be no danger of people holding converse with them; hence no necessity for this law. If, on the other hand, the dead are conscious, but can not hold intercourse with the living, there would be no necessity for this law. Whether the law is opposed to modern Spiritualism will be seen as we proceed. Two things are positively settled by this law.

First, the Hebrews were inclined to apply to the dead for knowledge; else there would have been no necessity

for this enactment. Paul says, "The law is made for the disobedient" (1 Tim. i. 9). This is positive proof that they knew the *fact* of spirit-intercourse, and some of them believed in its utility, insomuch that it was necessary to have such a law.

Second, the power making this law received the fact, or, instead of this law accompanied with these reasons, he would have informed them of their mistake.

Wherever this law originated, it was a part of the law which was only "added because of transgression, until the seed should come" (Gal. iii. 19). This law has been found unworthy of a place in the divine economy, and is among the things which have been abolished. (Eph. ii. 15; Col. ii. 14.) Is it possible that our Christian friends are going to arraign and condemn Spiritualists for violating an old dead Jewish law? If Spiritualists are guilty of a great crime in violating that law, what shall be done with Christians? for the law is not any more positive in forbidding Spiritualism than in its prohibition of working on Saturday; of mixing linen and wool together in garments; of eating of swine's flesh and catfish. (Ex. xx. 10; Lev. xi. 7-11.) This same law emphatically forbids a man to mar as much as the corners of his beard; but many Christians, and even ministers, who oppose Spiritualism because of precepts in the same law, shave two or three times every week of their lives. See Lev. xix. 27.

If the law forbidding spirit-communion was divine, and of lasting obligation, then Jesus broke a divine law; for he did hold a *tête-à-tête* with Moses and Elias after they had each been in the spirit-world several centuries. Paul also violated, when he conversed with Jesus after

he had spent several years in the higher life ; and John, for holding a conversation with his brother, deserved a punishment no less than death. (Lev. xx. 6.) Will the objector, for the sake of carrying out his objection, accuse all the New-Testament saints of violating the law of God?

Now, we believe there are reasons (some of them good, and some not so good) for giving this law. If the objector should hear a father say to his eight-year-old child, "You shall not study algebra," would he, from that, conclude that the father was opposed to the study of algebra, or only that the child was not yet developed up to that study ; that minor studies must be conquered first? And what would you think of the child, who, ten years after the father had said he should not study algebra, upon being requested by his teacher to enter upon the higher branches of mathematics, should respond, "It's wicked ; my father forbade it long ago"?

The case in our illustration is similar to the one produced by the objector. The race was younger then than now, and was not educated up to the point where unlimited spirit-communication would not, with its good, have a mixture of evil. Men in those days believed that every spirit who communicated was a god ; indeed, this was the way Jehovah, the Jewish God, got his infinity. We can not see how any one can read the description of the person and character of this God, who presided over the Hebrew nation, without coming to the conclusion that he was either a myth or a departed human spirit. It is to be doubted whether the Jews would not have been a better people, had they not had such implicit confidence in their Jehovah. It was their

God who said to Moses, "Avenge the children of Israel of the Midianites: afterward shalt thou be gathered unto thy people." — Num. xxxi. 2.

This God goes on giving commands, which were fulfilled as follows: —

"And they warred against the Midianites, as the Lord commanded Moses; and they slew all the males. And they slew the kings of Midian, beside the rest of them that were slain; namely, Evi and Rekem and Zur and Hur and Reba, five kings of Midian: Balaam, also, the son of Beor, they slew with the sword. And the children of Israel took all the women of Midian captives, and their little ones; and took the spoil of all their cattle, and all their flocks, and all their goods. And they burnt all their cities wherein they dwelt, and all their goodly castles, with fire." — Num. xxxi. 7–10.

Notwithstanding this wholesale butchery, and burning of cities, the Lord was in a rage because they had not been more heartless, and told Moses to say, —

"Now, therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. But all the women-children that have not known a man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves." — Num. xxxi. 17, 18.

The reading of this Scripture shows that their implicit confidence in their God led them to commit deeds of darkness, which, left to themselves, they were not bloodthirsty enough to undertake. This is proof positive, not only that they were led to deeds of crime by their belief in the infallibility of communications coming from their Jehovah, but that that God could not have been the Author of the universe. Undoubtedly, a lead-

ing reason why the prohibition against seeking the dead for knowledge was given could be found in the following language:—

“For thou shalt worship no other god; for the Lord, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God. Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and they go a whoring after their gods, and do sacrifice unto their gods, and one call thee, and thou eat of his sacrifice; and thou take of their daughters unto thy sons, and their daughters go a whoring after their gods, and make thy sons go a whoring after their gods.”—Ex. xxxiv. 14–16.

Here the gods of the land are recognized as being gods in every sense that this jealous-hearted Jewish God can claim that title. The God of whom it is said, “And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower which the children of men builded” (Gen. xi. 6), is not the Author of the universe. The following language is a better description of a bigoted, jealous human spirit than of the Creator of heaven and earth:—

“And the Lord said unto Moses, Go, get thee down; for thy people, which thou broughtest out of the land of Egypt, have corrupted themselves; they have turned aside quickly out of the way which I commanded them; they have made them a molten calf, and have worshiped it, and have sacrificed thereunto, and said, These be thy gods, O Israel, which have brought thee up out of the land of Egypt. And the Lord said unto Moses, I have seen this people, and, behold, it is a stiffnecked people: now, therefore, let me alone, that my wrath may wax hot against them, and that I may consume them; and I will make of thee a great nation. And Moses besought

the Lord his God, and said, Lord, why doth thy wrath wax hot against thy people, which thou hast brought forth out of the land of Egypt with great power, and with a mighty hand? Wherefore should the Egyptians speak, and say, For mischief did he bring them out; to slay them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth? Turn from thy fierce wrath, and repent of this evil against thy people. Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, thy servants, to whom thou swearst by thine own self, and saidst unto them, I will multiply your seed as the stars of heaven, and all this land that I have spoken of I will give unto your seed, and they shall inherit it for ever. And the Lord repented of the evil which he thought to do unto his people."—Ex. xxxii. 7-14.

No one now worships a God who was so spiteful and changeable as this representation of the Deity. Moses, in this instance, is decidedly the superior in every sense of the word. God acknowledges it, by yielding to Moses' superior wisdom, and not doing what *he thought* he would do unto his people. We do not say this ignorant bigot, calling himself God, was not Jehovah: that, for aught we know, might have been his name; but we do say that this whiffling, jealous Deity has not sense enough to govern the world. This is abundantly proved by his changing his plan of action in obedience to the superior wisdom of Moses.

The heathen gods were once men upon earth. After passing to the world of spirits, and returning and manifesting themselves, they were at once recognized as deities, and, of course, esteemed infallible. Spiritualism, to-day, would do more harm than good if every

Spiritualist received as infallible every communication coming from that source: hence, until people arrive at the position where they can take the spirits as *helps*, *teachers*, not *masters*, they are not prepared for communion with them. Let authority give place to *reason*, and men weigh communications from the other shore as they do advice from friends here, and communications from spirits can do no more harm than would result from friend counseling with friend in this life.

The Jews, quite as much as any other nation, were inclined to worship every spirit that communicated. Abraham and Lot each bowed to the earth before the angels which came to them. When an angel, who was emphatically called a man, appeared to Joshua, the record says, —

“And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him, What saith my lord unto his servant?” — Josh. v. 14.

When Peter saw Moses and Elias on the mount, his first exclamation was, —

“Lord, it is good for us to be here: if thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias.” — Matt. xvii. 4.

As much as to say, “When we would worship you, we would go into one of these tabernacles; when we would worship Moses, we would go into another; and, when we would worship Elias, we would go into another.” When John saw his brother a prophet, he fell at his feet to worship him. With that idea, the Spiritualism of to-day would lead to idolatry, and hence be wrong; but Spiritualists have advanced to where they can treat their spirit-friends as familiar friends, and yet

not receive them as authority. With this advancement, we claim that spirit-communion can not result in harm: those who have not got so far along would do well to let it alone.

The law forbidding spirit-communion had its evil as well as its good results. While it may have kept the Jews from idolatry, and some other crimes that they otherwise might have committed, it drove many of their best minds into the most gross materialism. Had they been permitted to consult the dead, their best writers never could have said, —

“For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun.” — Eccl. ix. 5, 6.

Solomon was not the only writer who occasionally gave utterance to such infidel sentiments. Job and David more than once utter the same; but Elihu, both a clairvoyant and clairaudient medium, says, —

“Now a thing was secretly brought to me, and mine ear received a little thereof. In thoughts from the visions of the night, when deep sleep falleth on men, fear came upon me, and trembling, which made all my bones to shake. Then a spirit passed before my face; the hair of my flesh stood up: it stood still, but I could not discern the form thereof: an image was before mine eyes, there was silence, and I heard a voice, saying, Shall mortal man be more just than God? shall a man be more pure than his Maker? Behold, he put no trust

in his servants; and his angels he charged with folly: how much less in them that dwell in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust, which are crushed before the moth?"— Job iv. 12-19.

This "spirit which passed before his face," causing him to quake and tremble, as hundreds of mediums now do, taught him the important lesson that men are not clay, but "dwell in houses of clay." Thus all can see the result, on the one hand, of spirit-communion, and, on the other, of its prohibition. All the texts usually produced by materialists to prove the dead unconscious are the result of the enactment against Spiritualism, and consequent non-intercourse with the dead.

Objection No. 2. — The Bible says, —

"Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls." — Jer. vi. 16.

It does not do to forsake the "old paths." Spiritualism is new; if true, it should have been discovered prior to the nineteenth century.

It sounds a little strange to hear this objection urged by the same speaker, and almost in the same breath with the one just noticed. Many of the opponents of Spiritualism seem to have lost their regard for consistency, if not for truth. In one breath, Spiritualism is an old sin God was compelled more than three thousand years ago to put down by legislation; in the next it is something new, and for that reason they have gone to work with such zeal to tear it to pieces that one would almost think they would pluck a new moon from the heavens if it were in their power to do so. Consistency

is too rare a jewel to come into general use among those who have enlisted in the battle against the angel-world. If Spiritualism is an invention of the nineteenth century, the last delusion of the Devil, God did not make laws against it in the days of Moses. On the other hand, if laws were made against it then, the objection of "new things" is *ad captandum*.

Has the objector ever considered that there are swords that have two edges? that, when persons go it blind, they occasionally catch an argument by the blade, and cut their own fingers? Such is the fact in this case.

Suppose Spiritualism to be a child of the nineteenth century: the argument of new things weighed as heavily against Jesus and his associates as it now does against Spiritualism. Christianity was so new in the days of Paul, that it is said of certain philosophers,—

"And they took him, and brought him unto Areopagus, saying, May we know what this new doctrine whereof thou speakest is? For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears: we would know, therefore, what these things mean. For all the Athenians, and strangers which were there, spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or to hear some new thing."—Acts xvii. 19–21.

Every thing had a beginning, and was new in the days of its infancy. We remember to have heard a learned professor say, "Monkeys existed before men, and fishes are older than philosophers." Protestantism in the days of Martin Luther was new, and Catholicism was old: what Protestant thence concludes his own religion false, and Catholicism true?

Had the "old path" argument used by our Catholic

fathers had the desired effect, there would not have been a Protestant in the world to-day. Ministers who are now preaching against Spiritualism because of its novelty, would, in that case, have been confessing their sins to a Catholic priest, and we to-day would have been eating the actual body and drinking the blood of Jesus Christ, and enduring a tyranny such as is only known within the limits of the "Eternal City."

When Martin Luther first made his discoveries, Lutheranism was new, and, per consequence, every follower of Martin Luther was either a knave, fool, or fanatic, as could be proved by every Catholic priest in the Old World. Lutheranism, however, spread, notwithstanding the barking of Catholic dogs. A century was quite sufficient to kill the cry of "Novelty;" and Protestantism could be respected and venerated because of its age. Lutheranism is not alone; other religious theories must run the same gantlet. When Methodism first began to force itself upon the people, it, too, was a new invention of the Devil to lead fanatics to hell: this could be proved by every Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, or Baptist in the land. Methodism has lived a century; and, as a result, those who abominated it, and would have sent every "fanatical Methodist" to hell (but words could not do it), now respect it as "our sister church."

If all the theories in the world have lived through the warfare against new things, we will risk but that Spiritualism will take deeper root and grow more healthy and beautiful as a result of this attack.

Now, admitting that Spiritualism is new, is its novelty against its truth? We think not. Men existed on the earth *at least one hundred and fifty thousand years*

before they learned to communicate with each other by means of the electric telegraph ; yet who refused to receive the news of Lee's surrender, because, a century since, it would have taken it a month to go from Richmond to Chicago? Persons will accept of improvements everywhere except in religious matters : how strange ! Are all who have died fools? Supposing they could not have communicated prior to 1848 : men in this world have made many discoveries since that time ; may not those on the other side have discovered something? Mesmer, who discovered the science of mesmerism, and Benjamin Franklin, who taught men how to control the lightning, are each in the land of the so-called dead. Now, while Prof. Morse was discovering and perfecting a new mode of communication between mortals, why can not Newton, Franklin, and others discover a plan by which the dead and living can converse? Certainly such a discovery would be of vast importance ; then why object?

But Spiritualism is not new : it is traced through all time, and found among all people. We have not the space here to devote to this proposition. The reader who is curious to look into this department of the subject is requested to go or send to the bookstore of Colby & Rich, No. 9 Montgomery Place, Boston, and get some of their numerous books on this question.

It is enough for us here to say that phenomenal Spiritualism was patent in the days of Luther. Who has not read the account of Luther seizing and throwing an inkstand at a spirit whom he supposed to be the Devil? The manifestations in the Wesley family, an account of

which John Wesley himself records, were quite equal to those occurring in the family of John D. Fox. Dr. Adam Clarke, Carvosso, and other Methodist divines, record as wonderful spirit-manifestations as there are in the year 1869.

Objection No. 3. — These manifestations are from the Devil. Paul says, —

“Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders.” — 2 Thess. ii. 9.

John says, —

“They are spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth, and of the whole world, to the battle of the great day of God Almighty.” — Rev. xvi. 14.

The charge of demoniac possession, like the “new things” argument, is an old one. When John the Baptist commenced his work, the popular church said, “He hath a devil” (Matt. xi. 18). When Jesus came, speaking as never man spake, and doing as never man did, a hypocritical church said, “This fellow doth not cast out devils but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils.” — Matt. xii. 24.

Jesus gave his followers to understand that this ever would be the case. He said, “If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?” — Matt. x. 25.

With this warning in advance, and a knowledge that our predecessors in every work of reform have endured the same charge, we are bold to endure such charges. If the Church of all ages can be believed, the Devil has originated and put into successful operation every re-

form, and that in spite of the Church, which has ever been faithful to warn its dupes that every reformer was the especial agent of his Satanic Majesty.

According to the church of Jesus' time he had a devil: but he and his devil succeeded in putting his work into successful operation, and matters went on swimmingly, until they succeeded in calling out a large party of followers; but, in proportion as they increased in numbers and power, they became corrupt, until the so-called Christian Church became so terribly wicked, that the Devil would have nothing further to do with it. His Majesty left them to "paddle their own canoe," and began anon to work through heretics, who were compelled, on account of their good works, to leave the Church.

During the whole period known as the dark ages, there was not a martyr burned at the stake, but that was under the influence of the Devil. That word "devil" has always served as a scapegoat to pack its ignorance and hatred of progress on. It requires no tact or learning to say "devil," and it often does to explain various phenomena hidden behind that word. This is, perhaps, the main reason why the old gentleman has had so much to carry. Even Martin Luther told his followers that the Copernican system of astronomy, including the rotundity of the earth, was directly from the Devil.

The telescope was of satanic origin. The first fanning-mill was "a wicked invention to raise the Devil's wind." The inventor was informed, that, if he wanted to separate his wheat and chaff, he should get down upon his knees, and ask God to send him a good dispensation of air; or, if not humble enough to do that, to

patiently wait until God in his mercy chose to send him wind. Notwithstanding the windmill was the Devil's invention, it soon gained such a hold on the populace, that a Presbyterian could, without any scruples of conscience, eat bread made of the wheat which had passed through the Devil's windmill. We would not be understood as representing that the Church sanctioned or even *tolerated* such impiety. It did not. Ever faithful to its duty, the Church disfellowshipped every member who had so far followed his diabolical leadership as to eat the bread made of wheat which had been cleansed by this "infernal machine." Alas for the weakness of man! how soon is he led astray! The Devil's windmill has become so popular, that ministers use bread, even in the communion service, that was made of the wheat which had gone through the Devil's windmill. Thus the Devil always carries the day.

The man who first applied water to the propelling of a sawmill was put to death for being in league with the Devil. The first printing-press was invented and run by the Devil. It was the Devil, who, through Harvey, discovered the circulation of the blood. This same Devil enabled Michael Servetus to discover that a mathematical impossibility could not be a theological truth. When this agent of his Majesty the Devil was told that in the Godhead there were three persons at *least*, and only one at *most*, he was inclined to doubt it, and wondered if that would not lead to the idea of *three Gods*. "Oh, no!" the response was: "there is but one God, and he is made of three distinct individualities." — "Well, taking either of these three separately, would he be a God, an angel, or a man?" His questions were too

well put : none but a Devil could invent such questions.
When he was asked to sing, —

“ Have faith the same,
With endless shame,
For all the human race ;
For hell is crammed
With infants damned,
Without a day of grace,”

he dared to question the truth of the song, and the propriety of singing it. He was at once set down for a Devil-possessed heretic, and condemned to death. John Calvin, after signing his death-warrant, led the mob that burned him over a slow fire, for the crime of disputing old theories. As usual, the Devil in this was successful. The whole world now acknowledge that Servetus was right, and Calvin and his horde of bigoted followers wrong.

“ The world goes round and round,
The genial seasons run,
And ever the truth comes uppermost,
And ever is justice done.”

It was in the present century that ministers came out in long printed statements (for by this time the Devil had made his printing-press popular enough for their use) to prove that vaccination to prevent small-pox was an invention of the Devil to change men to a kind of quadruped ; that vaccination would surely result in producing horns on the heads of those who submitted to any such satanic operation to prevent this dreaded contagion. The Devil originated the science of geology, set on foot the abolition movement ; in fact, has led

every band of reformers in the world. Now, his last great work is in Spiritualism. All we have to say is, Let him work. He has ever proved himself right, and we have confidence to believe it ever will be thus; that is, if he has figured as largely in every new movement as he has been accused of doing.

Now, admitting for the sake of the argument, the existence, power, and malignity of this almighty Devil, how is the fact to be harmonized with the existence, power, wisdom, and goodness of our loving Father? Whatever may be said of Spiritualists now, millions of them were once honest and earnest praying Christians. For years and years, they made it their daily duty to turn to their God and Bible: they have read again and again, —

“ And I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. For every one that asketh, receiveth; and he that seeketh, findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or, if he ask a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? or, if he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children; how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?” — Luke xi. 9-13.

Is this the way the All-Father has answered their prayers after telling them that if they would ask they should receive? They have prayed earnestly for the Holy Ghost, have ever been willing to take this prayer-hearing God at his word; and God has answered

their prayer by opening the *infernal regions*, and peopling the air with *quintillions* of devils, whose only object is to deceive and lead the elect to hell, our angel-friends meantime being shut up in heaven, away from earth, weeping to see us deluded by deceiving spirits, and that in answer to our most sincere and devout prayers a thousand times repeated. Is this the God our opposers worship? Is faith such a heartless cheat, baring the back thus for the Devil's rod? In Heaven's name, if God is such a knave as this idea represents, it is well to serve the Devil! We would not worship such a God if we could, and certainly could not if we would. That father who hands out myriads of scorpions and vipers to his weeping, starving children, is an angel of light compared with this treacherous knave called God, who thus deceives his trusting children.

Nay, we will go farther, and apply this argument even to the existence of his Satanic Majesty. If the Devil exists, he exists either by the will and power of God or contrary to it. If he exists by the power of God, then God is responsible for all of his actions: he permits him to act when he could prevent it. We consider ourselves responsible for all the evil there is in the world which we could prevent: so of God. But if Satan is *eternal* and *almighty*, if he exists contrary to the will of God, then God lacks either the power or wisdom to prevent the Devil deceiving and leading the world to hell. In one case, God is wicked; in the other, weak.

If the Church has been wrong in its cry of "Devil!" after every reform, it may be in this. If, on the other hand, it was right, then we are proud of our leader: he has proved himself right in every instance, and we will

trust him in this. Progress is the order of the day ; and one only needs to read his history to be convinced that he is not only a progressionist, but the author of progress. Commencing with his first work, which was to open the eyes of a pair of poor blind idiots in the garden of Eden, and teach them to know good from evil, and ending the drama with Spiritualism, we indorse every act of his. We are proud to-day to take our position beside "Michael the archangel," and not bring a "railing accusation against him." May he long live to put in motion all the latent machinery of human progress !

Reader, we can not close this chapter without saying, in all candor, your Devil is only a myth. Give the frontal brain the control of the back brain, and all the devils and satyrs will flee. They can not stand before well-developed causality and comparison.

That reader and writer may be enabled to resist all the devils growing out of a "lack of knowledge ;" that we may be enabled to see the hand of God in the wide field of human progress, and co-operate with the powers beyond in leading the people out of the devilish bondage of ignorance and superstition, we most earnestly pray.

THE CONTRAST.

CHAPTER X.

WHAT IS SPIRITUALISM?

Author describes his own Spiritualism. — Division of the Subject. — Religion of Spiritualism. — Objections to the term Religion. — Ground of Objection. — First Ideas, God a Spirit. — Second, Man a Spiritual Being. — Is Man infinite. — “Communion of Saints.” — Revelation not infallible. — Some Parts of the Bible more important than others. — “Cause and Cure of Infidelity.” — Burgeon on the Bible. — What Spiritualism denies. — Total Depravity. — Who believes it. — Chicago Fire and its Lesson. — Atonement weighed in the Balance. — Man in the Garden. — Clark on Genesis ii. 16. — Benson on Same. — Buck and the Confession of Faith on the Penalty. — “Spiritual Death” defined. — Badly mixed. — Adam and Eve in Court. — A foolish Judge. — Adam’s Dialogue with Men and Devils. — An unjust Judge. — The Principle applied to our Courts. — Conditions of vicarious Atonement. — Did Jesus die a spiritual Death? — How can Man be vicariously redeemed from Hell? — Formal Worship and our Duty. — Shall we ask the Blessing? — The Time for Worship and Sabbaths. — Vocal Prayer. — Jesus on public Prayer. — The Brotherhood of Man and its Corollaries. — Our Duty to the Family. — Endless Progression. — Man the Author of his own Heavens and Hells. — No Infallibility even among the Good. — Spiritual Philosophy and Philosophy of Spiritualism. — Source of Power. — Philosophy of Entrancement. — The inward Monitor. — No perfect Standard. — Science of making People good. — Rules of Life developed out of Conditions. — The Treatment of Sin. — Should Consumptives and Cripples be hung. — History of Spiritualism everywhere. — A. J. Davis’s Prophecy. — Rapid Advancement of the Cause. — Foretold Evils have not followed. — The present Work. — Concluding Suggestions.

It can not be expected that the question at the head of this chapter can be fully answered in one chapter,

or even in an ordinary sized volume ; yet a synopsis of Spiritualism can be so stated in a single chapter that the reader can get an idea of its general features. Its panorama can be so unrolled that the observer can get enough of a view to decide whether it is worth the time it would take to go into a more thorough analysis of its *minutiæ*.

I do not propose in this volume to be unnecessarily responsible for the general belief or practice of the great family of Spiritualists, nor are they responsible for anything I shall say or do. I can only, in my writings and actions, represent the Spiritualism of a single individual ; I shall therefore proceed to explain my own Spiritualism.

In marking the outlines of Spiritualism I shall divide it into four parts. I will consider, —

1. Its Religion.
2. Its Philosophy.
3. Its Morals.
4. Its History.

THE RELIGION OF SPIRITUALISM.

I use the term Religion, especially when I apply it to Spiritualism, in an accommodated sense. Strictly considered, it is a term I do not like ; it was invented to imply the restoration of man from the fall. It implies original sin, total depravity, and all its *et ceteras*. The term religion is a compound of two Latin words, *re* and *ligo*, signifying to *re-bind*, or bind again. As I never was unbound or cut loose from God, I need no re-binding. I never participated in any man's fall, much less that of old father Adam, therefore have no part or lot in his restoration. When, however, the

term religion is used in the sense of theology, or an effort to know and practice every duty, to arise daily to a purer and better life, Spiritualists are religious. Permit me, then, when I use the term religion in this chapter, to use it in this accommodated sense.

The first idea in my spiritual theology is that, "God is a Spirit;" or rather, that God is spirit; for I never like to put a definite or indefinite article before the three letters, G-O-D. I would like the phraseology quite as well, and it would be equally as true, if it was reversed, so as to read, "Spirit is God."

The next basic fact of Spiritualism is that man is a spiritual being, possessing all the attributes that belong to spirit anywhere. God has no attribute with which man is not endowed. Many of man's attributes and much of his power may be *latent*. Yet man has in *germ* all there is in the universe. Some do not know this, others do not believe it; yet all recognize that they have powers to-day that they could not have used one year since. The fact is, you have no power to-day that was not born with you. It has taken all these years to develop and bring into activity the amount of power you now have. Man never has reached the *Ultima Thule* in any direction: that being the case, if there is an ultimatum, he does not know it.

Does the objector urge that, though man has not circumnavigated, weighed, measured, and found the limits of his powers, he *may* yet find them? I answer, the same applies to God. How does the God power know but that some time it may find a power too much for it? When this question is answered, I will apply the answer to the spirit of man, which is the repository of infinite possibilities.

As two drops of water find an affinity for each other and intermingle, as oil blends with oil, so spirit, wherever it may be, blends with spirit. As spirits out of the body may blend with each other, and spirits in the body may blend with each other, so spirits out of the body and spirits in the body may interblend. The reader is by this time ready to understand that the first definite article in the spiritualistic faith is the doctrine of the communion of saints.

Believing that under the proper conditions spirit can communicate with spirit, in either world, they of course believe in not only a daily, but, if necessary, a *continuous* revelation from spirits. All Spiritualists must therefore believe in inspiration and revelation; yet they do not believe that any revelation is plenary or infallibly inspired. Infallible inspiration to a fallible being is an impossibility.

All revelation partakes more or less of the nature of that through which it comes; hence, until media can be absolutely perfect in their physical organisms, the manifestations given through mediumship must be more or less imperfect. Water sometimes tastes of the vessel in which it is kept. Light always partakes of the color of the glass through which it comes. The mediums who wrote the Bible were certainly inspired, yet the inspiration could not prevent the writers' manifesting their own idiosyncrasies; hence, even the Bible, though the work of inspiration, lacks a great deal of being perfect. A little reflection will convince any reasoner of the truth of this proposition.

The most profound Bible believer regards some parts of the Bible as being more sacred and important than others; but there can be no degrees in perfection.

therefore the Bible is not perfect. Who admires David's cursing psalm (the 109th) as they do the 19th or 22d? Reader, I appeal to you, if you were compelled to see some portions of the Bible annihilated, and could have your choice as to which you would yield, would you find any trouble in deciding whether to retain the Lord's Sermon or the history of the love affair between Boaz and Ruth? Which do you prefer, the Song of Solomon or the Lord's Prayer? The very fact that you could make a choice is proof that you do not regard the Bible as absolutely infallible. I now submit that you agree with the Spiritualists that the Bible, though inspired, is not an infallible revelation from God. All the inspiration of the spirit world could not spoil Paul's education or logic, nor yet make an educated man or logician of Peter. His brain was not the kind that could be inspired in that way.

Occasionally one hears the idea advanced that the Bible is infallible; but such cases are more rare than in former days. Rev. David Nelson, nearly a half century since, wrote a work entitled "the Cause and Cure of Infidelity"—a work, by the way, which, I think, has caused more infidelity than it ever cured; in that he states that "every sentence and every *part* of a sentence of the Bible is plenary inspired and infallibly true."

Rev. Mr. Burgon, a later writer, says, "The Bible is none other than *the voice of Him* that sitteth upon the throne! Every book of it, every chapter of it, every word of it, every syllable of it, *every letter of it* [Good Heavens! won't the man permit us to drop out just one letter?] is the direct utterance of the Most High! The Bible is none other than the word of

God — not some part of it more, some part of it less, but all alike, — the utterance of Him who sitteth upon the throne — absolute, faultless, unerring, supreme.”

The Rev. who penned the above doubtlessly would prize the obscene story of Onan, or Ezekiel's bread recipe, as highly as he would the “Golden Rule,” or the first and greatest commandment. It is only occasionally that such fossils are met with. There are but few now who even think they believe in the absolute perfection of the Bible. A great majority of the most devout Christians now recognize that the character of each biblical writer is indicated in his writings. Thus any one who would read the Song of Solomon would need no statement as to the number of his wives and concubines for intelligent readers could not help but know that the number would only be limited by his ability to obtain them.

Spiritualism in its dogmas is not purely affirmative; it denies as well. Believing as it does that man is the offspring of the Most High, — that spirit sprang from spirit, — it necessarily denies the old church doctrine of original sin and consequent total depravity. It knows no one so low, morally or intellectually, but that there is a divinity within him or her which will some time assert itself. I am by this subject as I am by that of inspiration; I doubt whether one who allows himself to think on it can differ with Spiritualists, much less argue an opposite side of the question. It is possible that an individual, while reading *Buck's Theological Dictionary*, may for the moment conclude that man is so totally depraved that he can not do a good act, speak a good word, or think a good thought, unless especially aided by power from on high; but

such belief can only last a few seconds after the volume is laid aside.

No mother ever yet pointed to her own unconverted child as a specimen of total depravity. No theologian will point to his own son, however wicked he may be, and say, "There is no good in him." Such calamities as the fire that consumed Chicago in 1871 afford an unanswerable argument against the dogma. That terrible calamity developed the fact that all — even theater actors, to whom the ministry had ever pointed as especial arguments in favor of the necessity of men and women being made better — had divine natures, which as spontaneously went out in words and deeds in behalf of the suffering, as was manifest in any church in the land. The late James Fisk, whom almost every editor and preacher in the land had denounced as being a sinner above all others, had a noble quality, which in this instance responded to the prayers of sufferers in a ten thousand dollar check. When such men as A. T. Stewart, of New York, count out fifty thousand dollars to help the sufferers of a single calamity, and railroad kings grant the free and unlimited use of their roads to two hundred thousand sufferers, I can not for one moment admit that they are totally depraved. Even the Heathen Chinese, in the "Golden State," who have suffered more from the depravity of Christians than Christians ever have from heathens, magnanimously stepped forward and contributed thirteen thousand dollars to relieve the sufferings of their Christian brethren.

Spiritualism, rejecting in toto the idea of the fall of man, has no use for an atonement. It does not believe that man has ever been separated from God,

therefore has no need to be made at one with him. Spiritualists generally regard the doctrine of the atonement not only as untrue, but as pernicious in its tendencies. Could they believe in an atonement at all, they could not believe in one based on vicarious suffering. It is said by Christians that Jesus suffered the penalty due for man's transgression, and in that made man at one with God, that is, placed him where he was before the fall. I know of no better way to explain this than to look after the results of the fall, as explained by Christians, and then apply Jesus' suffering and the atonement, and see the result.

Man, according to the theories which see so much evil in Spiritualism, was made of dust, about six thousand years since, and placed in a garden, where everything was beautiful and good except one tree, that may have been both beautiful to the eye and pleasant to the taste; yet there was either something intrinsically poison in the fruit, or man for eating it was arbitrarily condemned. At least man was solemnly warned against eating the fruit, which warning he did not heed. The result is, according to orthodoxy, death, spiritual, temporal, and eternal death. Dr. Clarke says, —

“Thou shalt surely die. Moth tamuth; literally, a death thou shalt die; or dying thou shalt die. Thou shalt not only die spiritually, by losing the life of God, but from that moment thou shalt become mortal.” — *Clarke's Com. on Gen. ii. 16.*

“The death here threatened is evidently to be considered as opposed to the life (or lives; rather) which God has bestowed on him. This was not only the natural life of his body, in its union with his soul, but

the *spiritual life of his soul* in its union with God, and the eternal life of both. The threatening then implies, Thou shalt not only lose all the happiness thou hast, either in possession or in prospect, and be liable to the death of the body, and all the miseries which precede and accompany it, but thou shalt lose thy spiritual life and become dead to God — dead to God and things divine, and shalt even *forfeit thy title to immortality*, and be liable to death eternal, and all this *in the day thou eatest thereof.*” — *Benson's Com.*

“*The covenant of works* was made with Adam; the condition of which was his perseverance during the whole time of his probation. The reward annexed to his obedience was the continuance of him and his posterity in such perfect holiness and felicity as he then had, while upon earth, and an everlasting life with God hereafter. The *penalty* threatened for the breach of the commandment was condemnation, terminating in death, temporal, spiritual, and eternal.” — *Buck's Theological Dictionary, under “Covenant of Works.”*

The Westminster Confession of Faith, pp. 45, 46, says, —

“Every sin, both original and eternal, being a transgression of the righteous law of God, and contrary thereunto, doth in its own nature bring guilt upon the sinner, whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God and curse of the law, and so made subject to death, with miseries, spiritual, temporal, and eternal.”

Spiritual death they have defined to be a continuation in sin, a loss of all desire to do good, or, in other words, *total depravity*. This subject I have considered in a former part of this chapter; yet I should

feel that I had neglected my duty were I not to devote a few more words to it, considering it in the light of a penalty for the Adamic sin.

The system of religion styling itself Orthodoxy, though inconsistent on many points, rather overdoes itself on this. A loss of the desire to do good, which is defined to be spiritual death, and hence a part of the penalty of the Adamic law, must precede, and not follow, the transgression. It would puzzle even a doctor of divinity to tell how a man could willfully and deliberately transgress a law until he had lost the desire to obey! The consent of the mind must be obtained before the body would voluntarily act in that direction. Hence Adam must have lost the desire to obey while he was pure and holy, before he transgressed; that being the case, spiritual death was the *cause*, and not the penalty, of the Adamic sin.

Spiritual death is defined to be simply a state of depravity, or being under the dominion of sin.

Buck says, —

“Spiritual death is that awful state of ignorance, insensibility, and disobedience, which mankind are in by nature, and which excludes them from the favor and enjoyment of God.” — *Theological Dictionary*.

Permit me for a moment to suppose this to be a truth, and the whole allegory of the transgression in the Garden of Eden to be a literal fact. The circumstance would run something like this: “Adam and Eve transgressed, and are arraigned for trial, and called into court. After a full confession of their guilt the Judge proceeds to pronounce the penalty, that is, that they shall be sinners, — greater sinners, — totally depraved. That is as if a judge should say to a horse

thief, "From your confession, I perceive that you have stolen a horse. I pronounce as a penalty that you shall be a horse thief." Should the idea suggest itself to the culprit that horse stealing was the *crime*, and not the penalty, the judge would proceed to explain. "Sir, I perceive that you do not understand this penalty. I do not mean that it shall always remain a fact that you have stolen a horse, for that fact may, by a peculiar process, be blotted out; but I do mean that you shall continue to steal horses. You shall be so totally given up to kleptomania that you will find it utterly impossible to resist the impulse to steal." Reader, what would you think of such an explanation of the penalty of horse stealing? How foolish does the orthodox explanation make the God of the Bible, when it makes depravity the result of sin!

The absurdity of this has not yet reached its climax. Temporal or physical death, we are informed, is another portion of the penalty of Adam's sin. Suppose, according to this sentiment, that Adam and Eve go on for nearly nine hundred years, *enjoying* depravity, which is the penalty of depravity; at the end of that time old father Adam finds that his locks have turned as white as the driven snow, his hearing has grown thick, his eyes dim, his limbs paralyzed, and his breath short. Something is wrong; he does not know what it is, but for some cause his body refuses to perform its functions. His sons and daughters gather around his bed and make the announcement, "Father, you are dying!" "What, dying!" says the old man. "Yes, physically dying." "Why is this?" inquires the expiring Adam. "Why," responds the son, "don't you remember the circumstance of eating the forbid-

den fruit? The penalty was, 'In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.'" "I well remember that," says the dying man, "but I have paid the penalty for that sin. I died a spiritual death in the very day I transgressed." "But," responds the son, "you ought to have had a spiritual birth; it would have enabled you to have understood that the law *meant* that you should have died two kinds of death for that sin." The poor, dying man has only strength left to say, "Why did not the law express its meaning in unmistakable language?" and expires.

Every rational creature will join with him and say, "Adam, your complaints are just. This God is a tyrant in inflicting a penalty not mentioned in the law. If God meant you should die more than once, he should have said so."

Poor Adam's spirit leaves the body, hoping that with him this is the last of the consequences of having eaten the forbidden fruit; but he hardly finds himself in the world of spirits, ere devils gather around him to drag him down to dark despair. They take him to the sulphurous regions, and as they unbar the door, and let the flames and smoke burst into his face, he inquires the meaning of this. He is answered, "This is death—eternal death." "And must I suffer this?" inquires Adam; "and for what?" He is again informed of his sin in Eden. Adam expostulates with the powers that be, pleading that he has already twice suffered the penalty for that sin; but all to no purpose. He is answered, "God's ways are not as your ways," and plunged into a gulf of dark despair, to suffer, gnash his teeth, and gnaw his white-hot chains to all eternity.

Suppose our courts were to act on the principle that orthodoxy represents God as adopting, with reference to man's sin. The law says the penalty for *petty larceny* shall be confinement in the county jail for a period of time not exceeding thirty days. Neighbor A., having no money, and being hungry, steals a loaf of bread. He is caught, tried, found guilty, and sentenced to the jail. After remaining there the time allotted by the law, the proper officer comes to take him out. As A. is being conducted out of the jail, he says, "Well, I have violated your law and paid the penalty." "O, no," says the officer, "we are not done with you yet. You must now go to the state's prison, and be confined to hard labor for five years." "What! Imprison me? and for what?" says A. "For stealing a loaf of bread," responds the officer. "But the law does not say so," says A. "It means it," is the reply. And poor A. is sent to the state's prison.

At the end of five years the proper officer again approaches A., to release him. "There," says A., "I have broken your law, and paid two penalties for it; are you now done with me?" "No, sir," says the officer; "you must now be hanged by the neck, until you are dead." A., startled and amazed, asks what he is to be hanged for? He is again referred to the loaf of bread, and told that the penalty for *petty larceny*, when rightly interpreted, means all that has been and is to be inflicted on him. Now I ask, in all candor, would not every rational being in the world rebel at such a procedure? Yet these are the lessons orthodoxy teaches us of God.

Am I answered that this is not a full statement;

that though we do believe in this moral, temporal, and eternal death, we believe, also, in the *vicarious* suffering of Jesus, which brings man out, if he will, from under all these penalties! Is that 'so?

The meaning of the word *vicarious*, is one suffering the penalty of the law instead of another. No one believes that the vicarious sufferings of Jesus entirely relieves the sinner from the consequence of sin. The most that is claimed is, that it reclaims and brings out from under spiritual and physical death, and saves from the other third of the penalty, which is eternal death, or rather eternal suffering. Thus, in order for Jesus to redeem man from spiritual death, or total depravity, he must endure the same, and have a spiritual resurrection, or be converted. Did Jesus pass through this? If not, vicarious suffering fails at the start, as Jesus did not endure it. If he did, "the wages of sin is death," and hence Jesus will have all he can do to die for his own sins, and not for those of Adam or the world. Supposing, however, that the vicarious sufferings of Jesus had redeemed man from spiritual death, his work is even then only one third done. Now man is to be redeemed from physical death: that is to be done, we are told, by Jesus' experiencing the same on the cross, and rising from the dead. Admitting all this to be accomplished, the worst is still to come. Man is to be vicariously redeemed from an eternal hell. This of course can be done in no other way than by Jesus suffering the same. Thus, instead of an atonement, the logical sequence of orthodoxy is, that Christ and the whole human family must endure eternal torture in a lake of fire and brimstone.

The foregoing, with many other similar reasons, together with an entire absence of proof of the fall of man and the atonement, are sufficient reasons for the Spiritualists' denials of the essentials of orthodoxy.

Among the orthodox doctrines that Spiritualism denies, is its whole system of formal or ceremonial worship. Some even go so far as to think that if the whole system of forms and ceremonies was abolished, "the world would be the better for it." Spiritualists generally conceive that if there was not so much importance attached to the baptisms, the eucharist, and other church ordinances, there would be more room to attach importance to real spiritual and intellectual development; that if people did not study forms so much, they would study *duties* more; that it is more our duty to see that widows and orphans are cared for, that the wants of the sick are relieved, than that certain hours are set apart to pray, or observe as holy time.

Many evangelical Christians ask a blessing or return thanks every time they sit down to their meals. Spiritualists believe that good, healthy food, taken in proper quantities and at proper times, is a blessing to the partaker, without any words being said over it. Improper food, or food taken in improper quantities, or at improper hours, can not be sanctified to the use of those who partake. The partaking of it is a curse. No God would dare to bless it. It would be setting an example which would ruin the world with dyspepsia, liver complaint, and gout. The fact that orthodox Christians are as likely to be troubled with all these complaints as are infidels and Spiritualists, proves their blessings to be only "as sounding brass or tinkling cymbal."

Spiritualists can not see why a formal blessing should be asked any more over each meal, than over every drink of water or every apple or nut eaten between meals; or why people should not, upon the same principle, go through the same ceremony at their bedside, their chopping, blacksmithing, or dish-washing. The fact is, while it is always proper to be reverential to all there is above and beyond us; and aspiring toward the good, the pure, and the beautiful, these foolish stated ceremonies, while they clothe one with the appearance or form of godliness, so effectually clip the wings of true devotion, that they destroy the power thereof. Any forms or ceremonies that compel their adherents to bow to them for fashion's sake, must more or less stultify the natural outgushing of the same. It must be confessed that often while the lips are saying prayers or singing praises the heart is on business, or somewhere else, as far from the service of the lips as the poles are from each other.

Spiritualists believe the proper time to eat is when one is hungry, the proper time to rest or *sabbatize* is when one is tired; so the proper time to pray is when the spirit of prayer comes, and at no other time. Then pray, whether in an audience chamber, a machine shop, or a brick yard. Withdraw your person from the crowd if convenient; if not, retire into your soul's secret closet, and there commune with the higher spiritual life. As prayer is purely an aspiration, no vocal words need, as a general thing, be used. If prayer is for God's benefit, that he may know and be willing to redress our wants, certainly, God being spirit, reads our spirit and understands our requests without our framing them into words. Spiritualists

generally think that the power we call God has an understanding of its business, therefore do not believe, to any great extent, in dictating what it shall and shall not do.

A prayer is a plea made ; but a plea for Almighty God to do something, implies that the one making the plea either fears that God would neglect his duty, or that he wants something that God could not bestow without going outside of his duty. In one instance prayer implies that God is derelict in his duty, in the other that God is wanted to do something more than justice. Spiritualists do not generally believe that man could at present control matters very much by prayer, if he would ; nor do they believe that the machinery of the universe would run much more smoothly if men controlled it all by their prayers.

Prayer before an audience is, as Jesus said, made to be heard of men. His words are, —

“ And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are : for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward.

“ But thou when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret ; and thy Father which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly.” (Matt. vi. 5, 6.)

For one, I am perfectly willing that those who regard Jesus as one third of the Infallible Deity, may violate these words : I must obey them. When I pray before an audience, let it be understood I am like others : I pray to be heard of men. Prayer is the birth pangs of new desires, new aspirations, new in-

spirations; the proper place for it is in the secret closet. When the spirit of prayer comes, be sure it is the precursor of something good. Go to your secret closet in the dark if possible, shut everything external away from you, then open your heart, your aspirations, your soul. Under these circumstances the angel within you and angels without can come nearer together, and soul will commune with souls more perfectly than under other conditions.

Spiritualism, believing as it does that man is a spiritual being, and that all sprang from the fountain of spirit called God, can not believe otherwise than in the brotherhood of man, however far back we may be compelled to find the evidence of that brotherhood: all are streams from the same great fountain. Believing this doctrine, of course they can not believe in any practice, nor consistently practice any belief that would be contrary to these sentiments. Lawsuits, quarrels, fights, slavery, war, or neighbor lying to or cheating neighbor, is not brotherly. Spiritualists can but be opposed to such things. This doctrine of brotherhood should, when carried to its legitimate extent, go farther than to teach us what we should *not* do to each other: it should teach us positive duties to each other. If all men and women are my brothers and sisters, then I am under obligation to do the duty of a brother by all,— to help the weak and unfortunate, to relieve the suffering, and as far as in me lies, to see that each has justice in all things. Men are sometimes inclined to trample on each other. Reader, do you realize that the crushed and the one who crushes are both your brothers? Have you no duties in such cases? That woman in the brothel,

whom you call fallen, is your sister, as much so as the most pious lady on earth. One of our elder brothers, Jesus, said to one such, "Neither do I condemn thee: go and sin no more." Will you consider her a sister, and say the same? You have duties here. Once more. When about to lead a young man into a gambling hell or a drinking saloon, or a young woman into a house of assignation, think this is my brother or sister. I am, as a stronger brother, bound in honor for his or her *protection* — not destruction; such thoughts should turn you from your evil purpose.

In passing judgment upon those called sinners, try to think of such as brothers and sisters, — weak, sickly brothers and sisters, — "flesh of your flesh, and bone of your bone." More than all, spirit of your spirit — of God's spirit. Consider yourself, least you should also be tempted.

"This life is a play, where each human heart,
 To make the *denouement*, must act out its part.
 If all men, like sheep, would follow one way,
 Then life would indeed be a very poor play.
 'Tis a law of our being, most pointedly shown,
 That each soul must live out a life of his own.
 Ah! be not too rash to judge of another,
 But ever remember that man is your brother.
 God made the owl see where man's sight is dim,
 And the light that guides you may be darkness to him!
 'Tis a great truth to learn, — a prize if you win it, —
 There's room in the world for all that is in it."

Following the thought of the brotherhood of man, in Spiritualism is that of endless progression. There are very few outside of the ranks of Spiritualists who believe this doctrine, and those who do are hardly able to tell why, much less to demonstrate the ground-

work of that faith. According to Spiritualism, man enters the next world just where he leaves this, surrounded by the conditions that he has made for himself by his words and acts in this world, and then in the other world goes on making his own misery or happiness by his conduct.

Man is now, and will eternally be, what he makes himself. Heaven and hell are both latently within every one. God will not go out of his way to put any one into happiness or misery. The fuel, the kindling-wood, and the match that lights the fires of hell, are within every one; and if ever the fires of hell are ignited, the sinner himself will do the incendiary work, and take the consequences.

Spiritualism does not allow that any one, even in heaven, is infallible. Those called good can, in the spirit world as in this, make mistakes; and the bad are not wholly bad. There is no absolute perfection in the universe: man always has, and ever will improve. Here it may be well to close the argument on the religion of Spiritualism. Should I devote as much time to each department of this chapter as I have to this, it would swell itself to a volume. I now pass to a consideration of the

PHILOSOPHY OF SPIRITUALISM.

Two widely different things are often sadly confounded: one is the Philosophy of Spiritualism, the other is the Spiritual Philosophy. By the latter phrase, Spiritualists mean the general laws or principles taught in or drawn out of Spiritualism. By the former, they mean the general laws or principles by which the various spiritual phenomena are produced.

Permit me first, in this division of the subject, to speak of general spirit intercourse. All volition or power inheres in spirit. I move the pen with which I now write, by moving the bones of my hand ; these bones are moved by the muscle, the muscle is moved by the blood, the blood is driven by the electric currents which pass from the brain through the nerves ; these currents are set in motion by the spirit. Thus the writing of this book, and in fact every motion of the hand, foot, or head, is a physical manifestation of spirit-power. Spirit can operate on nothing but spirit, or that which is next to it, which is electricity. When spirits move tables or chairs, or rap out answers to questions, they use only natural powers ; they get control of the electrical currents there are in the room or around the table, and through them move ponderable substances.

Every nerve is a battery, through which spirit drives the electric current. Brain is but a congress of nerves, and therefore a stronger battery. Through these brain and nerve forces spirits can sometimes approach and move ponderable substances.

The philosophy of entrancement is much the same. The brain is a battery through which spirits, when they get it well charged, can approach mortals, and hand their thoughts to the external world. The power of mediumship is more the power to hold still and submit to extraneous influences, than anything else. Spirit control is the same, whether effected by a spirit out of the body or in the body. In another chapter the reader will find that I have more fully discussed the philosophy of Spiritualism, explaining the necessity for darkness in order to produce certain

manifestations; also, I have offered a few thoughts on the general conditions of spirit manifestations. I now pass to consider

THE MORALS OF SPIRITUALISM.

There is no question on which there exists greater differences of opinion than on this. It is true that Spiritualism, to some extent, ignores old traditions, authorities, and standards. It is also true that old ideas of morality, unless they have something more than age to recommend them, are below par among some of the Spiritualists. This is enough to cause certain persons, who borrow their ideas of right from the past, to see all the evidence that could possibly be required to prove that Spiritualism is leading the people away from virtue's paths. There are people in the world who could not be convinced that ancient landmarks can be departed from without ignoring every rule of right, and having a general chaos ensue. With others, there seems an actual necessity of departing from the old, as it has, after eighteen centuries of experience and effort, failed to make moral men and women of even its own adherents. Spiritualists have, many of them, noted the slavery, war, drunkenness, murder, burglary, and licentiousness yet in the world, and often practiced under the very steeples of the churches, and sometimes by ministers who occupy the pulpits. This occasionally causes one to say, as many more think, There is a radical wrong somewhere, Christianity, as a system, has failed to make the world good. Thus investigation has led them to conclude that Christianity has too nearly ignored or rejected the inward monitor; that if people had been looking

within more, instead of to outside standards of right, and had striven to more thoroughly cultivate the acquaintance of the internal monitor, and developed good from within, working it out into every day practice, the world would to-day have been nearer heaven. Hence Spiritualism, if it has not already done so, must in a measure reject outside authorities with regard to right and wrong. In fact, until man is absolutely perfect, there can be no universal and infallible standard of right and wrong. It is acknowledged on all hands that man is more or less the creature of circumstances. Thousands of the Christians to-day, who denounce others for not looking through their glasses, owe all their Christianity to the circumstance of their having been born and reared at the time and place, and under the circumstances that have in turn been regarded as blessings or curses. Had they been born in a Mohammedan country, and educated by Mohammedan parents and teachers, they would probably denounce "Christian dogs" as infidels, worthy of nothing better than a Mohammedan hell. When it is understood that all are not born and reared under the same circumstances, it will be understood that all can not be tried by the same standard. I doubt whether any one, after a little reflection, would hold an idiot as thoroughly responsible for an infringement on the rights of others as they would one of greater capacity. We are all responsible in proportion to our capacity and development. This being the case, when a man kills another, the blame, if there be any, lies back of the murderer: it goes at least as far back as the cause that made him such. Our courts are beginning to recognize this idea: scarcely a murderer is tried but

an effort is made, often with success, to prove him insane. Every child has a right to demand of society a birth and rearing beyond that of a murderer: conditions that will preclude the possibility of murder. The crimes of the present generation point to the sins of the past, and those to the past, and so *ad infinitum*.

Believing this, Spiritualists generally doubt whether the world can be reformed by *precepts*. They argue that men now know better than they can do. Spiritualists are therefore trying to develop a philosophy, the carrying out of which will as naturally make man better as the spring showers and sun will quicken vegetation into germination. Spiritualists claim that a child, begotten by the proper parents (those whose union should produce children), and under proper conditions, can not possibly be as bad as one begotten and born under other conditions. Many of them claim that if a child is properly generated and reared, he needs no regeneration. A person raised in filth and on improper food can not, out of that, develop as pure rules of life, nor a practice of as pure precepts, as one well washed, who lives in the right kind of a house, breathes the right kind of air, sleeps in the right kind of beds, wears the right kind of clothing, and eats food calculated to develop the right kind of brain and muscle. Therefore, instead of denouncing sin and sinners, they are going to work to eradicate sin and *cure* sinners. Moral and mental disease should be made a *study*, and treated in a manner analogous to the treatment of physical disease. All who have followed me thus far, are prepared to hear me say, that our courts are no more justifiable in hanging

a murderer than they would be in hanging a consumptive, hunchback, or paralytic.

If the foregoing argument is true, no book standard of right and wrong can be given, any more than a book should regulate how often the heart should beat, or how often its readers should sneeze or cough, or how many fits of ague he should have, and by what intervals they should be separated. One will take cold more frequently than another, in spite of all the books in the world ; so the one born a kleptomaniac will steal more frequently than the one having no temptation in that direction. Books can not stop it.

HISTORY OF SPIRITUALISM.

The reader will not understand from the above heading that it is my design to go into the *minutiae* of the history of the Spiritual movement. To do that would require a volume as large as Webster's large dictionary ; besides, it is at this stage of its development quite an unnecessary work. The history of Spiritualism besides, in part at least, written in books, is so perfectly engraved on the minds of the readers of this volume, that but little need be said. The every-day occurrences of the spiritual phenomena, in almost every department of the globe, has given it such a wide-spread notoriety, that enough of its history is within easy reach of every one to answer the purpose of this book.

Modern spirit manifestations came into the world unsought and unheralded, except by A. J. Davis, the Poughkeepsie seer. As much as four years before the "Rochester knockings," he was laughed at and regarded as insane, for publishing that the spirit world

and this world would soon come in communication with each other. In fulfillment of Mr. Davis's prophecy, Spiritualism came undesired and unwelcomed. With no preacher or press to advocate its claims, it immediately began to make converts, gathering among its adherents persons of every rank and station in life. Editors, ministers, lawyers, doctors, actors on the stage, in short, men from every rank and station in life, fell before this mighty power. Nothing has stayed or even retarded the onward march of this new conqueror of the world. It has not only proved its right to life by living and thriving through all opposition, but it has questioned the right of hoary-headed errors to longer stay the march of mind. The doctrines that have been examined in this chapter have slunk away before Spiritualism, as bats and owls retire before the rising sun.

Although Spiritualism has in some way interwoven itself into the every-day reading, thoughts and life of the great majority of the Christian world, besides making between ten and fifteen millions of out-and-out converts; and although it has instilled itself into about all the literature, and almost everything else of the age, the evils that were prophesied by ministers and editors as sure to follow, have in no case ensued. Those who embrace the new religion, instead of becoming the lawless horde of religious and spiritual adventurers, that some had prophesied as being the inevitable result, settled down, attending to their own business, with an honor, integrity, and ability often excelling their evangelical neighbors.

Spiritual halls are now being built, lyceums founded, societies incorporated, Young People's Spiritual

associations organized, libraries and reading-rooms opened, and in every instance well patronized. Thus Spiritualism is now, as never before, compelling the world to *feel* and acknowledge its power. With this increase of converts and societies, there is a commensurate increase of knowledge and zeal among older Spiritualists. Old societies that had measurably become "weary in well doing," are reorganizing and buckling on the harness anew. New and talented speakers are being called into the field, and mediums for every form of manifestation are being faster and more perfectly developed than ever before. Thus is Spiritualism rapidly writing its own history in the hearts and heads of the people. More perfectly and indelibly does Spiritualism do its own history making than could possibly be told by my poor pen, were I to devote volumes to the elucidation of the subject.

Patient reader, with this in some respects brief, and in others prolix outline of what Spiritualism is, I close this statement, hoping that you have so fallen in love with what has been described as Spiritualism, as to be induced to follow me through the remainder of this volume.

CHAPTER XI.

COMPARATIVE EVIDENCE OF THE BIBLE AND SPIRITUALISM.

No necessary Antagonism. — Christian Arguments used for Spiritualism. — Nicodemus's Argument. — The Works of Jesus and Mediums compared. — Did Jesus raise the Dead? — Modern Resurrections. — Testimony of Daily Papers. — A man resuscitated after having been buried ten Months. — Mrs. Lancaster resurrected. — Resurrection of Rev. William Tennent. — Jesus did not always succeed. — The healing at Bethesda only one of a thousand. — Why did he not heal others? — The Pentecostal Evidences considered. — Same in Spiritualism. — Suicidal Argument against Spiritualism. — Silly Spiritualism and the Bible compared. — Jesus eating Fish and Spirits eating Apples. — "Devils and Darkness" of Bible Times. — Biblical Evidence not conclusive. — Second-hand Evidence. — Ignorance of the People. — The Difference now. — Reporters on the Ground, witnesses in Court, etc. etc. Bible Evidences through bad Hands. — Testimony of Lardner, Casaubon, Selmer, *et al.* — Lying for the glory of God. — Testimony of eminent Christians. — Internal Evidences. — Abraham chasing his Enemies four hundred Years into the Future. — An old Boy. — That flock of Quails. — Samson jawing the Philistines. — Those fiery-tailed Foxes. — Can the Bible stand before its own Guns — Did Samuel, Moses, and Elijah come back? — Bible can not be true and Spiritualism false. — Living Witnesses. — The Walls of Jericho. — A Dialogue.

THOSE who oppose the inauguration of the Spiritual dispensation, do not seem to have ever been able to comprehend that a person could believe both the Bible and Spiritualism. Let a person announce himself a Spiritualist, and he is at once set down by its opposers as having totally rejected the Bible. Those acquainted with the opposition can not fail to have observed that in lectures, books, and essays against Spiritualism there has ever been an effort to create the impression that one embracing Spiritualism must

necessarily have rejected the Bible. While such is not the case, I must confess that if I could not receive the truths and divinity of both — if I should be compelled to yield one or the other, the evidence of the truth and divinity of the Bible does not impress me as being so forcible as that of Spiritualism.

Individually I had much rather be permitted to choose the good of each, without any reference to the other. I can not see why Spiritualism should necessarily be evil or false because the Bible is good and true, nor can I understand how or why a reception of the truths of Spiritualism should involve a rejection of those taught in the Bible. Now, without any disparagement to the Bible or its contents, I propose to gratify the opposers of Spiritualism by a brief comparison of the evidences of the two systems. I know of no better way to commence this comparison than with the following proposition, viz. :—

**THE ARGUMENTS USED IN FAVOR OF THE BIBLE
APPLY WITH ALL THEIR FORCE TO MODERN SPIRITUALISM.**

One of the first and most general arguments used in favor of the Bible and its chief hero, is that of Nicodemus, in John iii. 2. “Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God : for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him.” It is claimed that Nicodemus was a member of the Jewish Sanhedrim, and probably went as a representative of that body. He did not say *I* think, or *I* know, but *we* know that thou art a teacher come from God, etc. Thus he expresses either the faith of the Jewish senate, whose committee he was, or that of

the nation. The argument is that Jesus' miracles were sufficient to call out the universal and unequivocal confession that he was a divinely sent teacher. If the Jews, his bitterest enemies, acknowledged his miracles, they must have occurred, and if they did occur, they prove the divinity of the religious system they were wrought to maintain. Thus by a "short method" is the Christian system lumped off, and proved of divine origin.

Now, I do not know of a Spiritualist who objects to this first argument for Christianity. We are perfectly willing it shall stand; all we ask is, that if the same reasons be found for believing in Spiritualism, they have the same weight in proving its divinity. Permit me to compare the works of Jesus and the early Christians with those of modern spirit mediums. The clearest statement of Jesus' works is made by himself in Matt. xi. 5: "The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them. And blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me."

These were the wonderful works by which Jesus was proved, according to Nicodemus's statement, to have come from God; and I myself think they are full proof of the God power. I submit, that if the logic of Jesus was good, and he presented this as a proof of the divinity of his mission, it would prove as much for any other person doing the same work. I myself have seen mediums do all that Jesus claims to have done, with the exception of raising the dead; and I have known of that being done in the same sense that Jesus did it. No Jesus, nor any other per

son, ever raised an absolutely dead person to life. As well talk of organizing a dozen bacon hams into the form of a human body, and making them live. Persons have gone into a cataleptic state, and been supposed to be dead, and have been reanimated. It not unfrequently occurs that doctors pronounce persons dead who are not dead. Certificates of burial are granted for persons who outlived those who signed them. The writer of this volume was once measured for a coffin; he also has a brother who has been pronounced dead at four different periods of his life. Should any one undertake to bury him now, after being four times scientifically dead, they would find a hard corpse to handle.

The maid that orthodoxy accuses Jesus of raising from the dead, had not been dead. At least, Jesus said of her, "She is not dead, but sleepeth." (Luke viii. 51.) Of Lazarus, Jesus said, "This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God." (John xi. 4.) Lazarus was supposed to be dead and entombed, it is true, so was a lady in Quincy, Ill., but she astonished the multitude by coming out of the tomb. The daily papers report that a lady was sent from Chicago, Ill., to Rochester, N. Y., for burial, but when she got there was resuscitated, and returned to her home. J. H. Weaver, an undertaker in Baltimore, Md., informed me that in removing dead bodies he had found several that had evidently come to life and struggled to get out of their coffins.

I have to-day clipped the following from the Cincinnati Commercial of February 20, 1872:—

"The Oshkosh Times says, Mr. Fuss, proprietor of the Fuss House, at Menasha, Wisconsin, was thought

to have died on the 8th inst., and preparations were made for the burial. The funeral was postponed until the 11th, when the friends of the deceased gathered to the last rites. Just before the coffin was closed some of the friends noticed that the supposed corpse was perspiring quite freely. A physician was called in, who proceeded to bleed the man, when the blood flowed, and he soon came too and recognized the anxious mourners. He is now doing well, and in a fair way of recovery."

The following is from the Cincinnati Gazette of March 5, 1872:—

"A man was found at Hall's Corners, Westchester County, N. Y., on Monday night, apparently frozen to death. The body was taken to Tarrytown, and the coroner from Hastings held an inquest over it, a verdict being rendered accordingly. The body was placed in a coffin, and started for Sleepy Hollow Cemetery. As the coffin was about to be lowered into the grave, a noise proceeded from it, causing the interment to be delayed long enough to discover that the man was alive. Last night the supposed corpse was sitting by the fire at the Farrington Depot, reflecting on things earthly. His name has not been ascertained."

Professor S. B. Britton, on page 471-2 of "Man and his Relations" (a work that every thinker should study), relates the history of the burial and resurrection of a man who was, by artificial means, thrown into a cataleptic state. The man, after being buried *ten months*, and having a crop of barley raised on his grave, was restored to life. This case is well authenticated; so are numerous others. I submit that they

border as much on the miraculous as any recorded in the Bible. Permit me to give the history of two cases, as great, at least, as the resurrection of Lazarus.

Mr. Britton says, "Some time since the writer received from E. G. Fuller, Esq., a gentleman of unquestioned intelligence and veracity, — whose residence is in Cold Water, Mich., — the main facts of a case of peculiar interest, and which will afford a striking illustration of my subject. Columbia Lancaster, a lawyer, who formerly lived in Centreville, St. Joseph's County, Mich., removed, in the autumn of 1840, to Missouri, with a view to going to Oregon, in the spring of 1841. He accordingly started, and pursued his course to the distance of several days' journey beyond Fort Laramie, when his wife, who accompanied him, became seriously ill. He waited a day or two, in the hope that Mrs. L. would speedily recover. But her illness continued, and he directed the rest of the company — except one man who remained to assist him in the care of his wife — to proceed on their way, himself designing to follow them as soon as the patient was sufficiently recovered, or to return should she be unable to continue the journey.

"But Mrs. Lancaster grew worse, and the man who remained with Mr. Lancaster and his lady, was sent back to Fort Laramie for medicines. He had been gone but a short time when the patient expired. Mr. Lancaster remained there with the form of his fair companion, until the man came back from the Fort. On his return he was accompanied by two Indians, who were strongly attached to Mrs. Lancaster, on account of her previous kindness to them. The Indians

formed a litter, by placing blankets and other suitable articles on poles. On this rude carriage the body was placed, and the Indians conveyed it some three hundred miles through the wilderness, fording streams, and surmounting whatever obstacles were in the way. On arriving at Fort Laramie, preparations were made for the funeral; but before the remains were finally disposed of, and *eight days after Mrs. Lancaster was supposed to have died, the body exhibited signs of returning life, and by degrees was fully restored!* When Mrs. Lancaster had so far recovered as to be able to converse, she assured her friends that she was all the while perfectly conscious of everything that occurred, and she even related the conversation and several incidents that transpired during the journey."

The same author, on pages 479 and 480, has the following: "The case of Rev. William Tennent, of New Jersey, a clergyman of the Presbyterian branch of the church, is one of the most remarkable on record. While conversing with his brother in Latin respecting the state of the soul, and his prospects in the life to come, he expressed doubts concerning his future happiness. Just at that moment he suddenly lost the power of speech and voluntary motion: he was apparently insensible, and his friends believed that the spirit had vacated its earthly tabernacle. Arrangements were accordingly made for the appropriate solemnities; but his physician, who was also a warm personal friend, was not satisfied, and at his request the funeral rites were delayed. Three days passed; the eyes were rayless, the lips discolored, and the body cold and stiff. The brother insisted that the remains should be entombed. The critical hour at length arrived, the

people had assembled, and the occasion was about to be solemnized by appropriate ceremonies, when the whole company were startled by a fearful groan! The eyes were opened for a moment but closed again, and the form remained silent and motionless for an hour. Again a heavy groan proceeded from the body, and the eyes were opened; but in an instant all signs of returning animation had vanished.

“After another interval of an hour, life and consciousness, with the power of voluntary motion, were measurably restored. After his restoration, it was found that Mr. Tennent had lost all recollection of his former life, and the results of his education and experience were wholly obliterated from his mind. He was obliged to learn the alphabet of his vernacular. His memory at length returned, and with it his former mental possessions; but his doubts respecting a future life were all dissipated for ever. During his absence from the body he was intromitted to the heavens, and, like Paul, heard and saw things unutterable. The trances and visions of the ancient prophets and apostles were intrinsically no more remarkable than this experience of Mr. Tennent.”

While on this subject, it may not be amiss to add that Victoria C. Woodhull relates, and actually believes, that her son was dead, and she, by her mediumistic power, restored him to life.

It is true that mediums do not always succeed in their undertakings: neither did Jesus. When they were offended at Jesus in his own country, where he was the *best* known, and his power the *best* understood, he answered, “A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country, and his own house.” The

evangelist adds, "And he did not many mighty works there, because of their unbelief." (Matt, xiii. 58.)

A case that at once illustrates Jesus' power, and lack of power, is found in John v. 1-9. "After this there was a feast of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. Now there is at Jerusalem by the sheep market a pool, which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethesda, having five porches. In these lay a great multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered, waiting for the moving of the water. For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had. And a certain man was there, which had an infirmity thirty and eight years. When Jesus saw him lie, and knew that he had been now a long time in that case, he saith unto him, Wilt thou be made whole? The impotent man answered him, Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool: but while I am coming another steppeth down before me. Jesus saith unto him, Rise, take up thy bed and walk. And immediately the man was made whole, and took up his bed and walked; and on the same day was the Sabbath."

No statement could be more clear than this. Here was a pool, where an angel went down at a certain season and troubled the water; then *the first* one who stepped into the pool after the water was troubled, was made whole. Thus it appears that one was healed every year; but as the sick rushed there by hundreds to be healed, and only one could be healed, at the annual troubling of the waters, the multitudes of sick and impotent folks increased until, John says,

there was a *great multitude*. Jesus, in looking over this "great multitude," found one, only one, of the great number that his clairvoyant perceptions told him he could heal, and, after the conversation above related, healed the one, and left all the rest to die there, or be healed at the slow rate of one, "at a certain season." This multitude increasing every day, rendered the chances of being healed at the pool hardly worth staying for.

I have, in my own experience as a healer, met parallel cases. Probably one case in a hundred of sick people that I see impresses me with an almost irresistible impulse to heal them, and in such cases I seldom fail. On the other hand, any medium will occasionally get the opposite feeling. In such cases, all the efforts of that medium will prove ineffectual. This was probably the case with Jesus, and will account for his healing one case, and going away and leaving so many sick folks at the pool of Siloam.

The day of Pentecost is by Christians referred to with great confidence as being especially prolific of evidences of the divinity of Christianity; and I must confess I know of no chapter in the Bible better calculated to portray the benefit arising from phenomenal Christianity. The works done on the day of Pentecost can be enumerated as follows:—

1. The falling upon the disciples or mediums of a spiritual influence, called the Holy Ghost.
2. The speaking of different languages by the aid of spirit power.
3. Peter preaching under spirit influence; and,
4. Soon after the Pentecost, and during the revival that then commenced, the healing of a cripple.

No one claims that any other evidence of the divinity of the Christian system than the four points mentioned can be drawn out of this revival. Now, can ten thousand witnesses be believed, when they declare, upon their sacred honor, that they have, at different times, witnessed all of these phenomena in modern Spiritualism. Do these things prove the divinity of Christianity? If so, permit them to do as much for that which now produces them. But I must argue more than is embraced in the proposition that the arguments used, in defense of Christianity apply with all their force to modern Spiritualism. Let me state, as a second proposition, that

**EVERY ARGUMENT URGED AGAINST SPIRITUALISM
APPLIES WITH ALL ITS FORCE AGAINST THE
BIBLE.**

I shall not now thoroughly argue every point that could be discussed under the above heading, as many of the points must come up in other divisions of this book. The reply to the oft-repeated arguments on the immoralities of Spiritualism, will be made in a chapter devoted to the comparative moral tendencies of the two systems.

It is sometimes said that Spiritualism has in it a great deal that is ridiculous and silly. I do not know but this is true: I am inclined to think there are some incongruities and absurdities in it. There are fools in this world, and there may be in the other. I notice fools sometimes pass over the river of death. Solomon says, "Though thou shouldst bray a fool in the mortar among wheat, with a pestle, yet will not his foolishness depart from him." I presume that even

the mortar and pestle of death have failed to pulverize the folly of some who have passed through that ordeal.

But is there nothing silly or absurd in the Bible? Is there anything in Spiritualism more silly than the angel's *tête-à-tête* with Moses at the country tavern when he tried to kill him? (Ex. iv. 24, 25.) Did the reader ever notice the tedious and silly way that Gideon took to talk with his God? (Judges vi. 36-40.) What could be more silly than the manner in which God told Gideon to test his army? (Judges vii. 4.) If a spirit were to say, "I will hiss for the fly of Egypt," or, "I will shave with a razor that is hired" ? (See Isa. vii. 18, 20), would not the opposers find in that all the evidence they could wish that Spiritualism was disgustingly silly? Yet, when the Bible represents God as doing these things, I would be called sacrilegious if I were to deny them. Were a medium to record that a spirit wrestled with him all night, and finally threw him down and broke his thigh, he would be laughed at by every Christian in the land. But let one dare to make sport of the wrestling-match between God and Jacob, and he does it at the risk of religious and social ostracism. (See Gen. xxxiii. 24-30.)

There are not so many now as in former times who deny spirit manifestations. The age for that is about past. If it were not, I would ask by what rule the wonderful stories in the Bible can be believed, and stories now just like them, only not half so large, established by ten times the amount of testimony, must be rejected? To illustrate: Christians find no trouble in believing that Jesus came to the disciples after his

anastasis and ate fish and honeycomb; but when I tell the same persons, who find it no stretch of their credulity to believe this story, that I can prove by a hundred good witnesses, some of them not Spiritualists, that spirits came into Mrs. Kegwin's circles in Jeffersonville, Ind., and ate apples in the presence of the whole circle, they are ready to swear that I and my witnesses are imposing on their credulity. Now, though this statement is true, I do not ask Bible believers to receive it; I only ask them to be consistent, and reject the story of the spirits eating the calf, and Jesus eating after his death. (See Gen. xviii. 8; Luke xxiv. 30, 43, 44; Acts x. 41.)

The objection that Spiritualism comes from the devil, was made with equal vehemence and truthfulness against John and Jesus. (Matt. xi. 18; xii. 24; John vii. 20; viii. 48.)

The objection against darkness being one of the conditions for certain of the manifestations of spirit power, would weigh against many portions of the Bible. That book declares that "God dwells in the midst of thick darkness." (1 Kings viii. 12.) God's wrestle with Jacob was in the dark. As soon as it began to get light God could do nothing more — could not even get away from Jacob, and began to devoutly pray for Jacob to let him go, "for the day breaketh." (Gen. xxxii. 24.) The pulling of the linchpins out of Pharaoh's chariot-wheels was done in the dark. So the resurrection of Jesus was a work of darkness. It was night when the walls of Jericho fell, and in fact almost every biblical wonder transpired in the dark.

I will now offer another proposition, viz. : —

THE EVIDENCES OF THE TRUTH OF THE BIBLE ARE NOT SO CONCLUSIVE AS THOSE OF MODERN SPIRITUALISM.

No one will dispute that the evidences of the authenticity, genuineness, and integrity of the Bible is second-hand evidence. If ever there was first-class evidence of the teachings, it has not reached us. But even if this was not true, if we had the privilege of consulting the original witnesses, they were not such witnesses as would now be taken as the best evidence of such manifestations as they record. The people among whom the prophets, Jesus, and the apostles did their wonders, were not educated as the multitudes now are. Not one in one thousand of them could read, much less had they a scientific education. Many of the now very simple phenomena were to them entirely unexplainable, and hence miraculous. The prophets, Jesus, and the apostles never had the good fortune to have to do any wonders among any people that were in advance of the Cheyennes or Camanches of to-day. When they became civilized enough to want to build a perpetual residence for their God (1 Kings viii. 12, 13), they were compelled to send to a heathen king for skilled workmen. They had not one among all their workmen capable of doing the work. (1 Kings v. 6.)

Now think of the biblical wonders being wrought among these ignoramuses, then think of the stories passing from mouth to mouth, and the verbal inaccuracies necessarily attending such stories, and that they are only preserved by these hearsay reports, and I think all will see the necessity of making calculations

for their growth. Now, reader, please add to the above considerations the fact that there were no Argus-eyed reporters on the spot to criticise and ridicule the manifestations; no interviewers to interview either the miracle-workers or those who beheld them, and the chances for deception become so great and numerous that the stories must be received with allowance.

No one, I think, will fail to recognize that while the above is true of all the Bible wonders, it is not true of modern spirit manifestations. They are wrought among the *litterati* of the age. Many of them are recorded on the spot by eye-witnesses; reporters and interviewers are frequently on the *arena*; every mistake is recorded and heralded by the daily press. Rigid scientific and theologic tests are applied, and every precaution to prevent deception. Those witnessing the phenomena are brought into court, and compelled to tell their stories under the pains and penalties of perjury. Thus the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, is elicited in the presence of those who have witnesses on the ground, and have laid every snare to entrap the witness of these wonders. Astute lawyers are well paid for exhausting their skill in examining and cross-examining witnesses, all to no purpose, save to deepen the general conviction that the manifestations said to have a spiritual origin do occur.

But should I withdraw the foregoing argument, and admit that the witnesses of the manifestations occurring in the presence of Jesus and the apostles were in every instance good, educated, honorable witnesses, still your testimony for biblical manifestations is not so good as ours for those occurring in the

present century. Biblical testimonies have been translated too often, and passed through too many hands. No one can know now whether it was true or not. Aside from the corroboration of modern facts, the evidences that they ever occurred have passed through entirely too many hands, and been tinkered too often. It would be impossible now to know their truth.

On this subject Lardner, the great Christian author, in his *Cred. Gos. Hist.*, vol. iv. p. 524, quotes Casaubon, as follows:—

“It mightily affects me to see how many there are in the earliest times of the church who considered it a capital exploit to lend heavenly truth the help of their inventions, in order that the new doctrines might be more readily allowed by the wise among the Gentiles. These officious lies, they were wont to say, were devised for a good end.”

Hundreds of other Christian authors have freely spoken on the same subject. Selmer shows the chances for deception with regard to facts in the case. He says, —

“The Christian doctors never brought their sacred books before the common people, although people in general have been wont to think otherwise. During the first ages they were in the hands of the clergy only.”

The tendency of good Christian people to lie for the glory of God, and sometimes manufacture whole stories, may be learned from the following from Bishop Heliodorus: “A falsehood is a good thing when it aids the speaker and does no injury to the hearers.”

Other Christian writers strengthen our faith in the

records they have handed us, in the following manner:—

Bishop Marsh says, "It is a certain fact, that several readings of our common printed text are mere alterations made by Origen, whose authority was so great in the Christian church, that emendations which he proposed, though, as he himself acknowledged, they were supported by the evidence of no manuscript, were very generally received." And Origen himself, speaking of the gospels, says, "There are things contained therein, which, taken in their literal sense, are mere falsities and lies." — *Hom. 6, in Isaiah*, fol. 107, D.

Origen admits, says Du Pin, that "there is a great discrepancy between the copies, which must be attributed either to the negligence of the scribes, or to the audacious perversions of others, or to those who correct the text by arbitrary additions or omissions, who oftentimes have put in and left out as they thought it most convenient."

Gregory Nazianzen says, "A little jargon is all that is necessary to impose on the people. The less they comprehend, the more they admire!"

Not only has the Bible and its history passed through a great many hands, and thus been subject to the mistakes of transcribers and translators, but it has been in *bad* hands.

The following testimonies from eminent Christians will let the reader somewhat into the light as to how far those who have handed us the stories we are expected to believe can be trusted:—

Ignatius (A. D. 107) says, "Now the virginity of Mary, and he who was born of her, was kept in secret

from the prince of this world, as was also the death of our Lord; three of the mysteries most spoken of throughout the world, yet done in secret by God."

If this historical fact, stated by an apostolic father, can be believed, it is doubtful whether Mary was a virgin, or any of the miracles of Jesus were ever wrought.

Bishop Horseley states that Origen "was not incapable of asserting in argument what he believed not, and that a strict regard to truth in disputation was not one of the virtues of his character." . . . "Time was when the practice of using unjustifiable means to serve a good cause was openly avowed, and Origen himself was among its defenders."

Eusebius heads the thirty-first chapter of his Evangelical Preparation, with the following query:—

"How far may it be proper to use falsehood as a medicine, and for the benefit of those who require to be deceived." In another place he takes occasion to laud himself thus: "I have related whatever might redound to the glory, and I have suppressed all that could tend to the disgrace, of our religion."

Mosheim (vol. i. p. 120) says, "The authors who have treated of the innocence and sanctity of the primitive Christians, have fallen into the error of supposing them to have been unspotted models of piety and virtue, and a gross error indeed it is, as the strongest testimonies too evidently prove."

On p. 198, vol. i., he says, "In the fourth century it was an almost universally adopted maxim, that it was an act of virtue to deceive and lie, when, by such means, the interests of the church might be promoted."

Dr. Whitby says, Papias and Iræneus have "handed down the actions of the apostles and their disciples from paltry rumors and dubious reports, and as having scandalously deluded the world with fables and lying narrations." — *De Script. Interpreted*, p. 73.

St. Hermas exclaims, "O Lord, I never spake a true word in my life; but I have always lived in dissimulation, and affirmed a lie for truth to all men, and no man contradicted me."

Daille, on the use of the fathers, says, "Neither ought we to wonder that even those of the honest, innocent, primitive times made use of those deceits, seeing for a good end they made no scruples of forging whole books."

He quotes Celsus as saying, "They altered the Gospels three or four different times, as if they were drunk, and when pressed by their adversaries, recurred to that reading which best suited their purpose!"

St. Jerome says, "I do not find fault with an error which proceeds from hatred towards the Jews, and a pious zeal for the Christian faith." — *Oper.*, tom. 4, p. 113.

Michaelis, in the Preface to his Translations, says, "No one will deny that the early Christians who differed from the ruling church, have altered the New Testament in numerous examples, according to their peculiar tenets." "And, so much so," says the Rev. Mr. Nolan, in his Inquiry, p. 460, "that little confidence could be placed in any edition."

Du Pin says, "It cannot be said that no fault has crept into the Scriptures by the negligence or inadvertency of the transcribers, or even by the boldness

of those who have ventured to strike out, add, or change some words which they thought necessary to be omitted, added, or changed."

St. Synesius says, "The people are desirous of being deceived. We can not act otherwise respecting them."

With all this array of testimony as to the character of the fathers in the church, — those to whom we are indebted for the Bible and all its contents, — who can do otherwise than doubt whether the big stories in the book may not have been put in there by those who esteemed it "a virtue to lie and deceive, when by it the cause of the church can be advanced."

THE INTERNAL EVIDENCES OF THE BIBLE NOT GOOD.

If appeal be made from the departments of the subjects already presented to the internal testimonies of the truth of the Bible and the divinity of its teachings, I must answer, Your witness testifies against you. The subject of the purity of biblical teachings, as compared with Spiritualism, will come up in another chapter. Now I only inquire after the historical truth of some of its statements.

Gen. xiv. 14, says, "And when Abram heard that his brother was taken captive, he armed his trained servants, born in his own house, three hundred and eighteen, and pursued them unto Dan." Does any one believe this? What would you think of the historian who would tell you that Alexander the Great pursued his enemies even unto Washington? Would you not call that an anachronism? The truth is, the city of Dan had no existence for more than four centuries after Abraham was "asleep with his fathers."

In Judges xviii. 28, 29, the historian records, that, "They [the children of Dan] built a city and dwelt therein. And they called the name of the city Dan, after the name of Dan, their father, who was born unto Israel; howbeit, the name of the city was Laish at the first." Dan was the great grandson of Abraham; it was Dan's great-great grandchildren that built the city and named it after him. Will the one who thinks the Bible all true and Spiritualism all false, tell us how Abraham chased his enemies to Dan so long before the great grandfather of those who built it was born?

The contradictory stories concerning Ahaziah's age, one recorded in 2 Kings viii. 6, the other in 2 Chron. xxii. 2, can not both be correct. It is not probable that either of them is true. They both make Ahaziah the youngest son of Jehoram. The statement in the Book of Kings would make Ahaziah only eighteen years younger than his father, which was not at all probable. The Book of Chronicles makes him two years older than his father, which was impossible.

As an instance of the unreliability of portions of the book which we are asked to credit rather than modern Spiritualism, I will refer the reader to the quail story, found in Num. xi. 31: "And there went forth a wind from the Lord, and brought quails from the sea, and let them fall by the camp, as it were a day's journey on this side, and as it were a day's journey on the other side, round about the camp, and as it were two cubits high upon the face of the earth."

According to this story the pile of quails must have been forty-four inches high and sixty-six miles in diameter. The story is too large. The story of

Samson slaying a thousand men with a jawbone of an ass, is too large. (See Judges xv. 15.) Men do not voluntarily walk up to be slaughtered in that way. Should they become insane enough to do so, the weapon Samson used is not sufficient. The second part of the story about the jawbone becoming the source of a stream of water is worse than the first,—it beats Jack the Giant-Killer, or Sindbad the Sailor. I really wish Samson had picked up the jawbone and thrown it into the stream that ran out of the hollow place in it. He might have imparted information as to whether it would sink or swim!

The story of Samson and his three hundred foxes with burning tails destroying thousands of acres of green corn (Judges, xv. 3, 5), represents Samson as being a more than ordinarily good fox-hunter, so much so that now it is generally considered a fit companion of Gulliver's Travels.

Without referring the reader to other portions of the Old and New Testaments, proving the unreliability of their contents, I submit another proposition, viz.:—

A DESTRUCTION OF THE EVIDENCES OF SPIRITUALISM WOULD DESTROY THE BIBLE.

In another proposition I argued that any argument used against modern Spiritualism would weigh with all its force against the Bible; but in this proposition I mean more than I did in that.

Can the dead, or can they not, return? If I am answered that they can return, then the foundation of modern Spiritualism is admitted. If they can not

return, then the Bible is not true, for it says Samuel did come back and talk to Saul. (1.Sam. xxviii. 21.) Elijah did give a communication to the king Jehoram, and that in his own handwriting. (2 Chron. xxi. 12.) He did come back, using John the Baptist as a medium. (Luke i. 17.) Moses and Elias did come to Jesus on the mount of transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 1-9), and seven spirits, one of them John's own brother, came to him on the Island of Patmos. (Rev. xxi. 10-12; xxii. 8.)

I now ask, Are these things true? If they are, Spiritualism is true; if not, the Bible is false. Take the case of Samuel to illustrate the argument. Did he come back? If so, he has proved there is a means of communication between the two worlds; since, if there had not been, he could not have come back. If, on the other hand, he did not come back, then the Bible, which says he did, relates a falsehood, and its veracity is destroyed by its indorsement of Spiritualism.

Once more I ask, Will you believe me, and dozens of other witnesses, when we say we have seen spirit hands formed, and take a pencil and write on a slate, — often in exactly the hand they wrote when in earth life? If not, how can you believe the Bible when it says, "In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaster of the wall of the king's palace: and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote. Then the king's countenance was changed, and his thoughts troubled him, so that the joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote one against another." (Dan. v. 5, 6.)

LIVING WITNESSES.

One great advantage Spiritualism has over the marvellous stories related in the Bible is, that Spiritualists are not compelled to look through the musty histories of many hundreds of years standing for evidence of its truth. Provided that the spiritual stories and Bible stories were all the same, it must be conceded that the great balance of testimony is in favor of Spiritualism. In the case of Spiritualism, the witnesses are alive, and in the vicinity of every reader of this volume. There is not one who reads this book who could not, in twenty-four hours' time, get the sworn testimony of witnesses enough to prove any point that can be proved by testimony. He can cross-examine the witnesses, and look into the chances for deception, *ad libitum*. Not so with biblical wonders: they may, or they may not, have occurred. There are no witnesses to-day of the resurrection of Lazarus; no opportunity is offered to detect fraud and trickery. Nothing is known of the names, much less of the moral character or intellectual attainments, of those who testified in this case, if, indeed, there were any to bear testimony. One case will fully illustrate my meaning. It is said that the walls of Jericho fell down when the children of Israel marched around them. Now imagine how a conversation would run between a Spiritualist and a Christian on the subject. Let the Spiritualist commence by asking the question, Do you believe the story of the falling of the walls of Jericho at the time of the great march of the children of Israel around them?

Christian. Certainly I do; it is in the Bible; why should I not believe it?

Spir. Knowing that Christians are some of them very doubtful of wonderful manifestations, when backed by what seems to me very conclusive evidence, I did not know but that you even doubted this story. Since you inform me that you believe the record of this wonderful manifestation, will you be kind enough to tell me why you believe it?

Chris. Because it is in the Bible; what more is needed?

Spir. When did this wonderful story find its way into the Bible?

Chris. I do not know.

Spir. What was the moral and intellectual character of the writer?

Chris. I can't say; I guess it must have been good.

Spir. Who was he? What was his name?

Chris. I do not know as the name of the author is given. In fact, I know that scholars do not *pretend* to know who wrote the narrative.

Spir. Do you know of any corroborative history in the world?

Chris. Not any.

Spir. Then why do you believe the story?

Chris. Because it is in the Bible.

Spir. I will tell you why I think it possible the story may be true. I have seen tables shaken and moved by spirit power alone, when no visible power touched them. Spirits that can shake tables may have shaken prison doors open, or the walls of Jericho down.

Chris. Don't talk to me about spirits shaking tables. I can't believe such big stories.

Thus you see, dear reader, what a strange admixture there must be in that organism which believes all the Bible and yet rejects modern Spiritualism, established by ten thousand times the amount of evidence.

Consistency is a rare jewel; let us always try to keep a good stock of it on hand.

“What is the Past, with its psalms and prayers?

And what are its crude beliefs to me?

Men never *saw*, in the Present of theirs,

What is denied for the *Now to see!*

The years that are gone are as stranger men

We passed, but shall never pass again.

“Mine is the Present, *now, this hour*;

Shall I be the dupe of a dupe of yore?

And see a revelation of heavenly power

In the rag of a gaberdine he wore?

The rag of a web spun long ago,

Might have covered a fool, for aught I know.

“And John may have dreamed, away down East,

In the Isle of Patmos — God knows where; —

But what to me is his horned beast,

His thrones, and his mammoth angel there?

The dream of John to my spirit means

Nothing more strange than another's dreams.

“And Christ may have suffered upon the tree,

And died for the sins of those who stood

To see him die. But he's naught more to me

Than are *other* men who suffered for good.

Their blood — as his — by the hand of power

Was shed for the faith of the living hour.”

CHAPTER XII.

TEACHINGS OF THE BIBLE AND SPIRITUALISM.

The Boast of Christians. — Age of the Bible no Argument in its favor. — A few knotty Questions. — Author does not dispute the Designs of Christianity. — Testimonies of Christians on the failure of Christianity. — Christians accuse each other. — Paul in a Dilemma. — His Plan of Escape. — Confessions of modern Christians. — Jesus' Parables leading in the wrong Direction. — The prodigal Son. — The unjust Steward. — Jesus commends the Scoundrel. — The unjust Judge. — Reasons for prayer. — The Laborers in the Vineyard. — Does God play the same Game. — Bad Precepts. — Borrowing of the Egyptians. — Children of Israel not Slaves in Egypt. — What to do with bad Meat. — Punishment for religious Differences. — Treatment of bad Boys. — The Bible on Slavery. — On the treatment of Slaves. — The war upon the Midianites. — Biblical Temperance. — Sketches from Jesus' Sermon. — Jesus a disturber of domestic Relations. — A cool Reception. — Immoral Doctrines. — Works of no avail. — Character of the biblical God. — The Difference. — The *modus operandi* of Salvation. — Proper Generation *vs.* Regeneration. — Recipe for making Hogs of Children. — How to cure Depravity. — Rest when Nature rests; work when she works. — North and South ends of People. — Ten syllogistic Arguments. — Conclusion.

By the time the argument on Spiritualism and the Bible has reached the crisis to which the last chapter brought it, the advocates of the Bible as opposed to Spiritualism begin to get their fears terribly aroused, least Spiritualism should lead people away from the high moral, mental, and spiritual bearing to which the teachings and practice of those who made, and those who now regard the Bible as the "Book of books," has elevated them. The boast of the Christian world is, that in the Bible as a book, and in the history of the characters who vouchsafed it to us, we have the highest possible type of moral, mental, and spiritual puri-

ty. The Bible is nothing else than God's own book, and therefore perfect. The moral lessons taught in it are so perfect that by no possibility could they be improved, and the character of its heroes, commonly called saints, are worthy to be held up as an example for all coming generations. In this connection of eulogizing the Bible and its Moguls, its advocates generally say, "There is no kind of use in attacking the Bible now, it has stood too long. Marcion, Porphyry, and Julian made an attack on it; Gibbon, Hume, Voltaire, and Paine undertook to put it down, but after nineteen hundred years of warfare it stands yet, a monument of strength against which it is foolish to battle."

This is in part true. Christianity stands to-day, but I am led to ask, *cui bono?* The Christian has one argument in favor of his system, that is, its age. Catholicism is old: is it therefore divine? How about Mohammedanism? Paganism is older yet than Christianity, and still it stands against the attacks of Christian missionaries; let us argue its divinity from its age. Sin is older than any religion; religions have tried in vain to crush it out, still it stands an impregnable bulwark. Shall we therefore plead with Christianity to cease its warfare upon sin?

Now that I have been frank enough to admit the fact that Christianity is old, how will the advocates of the system make that an argument in its favor? The question is not one of age, but what has it done for the world? How has the world been benefited by tolerating the institution so long? Has it made the world better? Has it redeemed humanity? Has it caused its own adherents to beat their swords into

ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks, and do they learn war no more? Are the lives of even those who profess to enjoy the blessings of Christianity, who practice its virtues, models of perfection and purity? Are Christians to-day, or have they ever been, governed by the golden rule, any more than those whom it denominates infidels? Nay, do not Christians themselves confess that the world has steadily increased in wickedness under its administration? Whether true or not, evangelical ministers, books, and papers to-day tell the people there never was so much wickedness in the world as at the present time. How is it that sin increases in proportion as a knowledge of Christianity and its Bible abounds? By and by I shall have a few words in answer to this question. I now suggest that nearly nineteen hundred years of failure is enough to show that there is something radically wrong in the system. I am led to think that if Christianity is to save the world at all, it is time it was about it. Let us have a change of physicians.

I have not the slightest doubt of the desire on the part of many good Christians to benefit the world, but good desires are not enough. With all their desires, their love of approbation, and the pride of their system, Christians have not even been able to keep themselves morally pure. Let us, writer and readers, now, not as theorizers or fault-finders, but as honest men in search of the truth, see why Christianity has failed, and see whether there is anything else that will do what it has failed to accomplish. That Christians themselves regard that their system has thus far failed in its work is evident. The following extracts are all from Christian authorities:—

Elder M. E. Cornell says, "It is not with any desire to find fault, or, like the wordling, to dwell upon the imperfections of others, and make their backslidings an excuse for laxity, that we speak of the fallen condition of the churches, for we do it with sadness, and would God it were otherwise. The facts are so well known to keen-eyed skeptics, infidels, and the world at large, that if we refuse to acknowledge them it would indicate a want of honesty on our part. But while infidels rejoice over the matter, and make it an occasion of doubting and rejecting the Bible and the Christian religion, we note the facts with candor, and see in it a fulfillment of prophecy. Instead of an occasion of stumbling, we find it an occasion of stronger faith in the Bible, as of heavenly origin. But while we speak freely on the subject, we need not appear before the world as confessing for the churches, as though they were unwilling to acknowledge the facts; for this they have fully done for themselves, as will appear from the copious extracts in the following pages. Let not the unbeliever rejoice over the fallen state of the church, for it is an omen of no good to the world. If the truth has lost its power upon its professed friends, what can its enemies hope for?"

Alexander Campbell says, "The worshipping establishments now in operation throughout Christendom, increased and cemented by their respective voluminous confessions of faith, and their ecclesiastical constitutions, are not churches of Jesus Christ, but the legitimate daughters of that mother of harlots, the Church of Rome."

Lorenzo Dow says of the Romish Church, "If she be a *mother*, who are the *daughters*? It must be the

corrupt, national, established churches that came out of her." — *Dow's Life*, p. 542.

In the Religious Encyclopedia (art. Antichrist), we read, "The writer of the Book of Revelation tells us he heard a voice from heaven, saying, 'Come out of her, my people, that ye partake not of her sins, and receive not of her plagues.' If such persons are to be found in the 'mother of harlots,' with much less hesitation may it be inferred that they are connected with her unchaste daughters, those national churches which are founded upon what are called *Protestant principles*."

Robert Atkins, in a sermon preached in London, says, "The truly righteous are diminished from the earth, and no man layeth it to heart. The professors of religion of the present day in every church are lovers of the world, conformers to the world, lovers of creature-comfort, and aspirers after respectability. They are called to suffer with Christ, but they shrink from even reproach. Apostasy, apostasy, apostasy, is engraven on the very front of every church; and did they know it, and did they feel it, there might be hope; but, alas! they cry, 'We are rich, and increased in goods, and stand in need of nothing.'"

The report of the Michigan Yearly Conference, published in the True Wesleyan of November 15, 1851, says, "The world, commercial, political, and ecclesiastical, are alike, and are together going in the broad way that leads to death. Politics, commerce, and nominal religion, all connive at sin, reciprocally aid each other, and unite to crush the poor. Falsehood is unblushingly uttered in the forum and in the pulpit, and sins that would shock the moral sensibilities of

the heathen go unrebuked in all the great denominations of our land." These churches are like the Jewish church when the Saviour exclaimed, "Wo unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites."

Henry Ward Beecher says, "All the framework of society seems to be dissolving. On every side we find men false to the most important trusts. Even the judges on the bench are bought and sold like meat in the shambles. One must go into court with a long purse to obtain justice. The judiciary of New York stinks like Sodom and Gomorrah. Men say they hardly know a court in which to trust a case. It is no longer an honor to sit on the bench, for if the judge be an upright man his character will be contaminated by the great majority of his associates."

Says the New York Tribune, "The telegraph wires bend under their weight of woe; the old earth quivers with throbs of agony from the center to the pole; cities are shaken down, countries are engulfed, fair domains are overflowed with red-hot lava; wife is arrayed against husband, mother against child, son against father; a hecatomb is sacrificed on one railway, half as many on another, and on still another the width of a hair stands between a thousand and sudden death. In social life, our newspapers are smutched all over with reports of divorce and separation trials, of infidelity and disgrace, of gigantic crimes undertaken, half accomplished, or completed. What shall be the end of these things?"

The Christian Inquirer says, "Such an intense and insane rush and struggle for wealth, such reckless, ruinous, extravagance of expenditure, such a delirium for vulgar display, this country has never seen.

And, alas! not only taste, refinement, purity, and piety have gone down before the tide, but even honesty, &c. . . . Every vice has increased in an alarming degree. Intemperance — not only are our streets and public places full of it, not only do young men and old men and mere boys fall before it by scores and hundreds, but even women, beautiful, accomplished, beloved wives and daughters carry its fire-blush on their cheeks, and reel and totter under its influence on the sidewalks. There are more gaming places in the city to-day than there were dry goods stores twenty years ago; and the gamblers include all classes, from the boy of fifteen to the *roue* of fifty. But why enumerate? Every vice on the black catalogue of transgression has more than doubled in volume and in victims within these five years, and our youth, the pride and hope of our land, are falling beneath the subtle destroyer faster than ever they fell in Southern campaign.”

A writer in the New York Tribune, speaking of the fashionable religion and worship of this boasted age of progress, says, “Now the worshipers one after another glide in, silks rattle, plumes wave, satins glisten, diamonds glitter, and scores of forty-dollar handkerchiefs shake out their perfumed odors! What absurdity to preach the gospel of the lowly Nazarene to such a set! The clergyman knows better than to do so. He values his fat salary and handsome parsonage too highly. So with a velvety tread he walks all around the ten commandments — places the downiest pillow under the dying profligate’s head, and ushers him with seraphic hymning into an upper-ten Heaven.”

A Christian poet, in a long lamentation on the departure of piety and religion from the church, says, —

“ Her pastors love to live at ease;
 They covet wealth and honor;
 And while they seek such things as these,
 They bring reproach upon her.
 Such worthless objects they pursue,
 Warmly and undiverted,
 The church they lead and ruin, too —
 Her glory is departed.

From these extracts, and hundreds of similar ones which I have at command, the reader can not help but see that Christians themselves have written their system down a failure. Like the ancient prophets, who had no confidence in each other's predictions, they spend their time in accusing each other, as we have noted in the foregoing extracts. Those who have been accustomed to attend love-feasts, conferences, or even to hear Christians pray, can not fail to have noted that in all these they have confessed enough to have sent them to the state's prison. Christians are always confessing their proneness to sin, “as the sparks are to fly upward.” Many of my readers will remember, that, in a former volume,* I turned to the Bible, and exhibited a chapter of the short-comings of its grandest heroes.

The trouble with the Christian system was, and is, *it does not know* how to make good people of its own advocates. Paul has stated the whole matter so clearly and truthfully in Rom. vii. 7-25, that his statement can neither be refuted, nor its “natural force abated.” His version of the matter is as follows: —

* Question Settled, pp. 87 to 89, published by William White & Co., Boston.

“What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good: that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful. For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do, I allow not; for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh), dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into the captivity to

the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with my mind I myself serve the law of God; but with my flesh the law of sin."

I think it impossible for even the most stupid Christian to misapprehend this statement. Paul gives his own experience, his daily conflicts. How hard the struggles of this gospel "Boanerges!" How weak he was when in the power of sin! All his life, this "other law" in his members, bringing him into captivity to the law of sin. Poor "chief of sinners!" All the days of his life going around exclaiming, "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" This apostolic sinner never found a power in the gospel or elsewhere strong enough to deliver him. Could anything more clearly demonstrate the utter insignificance of the Bible and all its plans, so far as saving men from the commission of sin is concerned? The only consolation Paul had above sinners who had not been Christianized he couched in these words: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." (Rom. viii. 1, 2.)

Here it is. Paul was in Christ Jesus. Got into him by baptism. (Rom. vi. 3.) There is no condemnation for the sinner who is in Christ. Jesus had paid the penalty for his sins; so, although he was chained to "the body of this death," the spirit of God dwelt in him (Rom. viii. 11), and he was waiting for a peculiar manifestation which he hoped would put him

beyond the necessity of sin. (Verses 19-24.) He, however, had in this one consolation ; that is, sin, with all its consequences, could not tear him away from the love of God, in Christ Jesus. (Verses 38, 39.)

Our readers will remember the confession of a pious saint, in a previous chapter of this work : " O Lord, I never told a truth in my life, but have continually affirmed for a truth what I knew to be a lie." The confession of modern Christians is, " O Lord, if thou hadst dealt justly by us, we might have been with the rich man in hell calling for water to cool our parched tongues." Thus, in every shape, is the confession made, that so far as making men and women *practically* good in this world is concerned, Bible religion is a failure.

When it is remembered that the Bible everywhere holds up bad examples before its adherents, it could not be expected that even good precepts would greatly advance its adherents in morality. I do not now remember an example in the Bible held up as a specimen of perfection, but the following of it out would convert this world into a worse than Pandemonium. Take, as an illustration, the parables given by Jesus ; there is not one of them that does not, in some way, justify the evil and put down the good. In Luke, xv. 11-32, is the parable of the Prodigal Son. I quote it entire :—

" And he said, A certain man had two sons : And the younger of them said to his father, Father, give me the portion of goods that falleth to me. And he divided unto them his living. And not many days after the younger son gathered all together, and took his journey into a far country, and there wasted his

substance with riotous living. And when he had spent all, there arose a mighty famine in the land; and he began to be in want. And he went and joined himself to a citizen of that country; and he sent him into the fields to feed swine. And he would fain have filled his belly with the husks that the swine did eat: and no man gave unto him. And when he came to himself, he said, How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger! I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants. And he arose, and came to his father. But when he was yet a great way off, his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son. But the father said to his servants, Bring forth the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet: And bring hither the fatted calf, and kill it; and let us eat, and be merry: for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found. And they began to be merry. Now his elder son was in the field: and as he came and drew nigh to the house, he heard music and dancing. And he called one of the servants, and asked what these things meant. And he said unto him, Thy brother is come; and thy father hath killed the fatted calf, because he hath received him safe and sound. And he was angry, and would not go in: therefore came his father out, and entreated him. And he answering said to his

father, Lo, these many years do I serve thee, neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment; and yet thou never gavest me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends: but as soon as this thy son was come, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou hast killed for him the fatted calf. And he said unto him, Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine. It was meet that we should make merry, and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again; and was lost, and is found."

This parable, whether originally given for that purpose or not, is read and commented on to show God's forgiving disposition,—his willingness to meet the sinner half way, and the particular and especial favor he shows to the greatest sinners. The father is said to represent God, who has been offended by our sins. The human family is divided into two classes,—the outrageously wicked are represented by the prodigal son; the naturally just and virtuous—"just persons that need no repentance"—are represented by the older son. Now, this prodigal son takes half of the old man's estate and squanders it, then returns to get the portion of the estate that justly belongs to his virtuous and otherwise righteous brother. What is the result? The father meets him while he is "yet a great way off," and orders the best robe put on him, his person decked with jewelry, the fatted calf to be killed, a band of music employed, a supper, dancing, and a general good time ensues, and the old man never so much as invites his dutiful son to the party, or even informs him of the return of his wicked brother. When the faithful son would know the meaning of all this, his only chance is to inquire of a field-hand.

He is answered, that his brother has returned, and there is a great feast and dancing-party at his father's house. Was he not justly indignant? His father, notwithstanding all his faithful services, had never so much as given him a kid, or even a dish of kid soup; and now all this ado over a profligate brother was an outrage, and would be justly resented by any worthy young man in the country.

Bible Christians will agree with me, that the old man was unjust to his oldest son. Not one of them would follow his example. The claim is, that God has a right to thus deal with his children. I deny it. Spiritualism denies it, and pronounces it a piece of outrageous injustice. This harmonizes with, and was undoubtedly gotten up to illustrate the idea, that the greater the sinner in this world, the greater the saint in the next, — the more one sins here, the more will he be forgiven, and consequently the happier one will be in the next world. Jesus illustrates this by reference to a case who had been a terrible sinner. He says, "Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little. And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven." (Luke vii. 47.)

The Parable of the Unjust Steward reads as follows: "And he said also unto his disciples, There was a certain rich man, who had a steward; and the same was accused unto him that he had wasted his goods. And he called him, and said unto him, How is it that I hear this of thee? give an account of thy stewardship; for thou mayest be no longer steward. Then the steward said within himself, What shall I

do? for my lord taketh away from me the stewardship: I cannot dig; to beg I am ashamed. I am resolved what to do, that, when I am put out of the stewardship, they may receive me into their houses. So he called every one of his lord's debtors unto him, and said unto the first, How much owest thou unto my lord? And he said, A hundred measures of oil. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and sit down quickly, and write fifty. Then said he to another, And how much owest thou? And he said, A hundred measures of wheat. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and write fourscore. And the lord commended the unjust steward because he had done wisely: for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light. And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations."

These plain declarations need but little, if any, comment. The steward was a scoundrel, and finally made hosts of friends by cheating his master in settling with those who owed him. Then follows one of the lessons that Jesus would teach by this parable: "And the lord commended the unjust steward because he had acted wisely," and then condemns the "children of light" for not imitating the example of the knave he introduces as a hero. Now follows his advice to his disciples: "And I say unto you, make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations." (Verse 9.) Could there be a more positive command to play the rogue's part than is there expressed? Should such a piece of advice be found

in the writings of A. J. Davis or Victoria C. Woodhull, what would be the result? Every Christian paper in the United States would reproduce it, with comments to show the immoral tendency of Spiritualism. How strange! We will admire, and even *reverence* things in the Bible, that we could not be induced to tolerate in a person of this age.

The Parable of the Unjust Judge reads as follows: "And he spake a parable unto them to this end, that men ought always to pray, and not to faint; saying, There was in a city a judge, which feared not God, neither regarded man: and there was a widow in that city; and she came unto him, saying, Avenge me of mine adversary. And he would not for a while: but afterward he said within himself, Though I fear not God, nor regard man; yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me. And the Lord said, Hear what the unjust judge saith. And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them? I tell you that he will avenge them speedily. Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth? And he spake this parable unto certain which trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others." (Luke xviii. 1-9.)

In the Orthodox interpretation of this parable (which is the only correct one), God is represented as being the unjust judge; those who pray, are represented by the widow who *teased* the judge? The leading idea is, that God, whom we are to follow in all things, will not consult justice in answering prayers, but will answer without any reference to the

right, in order to get rid of the worrying troubles caused by the continual praying of his children. If God answers prayer at all, the idea is certainly a true one. No person ever asked God to do anything for him without either implying that God would not do his duty by him without his prayers, and hence that God is an unjust judge, or that he wants something that God could not, in justice, give; and now he will either play the part of a spoiled child, and tease God's life out of him, or compel him, by his teasing, to an act of injustice. Now, I ask in all candor and sincerity, can any interpretation be put on the parable of the unjust judge that will allow that the one who originated it knew anything of the first principles of justice? The fact is, the only idea contained in the parable is, that God will sacrifice justice in answer to the prayers of his children.

Though an instructive lesson might be learned from every one of Jesus' parables, I will only occupy space with one more. "For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder, which went out early in the morning to hire laborers into his vineyard. And when he had agreed with the laborers for a penny a day, he sent them into his vineyard. And he went out about the third hour, and saw others standing idle in the market-place, and said unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard, and whatsoever is right I will give you. And they went their way. Again he went out about the sixth and ninth hour, and did likewise. And about the eleventh hour he went out, and found others standing idle, and saith unto them, Why stand ye here all the day idle? They say unto him, Because no man hath hired us.

He saith unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard, and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive. So when even was come, the lord of the vineyard saith unto his steward, Call the laborers, and give them their hire, beginning from the last unto the first. And when they came that were hired about the eleventh hour, they received every man a penny. But when the first came, they supposed that they should have received more; and they likewise received every man a penny. And when they had received it, they murmured against the goodman of the house, saying, These last have wrought but one hour, and thou hast made them equal unto us, which have borne the burden and heat of the day. But he answered one of them, and said, Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst not thou agree with me for a penny? Take that thine is, and go thy way: I will give unto this last, even as unto thee. Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good? (Matt. xx. 1-15.)

Now I think any jury, bound upon their honor, would decide, if these men who had "borne the burden and heat of the day," had sued this householder, that this was a case of outrageous injustice. It occurs to me that this man took advantage of these poor laborers, who were out of employment, when he hired them for a penny a day. Indeed, he virtually confesses this himself, when he promised others that he would pay them "whatsoever was right" for one hour's work, and then paid them a penny. If it was right to give them a penny for one hour's labor in the cool of the day, it certainly was not right to compel the others to work full twelve hours, and "bear the

burden and heat of the day," and then pay them off with a penny. No one claims that this is justice between man and man.

The explanation given of this parable is, that it illustrates God's goodness in saving sinners on a dying bed. God is the householder, the field is the world. Men and women are the laborers. The parable is given to show that God will give the same reward in heaven to the villain who becomes his servant at the last hour of his life, as to the one who spends a lifetime in his service. The explanation does not help the matter; even that is unjust and unfair. God has no right to war against the moral interest of his children here in any such way. The religion which teaches that God would thus deal by his children, not only teaches them to imitate this God in this example, in their dealings with each other, but holds out inducements for them to enjoy, what Paul would call, "the pleasures of sin, for a season;" as they will be just as happy in heaven by serving God but one hour. Spiritualism rejects the leading sentiment of each of these parables, fully believing that they are calculated to lower the standard of morality among the people.

THE BIBLE ABOUNDS IN PRECEPTS, THE CARRYING OUT OF WHICH MUST MORALLY DEGRADE THE PEOPLE.

Beyond all doubt, the Bible has many good maxims, axioms, and precepts. If there were none in it that tended in any other direction, a moderately good life could be lived in harmony with its teachings; but, alas! too many of its precepts, if obeyed, would render the world so much worse than it is, that all would

soon demand the abolition of the Bible from respectable society. A historian says, "And the children of Israel did according to the word of Moses, and they borrowed of the Egyptians jewels of silver and jewels of gold, and raiment: and the Lord gave the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians, so that they lent unto them such things as they required: and they spoiled the Egyptians." (Exod. xii. 35, 36.)

This "spoiling of the Egyptians," was done in obedience to a command of God found in Exodus iii. 22, and xi. 2. In answer to the charge that this was a piece of flagrant injustice, the defenders of the Bible usually urge that the children of Israel were slaves, and it was but just that they should have the property they obtained by this "breach of trust," under God's command, as a compensation for their labors.

Much capital has been made out of the slavery of the children of Israel in Egypt, but, like many other arguments of the clergy, it is untrue. In the sense that the children of Israel may have been regarded as foreigners and not citizens they may have been slaves, but beyond that were no more enslaved than are the working classes generally. They were freeholders colonized together, and had their lands, cattle, and sheep in the most fertile parts of Egypt. (Gen. xlvii. 11, 27; Exod. ix. 4-6; x. 23, 26; xii. 23, 27, 32, 38.)

Deut. xiv. 21, contains the following bad precept; "Ye shall not eat of anything that dieth of itself: thou shalt give it unto the stranger that is in thy gates, that he may eat it; or thou mayest sell it unto an alien: for thou art a holy people unto the Lord thy God. Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk."

Is this just? If that which died of itself was fit to eat, then the command not to eat it was wrong; if it was not fit to eat, then it was wrong to sell or give it to any one else to eat. The religion of Spiritualism could not recognize the justice of anything of the kind.

Deut. xiii. 6-11, reads as follows: "If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend, which is as thine own soul, entice thee secretly, saying, Let us go and serve other gods which thou hast not known, thou, nor thy fathers; namely, of the gods of the people which are round about you, nigh unto thee, or far off from thee, from the one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth. Thou shalt not consent unto him nor hearken unto him; neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him. But thou shalt surely kill him: thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people. And thou shalt stone him with stones, that he die; because he hath sought to thrust thee away from the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage."

Here husbands are commanded to kill wives; brothers, brothers; fathers and mothers, their sons and daughters, and friends, bosom friends, for a difference in religious opinion. Spiritualists urge the utmost liberality in religious opinion, and Spiritualism forbids any one the right to kill for any purpose whatever, much less for a difference of religious faith. The truth is, the churches themselves have outgrown many things in the Bible.

Deut. xxi. 18-21 says, "If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son, which will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and that, when they have chastened him, will not hearken unto them: then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city, and unto the gate of his place; and they shall say unto the elders of his city, This our son is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton and a drunkard. And all the men of his city shall stone him with stones, that he die: so shalt thou put evil away from among you; and all Israel shall hear, and fear."

Is this the way to treat a badly organized child, — one that did not organize himself, and was no more to blame for being "stubborn, rebellious, and a drunkard," than the sun is for shining, or rain for falling? If there is any blame anywhere, it is with the parents who gave him his organism, and the society that called out the latent incongruities and failed to develop the normal action of his organism. Let us spare the child, and throw around him more harmonious conditions, we may then enable him, in the next world, to be

" — blest with a holier birth
Than the passions of man allowed him on earth."

The command to murder such an unfortunately organized child is not good. Spiritualism would *bless*, and not kill this poor, unfortunately organized child.

In Leviticus xxv. 44-46, is a passage of Scripture that has been used with crushing effect by the American slave-monger. It reads as follows: "Both thy bondmen, and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have,

shall be of the heathen that are round about you ; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land ; and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession ; they shall be your bondmen forever : but over your brethren, the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigor."

How many hundreds of times, and with what cursed effects, has this precious bit of " God's Holy Word," been used in this country, to tighten the chains of the " divine institution " of slavery upon the millions of innocent victims that were so many years held in bondage. I am personally acquainted with hundreds of people who were led astray by this very text. Thousands of innocent rebels went into the late war fully believing that God would miraculously interfere in behalf of the " divine institution." Some who were conscientiously opposed to slavery, when their ministers in the South showed them how clearly the Bible taught that they were in the right and abolitionists in the wrong, yielded their opposition, and laid down their lives in behalf of " the sum of all villanies."

Not only did " the Book of books," their moral and religious guide, give them the privilege of owning slaves, but to beat them, and under certain circumstances to kill them ; that is to whip them so that they would die within a few days.

Here is the law on that subject. " And if a man

smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall be surely punished. Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished; for he is his money." (Exod. xxi. 20, 21.)

Such texts need no comment, and I offer none. I only say, the book that contains them must be an imperfect guide to holiness.

In Num. xxxi. 17, 18, is a command, which, to say the least, is not very elevating in its moral character. It reads as follows: "Now, therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath . . . but all the women children that hath not . . . keep alive for yourselves."

Such language needs no comment. Ministers have used a great deal of lung force, and bundles upon bundles of quills have been used up, to try to convince the world that this command is not bad; but the world is not yet convinced. The command is an outrage on our sense of justice; present inspiration can give better ones.

In Prov. xxxi. 6, 7, Solomon, the wise man, is represented as saying, "Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish, and wine unto those that be of heavy hearts. Let him drink and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more."

How much "strong drink" does it take to enable the poor man to forget his poverty? How much will it take to keep him in a condition where he will remember his misery no more? I have seen poor men get rich on twenty-five cents, but to keep so would require the investment of a good many dollars.

The New Testament is a decided improvement on the Old, yet it contains many silly, and some abso-

lutely wicked commands. In Matt. vi. 25-34, is a department of Jesus' great Sermon on the Mount. It reads as follows: "Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature? And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: and yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith? Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat, or, what shall we drink? or, wherewithal shall we be clothed? (for after all these things do the Gentiles seek): for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you. Take therefore no thought of the morrow; for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

What would a minister think of a church that would harbor one serious thought of obeying this text? His first conclusion would be, that he would be compelled to look somewhere else for his salary. Obedience to this text would of course lead to vagrancy, with all its

attendant crimes. When men and women, in obedience to this text, live as the birds do, without plowing, sowing, or gathering into barns, the millennium will come in the shape of pandemonium. This command, if not wicked, is foolish.

In Matt. x. 34-38, Jesus says, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law, and a man's foes shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father and mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son and daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross and followeth after me is not worthy of me."

In these days of spirit manifestations, we hear a great deal of talk about Spiritualism breaking up families. Professors Mattison, Mahan, *et al.*, thought that nothing good could sow the devastation and desolation that grew in the wake of Spiritualism. Can it be worse than that which Jesus advertised as his work? The chief intention of the hero of Christianity was not to sow peace and harmony in families, but its opposite. As Jehovah was a jealous God, and would not tolerate the interference of other gods (see Exod. xxxiv. 14-16), so Jesus was even jealous of a mother's love for a child, or a husband's love for his wife. If a child loved father or mother more than it did Jesus, it was unworthy of him. In Luke xiv. 26, the language is stronger than that already quoted. There Jesus says, —

"If any man come to me and hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and

sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple."

Now I am led to ask, Can a book teaching such sentiments, in the first sense of the word, be moral? Even though we submit to the claim of the clergy, and interpret the word hate, as can not honestly be done, to mean "love less," is it just to ask me to love that wife, who in her youth forsook all for me, and has ever since done her whole duty by me, *less* than I love Jesus; and what of those children which are the result of the union of her soul and mine? Must I love those whose very existence I am responsible for less than I love Jesus, who certainly has no more claims to my love than have the revolutionary heroes who laid down their lives for my liberty? It is unjust to ask me to love Jesus above all others. I can not do it.

One more text is enough to show the imperfections of biblical precepts. John, the beloved disciple of Jesus, says, "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." (2 John i. 10.)

Is this a good precept? Suppose that the mercury was at this hour twenty degrees below zero; and suppose, Christian reader, that I, contaminated by Spiritualism as I am, was to drive up to your house in almost a frozen condition, would you receive me into your house? Or would you first question me concerning my religious faith? Is not the precept, which would freeze me to death because of my honest convictions, a bad one? Would not the Bible be a better book if that was not in it? Would *you* not like it better if all the precepts I have just quoted

ould be expunged? Spiritualism does not believe them, does not tolerate them, even though they are in the Bible. It calls upon its head a great deal of opposition on account of its repugnancy to these biblical immoralities. Is not Spiritualism, in this respect, morally ahead of the Bible?

MANY OF THE DOCTRINES OF THE BIBLE ARE MORALLY DEGRADING IN THEIR TENDENCY.

I have only space under this heading to mention a few points that do not come up in other departments of this book.

Any doctrine that teaches man that the consequences of his acts are not to be visited on him personally, will teach him to act without reference to personal consequences. What could more effectually do this than the present system of religion called Christianity? The Christian system does not teach that a person can be justified by any merits or acts of his own, but, on the contrary, that good actions or works are not recommendations to the favor of the great I AM; on the contrary, it is the belief of a creed or dogma, rather than nobility of character, that is to commend us to the favor of their God and Christ. Paul says, "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." (Rom. iii. 24-28.)

Language could not possibly be plainer than this. The *propitiation*, and not honor, integrity, or virtue, is to do the work. He who believes, *is to be justified by faith without the works of, or obedience to, the law.* Is not this calculated to lead *from*, rather than *to* obedience to moral law? I could not, with the stake before me, decide otherwise.

In Rom. iv. 4-8, Paul argues the question still further. Hear him. "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin."

If the sentence, "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness," is not calculated to put righteousness at a discount and ungodliness above par, then language fails to convey any meaning.

Once more, this same apostle explains the matter as follows: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast. (Eph. ii. 8, 9.)

Nothing could be plainer. Your future destiny is not shaped by yourself, but is purely a work of grace or favor — a gift bestowed on the believer of certain tenets, entirely irrespective of anything done or left undone.

Even the God of the Bible, who, of course, is held

up as an example to his children in all things, is represented as angry. (Psalms ii. 12; vii. 1.) Passionate. (Exod. xxxii. 10.) Weak. (Exod. xxxi. 17; Judges i. 18.) Vascillating. (Gen. vi. 5, 7; Exod. xxxii. 14; Jonah iii. 10.)

I submit, that in proportion as the Bible inspires respect for the character here represented as God, it will incline people to imitate that character. Persons denying the infallibility of the Bible, and looking to the philosophy developed in modern Spiritualism as an aid to overcome the wickedness of the world, will have a better opportunity to learn and practice lessons of morality. While the time spent in the study and imitation of the character of this God is worse than thrown away, that spent in investigating and practicing the laws of life, as developed in Spiritualism, must, as I shall show, result in the redemption of the race.

THE DIFFERENCE.

Having now shown some of the imperfections of the Bible, and its plan for reforming the world, I propose to exhibit some of the superiorities of Spiritualism in that direction. That the phenomena of Spiritualism in itself is calculated to make men better, cannot be disputed. The spiritual phenomena always appeals to the highest qualities of man's nature, — that is, to his social nature. A mother's influence over a child in earth-life is of course designed for good, and if properly used, must tend toward the moral and intellectual development of the child. Even the watch care of the mother will put the child on its guard; so will a belief that fathers, mothers, broth-

ers, and sisters, on the other side of death's narrow stream, incline men to virtue in this life; yet it is not claimed that this is the chief superiority of Spiritualism over opposing religions. Spiritualism and Spiritualists have learned that the world cannot be reformed by precepts. The trial of that has been quite sufficient. The world needs more to be shown how to put into practice the good that it knows than it does an urging to obey precepts of any kind. It does but little good to inform a drowning man that he can be saved by swimming to the shore. No one on the shore knows better than he that there is salvation for him on the shore. All he wants is instruction and ability to get to the shore.

The gospel, as I have shown, failed to teach its adherents how to perform the right. Paul said, "How to perform that which is good, I find not." The world needs teaching more than commanding. Dissertations on the folly or misery of sin, or on "the beauty of holiness," will never save the world. The drunkard knows the evils of intemperance better than the temperance lecturer can point them out. He knows whisky robs him of his brains and fills him with devils and hells, but like Paul, "when he would do good evil is present with him." The thing needed is a system of philosophy, the carrying out of which will naturally, and apparently without effort, make the world better.

Churches have been preaching of *regeneration* as the panacea for all the wickedness there is in the world. Spiritualists, having tested the matter in those professing to have passed that ordeal, have made the important discovery that no *re-generation* can over-

come the faults imparted at the first generation. They have learned that if you would have the man right, you must have the child right; and if you would have the child right, you must have him begotten under the right circumstances, of parents properly mated, and at the right time; and then certain conditions must be thrown around the mother during the period of gestation.

Spiritualists have learned that one kind of food will make one kind of head, heart, and muscle, and another kind of food another; that if you wish to make a hog of your child, but little effort is needed more than to feed him plenty of hog, and let him live as much like a hog as possible. Precepts and example can not make an evenly balanced child of one who lives after the example named above. Feed persons properly at proper times, in such quantities as they need of the food they need; give them the right kind of beds, in large, properly ventilated rooms; give them proper quantities of sleep, at the proper hours, with their bodies properly inclined, and their heads in the right direction, and you will, in two generations, *cure* depravity in man, and the churches of the doctrine of total depravity. Thus you will have overcome the necessity for any other kind of preaching than can be done by the village schoolmaster.

The investigation of the spiritual phenomena and development of its philosophy, has opened the door to the investigation of the varied sciences coming under the names, Magnetism, Mesmerism, Clairvoyance, Electricity, Psychometry, and Psychology. The investigation of these and kindred sciences developed by Spiritualism, has taught us that everything in the

universe has polarity, or, in other words, a north and south pole, — a positive and negative force. We have also learned that everything is harmonious, or what is generally called good, in proportion as it harmonizes with nature. At night, when darkness reigns, nature sleeps: that is the proper time for persons who would be harmonious to sleep. If you will sleep when nature sleeps, with your north side or end to nature's north, permitting your south to correspond with nature's south, you will be more harmonious with nature, and thus will be enabled to blend with her more perfectly and receive her instructions to a better advantage than you possibly can by any other means. When you perfectly blend with nature you will be in harmony with yourself; then you are what the world calls evenly balanced. In that condition you could not kill, rob, steal, get mad, or in any way wrong any one. The person who is properly brought into the world and lives thus, naturally reads and interprets correctly nature's great infallible volume, he can not go astray. Nothing is more needed in our colleges now than professors who shall thoroughly understand and teach the science of reform — of living truly. These things can not be brought about in a single day. "The mills of the gods grind slowly, but grind exceeding small." Let Spiritualism work after the plan it is now so successfully inaugurating, and in a few thousand years the long looked-for "good time coming" will be here.

I can not better close this chapter than by presenting a summary of the issue between Christians and Spiritualists in the form of a few

SYLLOGISTIC ARGUMENTS.

PROPOSITION. *Resolved*, That the religion of modern Spiritualism is better calculated to morally, mentally, and spiritually elevate humanity, than that of the Bible.

SYLLOGISM NO. 1.

1. That which places good works second to anything else can not, in the first sense of the word, be morally elevating.

2. But the Bible gives moral obligations, or good works, only a secondary position.

3. Therefore the Bible is not, in the first sense of the word, calculated to morally elevate mankind. Proof — Eph. ii. 8, 9 ; Rom. iii. 20–28.

SYLLOGISM NO. 2.

1. That which loves sin can not be morally elevating.

2. But the gospel does love sin.

3. Therefore the gospel is not morally elevating. Proof — Rom. vi. 17.

SYLLOGISM NO. 3.

1. That which can not teach a person how to do right, can not morally elevate him.

2. But the Bible can not teach a person how to perform that which is right.

3. Therefore the Bible can not morally elevate its adherents. Proof — Rom. vii. 14–25.

SYLLOGISM NO. 4.

1. That which teaches that persons may escape the

consequences of their own acts will teach them to act without reference to consequences.

2. But the Bible does teach that persons may escape the consequences of their acts.

3. Therefore the Bible teaches its adherents to act without reference to consequences. Proof—1 John i. 7; ii. 1, 2.

SYLLOGISM NO. 5.

1. That which leads to war, rapine, and the shedding of blood, is immoral in its tendency.

2. But the Bible has ever led its followers to war and bloodshed.

3. Therefore the Bible is immoral in its tendency. Proof—The whole history of the church. Numb. xxxi. 1, 7-17; Jer. xlviii. 10; Joel iii. 10-14; Luke xxii. 36.

SYLLOGISM NO. 6.

1. That which warns against education and philosophy is mentally depressing.

2. But the Bible does warn against education and philosophy.

3. Therefore the Bible is calculated to mentally depress its adherents. Proof—1 Cor. xi. 1-4; Col. ii. 8; 1 Cor. xiv. 38.

SYLLOGISM NO. 7.

1. That which urges an individual to hate and forsake his own family is immoral.

2. But the Bible urges men to forsake and hate their families.

3. Therefore the Bible is immoral. Proof-- Matt x. 34-38; Luke xiv. 26.

SYLLOGISM NO. 8.

1. That which leads to intemperance is immoral.
2. The Bible leads to intemperance.
3. Therefore the Bible is immoral. Proof— Deut. xiv. 26; Prov. xxxi. 6; 1 Tim. v. 23.

SYLLOGISM NO. 9.

1. That which teaches that our most secret actions and thoughts are liable at any time to be read to the multitude, will teach its adherents to so act and think that they may be willing that their thoughts and acts may be thus read.

2. But Spiritualism teaches that media can and often do read our acts and thoughts.

3. Therefore it teaches its adherents to see that even its secret acts and thoughts are pure. Proof— The whole spiritual phenomena.

SYLLOGISM NO. 10.

1. That which teaches that each individual must abide the consequences of his or her own acts, will teach its adherents to act with reference to consequences.

2. But Spiritualism does teach that each individual must abide the consequences of his or her own acts.

3. Therefore Spiritualism teaches its adherents to so act that they may be willing to take, in their own persons, the consequences of every act. Proof— All the spiritual literature of the nineteenth century.

In conclusion of this chapter permit me to say, that

if Spiritualism boasts of one thing more than another, it is its eclecticism, its optimism. It takes

“ — truth wherever found,
Whether on Christian or on heathen ground.”

The Quaker poet, in his contrast of the Old and New, thus apostrophizes the New: —

“ For still the new transcends the old,
In signs and tokens many fold:
Slaves rise up men; the olive waves,
With roots deep set in battle graves.

“ Through the harsh noises of the day
A low, sweet prelude finds its way;
Through clouds of doubt and creeds of fear,
A light is breaking calm and clear.

“ Henceforth my heart shall sigh no more
For olden time and holier shore;
God's love and blessing, then and there,
Are now, and here, and everywhere! ”

That writer and readers may be enabled to bring into every-day practice the best good of all religions, is my most sincere desire.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE MISSION OF SPIRITUALISM.

Spiritualism necessarily iconoclastic. — A superior Light. — Jesus vs. Moses. — The world's Light and Saviours. — Relation of Spiritualism to Christianity. — The decay of Institutions. — Babylon, Greece, Rome. — Republicanism as it was and is. — All stationary Institutions doomed. — The Good of all preserved. — A moving World. — A glance at the Christian World. — "What went ye out for to see." — A lethargic State. — The Infidel World. — A Feast of Negatives. — Dominion of Orthodoxy. — Programme changed. — Ministers on their good Behavior. — A Thought awakener. — The Hydesville Manifestations. — The *Vox Populi*. — Table Tippings. — New Theories of explanation. — Writing Mediumship. — A new set of Thoughts awakened. — Entrancement. — Sublimity of the Subject. — Efforts to confound the Media. — Opposers confounded. — A change of Base. — A new element of success. — A Hearing obtained. — Number of its Adherents. — Elements of Success. — Not a Matter of Faith. — Quality of Spiritualists. — Their Happiness. — Questions for Skeptics. — Death and the Grave destroyed. — An outside Work. — A few Words with Spiritualists. — A Bid for your Spiritualism. — Our Duty.

ALTHOUGH there never was, nor ever can be, a word written in defence of Spiritualism, but that must to some extent point out its mission, a chapter devoted especially to an elucidation of that subject may not be amiss. Though Spiritualism may have hitherto appeared almost exclusively *iconoclastic*, it is not so; its chief object is not to tear down, but to build. In clearing the foundations of a new superstructure it is sometimes necessary to remove the ruins and rubbish of old dilapidated ones. The sun does not shine on purpose to put the moon and stars to shame; yet the more effulgent light of the sun has always so dimmed

the lesser lights that they might have become jealous, and urged that the naughty sun only shines to obscure them. They could have said its work is purely that of an incendiary ; see, it has totally obscured our light ! How dreadful ! The millions who walked by our light last night must now be deprived of that blessed privilege !

Jesus did not come into the world to fight Judaism, — to overthrow it by positive combat, — but to *out-shine* it ; this Christians think he did. He showed his own superiority, and that of all who were guided by the light that shone from and through his inspirations, and a similar one coming to themselves, to any books that were ever written. Indeed, so far as books printed with ink on paper were concerned, Jesus was never backward in expressing his infidelity. Did he quote Moses, he more frequently quoted him to dispute his words than otherwise. Moses had said, “ An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth ; ” but Jesus could not indorse the sayings of the inspired Moses. He followed this quotation with a disjunctive, “ *But I say unto you, resist not evil.* ” Did he quote the command, “ Thou shalt not kill, ” he read it only to show its imperfection, — that if man could be kept from being angry with his brother without cause, he would not need any such command. He warned the people, that except their righteousness should exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, whose righteousness consisted in strict obedience to the letter of the Old Testament, they could not enter into the kingdom of heaven. The command, “ Thou shalt not commit adultery, ” he thought could be rendered useless by man becoming so spiritual as to have all

lust taken out of his heart. Moses had given certain laws concerning divorce; Jesus did not indorse them. Thus this great teacher takes up one command after another of the Old Testament, and either suggests an improvement, or comes out squarely in opposition to them.

All this might lead some one to ask, "But if you overthrow the authority of the Scriptures in this way, how will we know what to take for a guide?" All this Jesus answers: "You are the light of the world; a city set upon a hill can not be hid; men do not light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick, and it giveth light unto all them that are in the house." Thus he teaches that the world is to get its light from those who have this inspiration, not from books. The world had long been looking for saviors, but Jesus answers that: "Ye are the salt of the earth." Then he portrays the consequence of the salt having lost its savor.

Now, I declare that Spiritualism occupies the same relation to Christianity, that Christianity did to Judaism, and is destined to eclipse Christianity, and inaugurate a new dispensation in the same way.

All institutions in point of time are local, and as every institution of the past has given way to something grander in the future, so all present institutions, even those regarded as the most sacred, must give place to those more perfect, better adapted to the wants of man, that yet lie in the womb of the infinite future. The Babylonian government was better than the one which preceded it; so that of the Medes and Persians was better than that of the Babylonians; but "Mene, Mene, Tekel," was written on that, and it

gave way to the still more humane government of Greece. Greece could not always stand. The indomitable Romans swept that government into oblivion, retaining all there was good of it. Thus I might trace the history of nations, and find that the universal law is, the good must be superseded by the better. When the people get ripe for republicanism, a republican government is founded, and tyranny trembles before it. Republicanism as it was, was thought good enough, but it could not long satisfy the ever-progressive march of humanity toward intellectual and spiritual freedom. It had to be remodeled. The Constitution of the United States has already had fifteen amendments, and now there are many who think it sadly needs fifteen more. Thus institutions are passing, and newer, better, and higher ones taking their places. It can not be possible that what is called Christianity can escape this general wreck of institutions. As all that was good of Judaism was brought over and incorporated into the Christian system, so all that is worth preserving in Christianity will be incorporated into all future systems. For several hundred years Christianity, under an outside pressure, has steadily lopped off one after another of its excrescences, until now it could hardly be recognized by an ancient Christian. Yet this work is not finished. There are prunings and graftings for it in the immediate future, which will cause it to lose its identity. While institutions are stationary, a common and true saying is,

THE WORLD MOVES.

The world ever has moved ; sometimes it has moved so slowly that we have almost been compelled to look

through an entire century to see that it moved at all. For some cause it has moved more in the last twenty-five years than in three centuries prior to that. What is the cause of this? Simultaneously with the introduction of modern Spiritualism into the world, came a general awakening on almost every imaginable subject. A general agitation of thought seems, somehow or other, to connect itself with Spiritualism. In order to see this more perfectly, it may be well for us to take a view of the theological world, or that portion of it called Christian, at the time Spiritualism was introduced. First, let us take

A GLANCE AT THE ORTHODOX WORLD.

No observer can fail to have noted the great change that has overtaken so-called Evangelicalism since 1848. At that time, the staples of orthodoxy were, the doctrine of Original Sin, Total Depravity, an Angry God, Eternal Hell, and salvation from the wrath of this God, the pains of a fiery hell, and the clutches of an almighty personal devil, by virtue of a vicarious atonement. If my readers went to church at all in those days, they went to see a minister dressed in a peculiar style, stuck up in a close-communication pulpit, half way between the floor and the ceiling, one who claimed to be a mouthpiece for Almighty God, divinely called, and sent to denounce the wrath of an offended God upon their unprotected heads. They could, as they sat under his eloquence and logic, see themselves as poor defenseless worms, and God, as a great stogy-boot, raised over them to crush their life out. They went to hear of a "heart deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked;" men and women were

compared to "cages filled with unclean and hateful birds;" to "the sea casting up mire and dirt." Thus, from Sunday to Sunday, the people went to hear themselves denounced and abused. For some cause or other, a great change has come "over the spirit of the dreams" of the clergymen. We hear but little now of this solemn folly. Why is it? I answer: the people have grown away from it. Ministers would preach to empty pews if they now preached such nonsense.

The truth is, the world has thoroughly awaked from the lethargy that characterized it forty years ago. Then you went to meeting from Sunday to Sunday to hear the same old sing-song story told in the same old way. It was but little matter to you what the minister preached. You went to church, not for an intellectual or spiritual feast, but because it was your duty. You had to go to church or to hell, and you thought of the two you preferred the former. No minister in those days dared meet the consequences of venturing too far from the "ancient landmarks." Thus they repeated themselves and each other. When the barrel of sermons had been preached out, they could turn it over, knock the other head in, and commence again. One set of sermons would do for father, son, and grandson; and so on, almost *ad infinitum*. The world, with few exceptions, was in a lethargic state, — priests and people alike asleep, — hardly one sufficiently awake to hail the dawn of a new thought.

THE INFIDEL WORLD.

If we turn from the orthodox to the infidel world, we find that, in some respects, in the same condition.

Infidels in those days were not thinking as they are now; the most, if not all of them, seemed perfectly contented with negating the affirmations of orthodoxy. They were building no churches, schools, or colleges; in fact, were doing nothing for the world more than denying almost anything a minister would affirm. Thus one portion of the world was stagnant, and the other on a tread-wheel.

Orthodoxy all this time held a dominion over the mind, scarcely excelled by the Catholic church in its palmiest days. The minister was God Almighty's mouthpiece, his great vicegerent. He dressed, looked, talked, and acted a kind of "stand-aside-for-I-am-holier-than-thou" doctrine, and you granted it. He was a "*Learned Divine*," made of better material than common mortals, had more influence with heaven, was better acquainted with the gods and devils than were the common herds of the human family. When you met him, you took off your hat and made your lowest bow. When he expressed an opinion, it settled the question, especially if it was a theological opinion. If you differed with him, you were inclined to keep that difference to yourself. Few dared brave the world so far as to express a difference of opinion with the theologian who had arisen to any notoriety in the world.

A CHANGE.

Now we see a great change. Men have come to regard the minister as being about as good as an ordinary mortal, provided he behaves as well. If he steps aside from the path of right, his actions are criticised the same as that of any other sinner. Formerly it was not strange to see one minister settled over one

congregation for twenty, or even fifty years. Now hearers criticise the dress, manner of address, doctrine, and logic of the discourse so astutely, that few ministers can stand the ordeal. The result is, a change of ministers is required more frequently than before. The church is progressing. Some of its members progress rapidly, some slowly. The minister is too liberal for one portion of the church, not liberal enough for another; and the result of all this is, a general upheaving, a tearing up of the old foundations. But enough of this now. A few more thoughts are in reserve on the subject.

THOUGHT AWAKENED.

A writer once said, "When God lets a thinker loose on the world, let it beware." He might have said, When God lets a *thought* out, let the world take warning. Who can tell what new worlds one seed-thought may bring to light? Let Sir Isaac Newton, Harvey, Kepler, Galileo, Luther, or Jenner get an idea, and they will revolutionize the whole world of thought. Well, the theological world was wrapped in deep slumber, never even dreaming that the work of its renovation was so nigh at hand. When the spirit-raps came in the family of one John D. Fox, at Hydesville, N. Y., they came as an awakener. Be patient, dear reader, and you shall see the result. When the sounds were first heard in the winter of 1848, no one suspected the cause. The thumping on the little pine table, however, awakened the world sufficiently to have it inquire after the cause. All is well. A person who is soundly asleep can not even have his attention attracted by the raps, or inquire after their cause.

The truth is, these raps have startled theologians and scientists from their slumbers enough so they can inquire, What is this? The inquiry itself is the agitation of thought; but who can answer? This is the first time the world has had an opportunity to ask a question, and no one is sufficiently awake to answer. One suggests that it is the devil; another, that it is machinery; and another has his peculiar answer. Men, women, and children rush out to hear the tiny sounds, and to see if they can decipher the cause. The wise and the unwise are alike confounded by it. The theologian begins to search his Bible; the chemist goes into his laboratory; all take their "divining-rods" to see if they can divine the cause of the mysterious sounds. The stories of the raps are published in all the daily and weekly newspapers; those who are curious, and have the means, journey to the Mecca of Spiritualism, to learn what they can of this new phenomenon. Thus the world is aroused. One arrives at one conclusion, and another at another. These contradictory hypotheses rub against each other. A general fight ensues among the contradictory positions of an awakened world. Toe-joints, knee-joints, machinery, electricity, trickery, and *od force* so effectually play the game of Kilkenny cats with each other, that not one of them is left to tell the tale of the destruction of the others. Thus the warfare goes on.

Hundreds that fell in the battle against the new phenomena, soon found themselves resurrected on the other side, and with strength enough to do effective battle against either or all of the contradictory theories brought to bear against it. A circumstance as purely accidental as that of the acorn falling on Sir Isaac

Newton's head, had revealed an intelligence connected with the raps which was first proclaimed by a little girl, who said, "Why, mother, it can hear!" and second, by the same child, "*Only look, mother; it can see as well as hear!*"

For a time the angels seemed content with this single form of manifestation; they did not seem to wish to show us at once all they had in store for their brothers and sisters yet in the flesh; so it was rap, rap, rap, here, there, and everywhere. After the world had investigated the raps sufficiently, as the exclusive form of manifestation, and some had decided in favor and others against them, our spirit friends vouchsafed another form of manifestation. Tables began to manifest a strange disposition to get up from the floor, turn over, and move about the room; and, strange to say, there was an intelligence connected with these forms of manifestation! Tables, chairs, and stools would answer questions that were entirely beyond the ken of any in the room.

Now, the world that supposed it had thoroughly exploded the raps, was called upon for an explanation of this. Alas for the ministry and scientists! A new system of explanation was required, as much so as though it had been an entire, independent science that was to run the gantlet of their investigation. The result was, a new research and a readjustment of their theories to suit the circumstances. Thus, still more thought was awakened. This was enough. The agitation of thought was, in this case, as in others, the beginning of wisdom. The new theories of opposition brought to bear against Spiritualism were as unsuccessful as the old. Spiritualism was a "Ban-

quo's Ghost," that refused to "down," even at the bidding of the ministry.

By this time, the angel world had fully prepared, and were ready to exhibit to the world a new form of manifestation. Mediumistic individuals began to observe hitherto unknown sensations in the muscles of the arm. Soon the arm, in many instances, lost its sense of feeling, and became uncontrollable. In this condition, without the brain or soul of the subject knowing what was to be done, the hand would grasp a pencil and write out a communication, in many instances filled with undoubted tests that the writing came from a dead friend, whose signature was attached to the communication. At other times, though the medium may have been inferior in organism and development, a communication would be written, which, for elegance of diction, or argumentative power, could not have been equalled by any person present. This caused the world to put its thinking-cap on once more, and many who felt themselves fully competent to explain the raps, or tips, without admitting Spiritual agency, after the earnest inquiry, "What does this mean?" found themselves converts to the spiritual philosophy.

The combination of the rapping, tipping, and writing manifestations were destined to ripen the world for something more sublime, which the angel world had in store. Now comes the deep, unconscious, entrancement. Little boys and girls, some of them hardly in their teens, found themselves suddenly thrown into an unconscious state by the new power, and in this condition would arise and give utterance to truths the most grand that ever fell from mortal lips. The sub-

limity, eloquence, and logic of the discourses had never been surpassed, seldom equaled. Those who had only been attracted to Spiritualism before as a series of phenomena, were now attracted on account of the profound interest they felt in the facts and philosophy that were being uttered by those whom every one knew were entirely ignorant of either. As the most sublime strains of praise issued from the mouths of these "babes," tears chased each other down the cheeks of those unused to weeping; and men and women began to exclaim, as in days of yore, "Truly, they speak as never man spake." Learned doctors, lawyers, ministers, and professors in institutions of learning, circumnavigated the range of their lore to find subjects upon which girls, not fourteen years old, could not, under this power, deliver a learned and eloquent speech. This all proved unavailing, so far as confounding the power was concerned; for it showed a like familiarity with all subjects. Their efforts to "confound these mediums in their speech," were as futile as those of their ancient allies to confound the medium who overthrew Judaism. Departed poets returned, and, in strains the most rhythmical and sublime, not only answered every question asked, and solved every mystery presented, but told of their departure from earth, and their birth into a better country.

A CHANGE OF BASE.

Now Spiritualism, which had up to this point stood exclusively on the defensive, assumed the aggressive, and hoary-headed error fell before it like grass before the scythe. It now made a direct attack on systems which had long enough stayed the progress of the

world. It bearded the lion in his den, and old errors, which had denied even the right of existence to Spiritualism, had to fight for their lives. From this time forward but few found time to attack Spiritualism; all had more than they could do to defend their own fortifications. Of course Spiritualism now began to spread more rapidly than ever before, for it had not only all the phenomena that had characterized it up to this point of time, but a philosophy to commend it to the judgment of those who think. Its advocates were not compelled to go through a course of from seven to twenty years of study to be ready to enter upon its ministry. It frequently occurred that a fifteen minutes' schooling in a spirit circle was sufficient to prepare its preacher to more than meet any foe.

IT HAS OBTAINED A HEARING.

Spiritualism has not only as a distinctive form of religion gained the attention of the world, and proved its "right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," but has, somehow or other, succeeded in ingratiating itself into the general favor of the world, until there is little of the world that does not, somehow or other, mix with and recognize it. It is rapidly finding its way into the stories, poems, songs, and all other literature of the age. It is in one way or another being dramatized, and put on the boards in the theatres, and spreading even in the church in every conceivable way. Such books as Gates Ajar, unwittingly indorsing the phenomena and philosophy of Spiritualism, find their way into almost every family, while books written in opposition to Spiritualism seldom pay their publishers.

With regard to the number of converts that Spiritualism has made, I have but little to say. Having personally made no figures on the matter, I am not prepared to speak with definiteness. Calculations have been made varying all the way from nine to fifteen millions. If it was only two millions, or even one million, the work would be wonderful beyond all precedent. Starting out not a quarter of a century since, with no John the Baptist to herald it, no press or preachers to stand up in its defence, not only without a worker in its behalf, but without a believer in the world, and wading through the most dire opposition that any theory ever met; all the prejudices of the world being brought to bear against it; the pulpit and press volunteering their services in the opposition; all manner of honorable and dishonorable means used in the warfare against it,— the existence of a very few Spiritualists is proof of the power of Spiritualism to resist opposition, and, like an old sword, come out of every fight brighter than it went in: Personally I have traveled through thirty-four States and the Canadas, and, with the exception of New Orleans and San Francisco, have preached Spiritualism in every important city in the Union. In nearly every city my audiences have been much larger than those attending any church. Not only do Spiritualists exist, but there are spiritual societies scattered through all our cities, villages, and hamlets; and the "Macedonian" cry still comes in from every quarter of the globe. The demand for first-class lecturers is to-day ten times as great as the supply. This is a proof that the harvest is ripening. The gathering of souls to the great spiritual harvest is to be greatly increased in the future.

Now Spiritualism is thoroughly advertised; the prejudices have been met and overcome; our presses and ministers are at work; new media, and new forms of mediumship, are being brought into the field; almost every daily paper contains the history of something new connected with Spiritualism. Thus have we greater reason to be encouraged than ever before. Spiritualism has set out to conquer the world, and will not rest until it has accomplished this part of its mission.

Although Spiritualism has done the work I have just designated, I do not think there is one Spiritualist on earth stronger in his faith for the advancement Spiritualism has made in the world. The millions of Spiritualists are every one of them converts, either from personal tests to themselves, which would be just as good if no other person had ever received tests, or because they see the harmony of its phenomena and philosophy with all nature. Be it understood, the difference between Spiritualism and all other religions is, other religions are all matters of faith. Spiritualism is not a faith at all; its advocates tell what they *know*, not what they believe. They testify to what they have seen, not to what they have heard that others have seen.

THE QUALITY OF ITS CONVERTS.

Spiritualism, like a reform advocated by an ancient medium, finds more believers among the "common people" than among those who have more of the honor and wealth of this world on which to rely. Yet, while those of "low estate" gladly rally to its standard, there are not a few of those, whose names

would be an honor to any cause, in our ranks. Spiritualists are not all fools or fanatics. Among the leading people of the world who have avowed Spiritualism, either in its name or doctrines, or both, may be classed such names as Queen Victoria, Alexander, the Czar of Russia, Napoleon, ex-Emperor of France, the late Lord Brougham, Hon. J. R. Giddings, Senator Sprague, William Lloyd Garrison, the late Governor Talmadge, Hon. R. D. Owen, Judge J. W. Edmonds, Hon. B. F. Wade, the late President Lincoln, and besides more than as many other statesmen, who stand quite as high as those above named, some of the best scientists and philosophers in the world. Thus has Spiritualism proven itself adapted to all states and conditions of people. But this is not all. Spiritualism has not come simply to make a few millions of converts, and among them not a few of the greatest men and women on earth, but it is doing a yet nobler and grander work. I am now ready to consider

THE HAPPINESS OF ITS CONVERTS.

On this department of my subject, I only need to appeal to my Spiritualistic readers. They are certainly competent witnesses. They most of them have enjoyed or *endured* all the consolation that could possibly flow from the religions by which they are surrounded. A vast majority of the Spiritualists have come from the churches; many of them have been acceptable preachers in the various sects throughout Christendom. They know just what the various phases of evangelicalism can do for its adherents, having experienced all its consolations. They also know what Spiritualism can do. By a blessed experience, they

have learned the difference between faith and knowledge. Then, I ask, are they not competent to testify in this case? Does the skeptical reader object? Very well; then we will put him on the stand. "Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee."

Friend Skeptic, I ask you to answer me a few plain questions.

1. Which would render you the more happy, — to believe that about six thousand years ago, a short-sighted God had made of dirt a pure, good, and just man and woman, but had, at the same time, or before, made a tempter, who had tempted and enticed this sinless couple, so that they had fallen, insomuch that the men we see now are only the ruins, the *wreck*, of a former race; or to believe that man commenced low down in the scale of being, and had arisen to the noble specimens you see in the world to-day, with every prospect for better men in the future?

2. Which do you prefer to believe, — "original sin," "total depravity;" or that man, like the peach, commenced low down in the scale of being, and developed the baser, the so-called evil faculties first, but is progressing, growing better every year, developing, rounding out, so that some day he will stand comparatively perfect?

3. Which would make you the more happy, — to believe in endless hell, or endless progress? Which would you prefer, — to think of your unconverted child, in the other world, as scorching in endless flames, or endlessly progressing toward all that is pure and good?

4. Which would you prefer, — to daily talk with a sainted companion, or beatified parent or child, or know that they were locked up in an orthodox

heaven or hell, with not the least interest in you or yours?

5. Which would you prefer, — to go to an orthodox heaven, knowing that some of your friends were on the road to endless perdition, and the remainder of them suffering all of life's vicissitudes, and you not have the privilege of coming to them, or to take your position in a Spiritualists' "Summer Land," with the privilege of working for, and bringing earth-friends to a purer and better life?

Dear reader, I know we are not to make Spiritualism true or false by popular vote; a theory is not made false or true at our option; yet the answer to these questions will certainly suggest the comparative happiness of those who believe, and those who reject Spiritualism.

Spiritualism has shown us the "Gates Ajar." Our dead are brought back to us. We see them; we talk with them; we enjoy their society. Death has been robbed! His sting is gone! The grave has been despoiled of its victory! Those whom, in times past, we have regarded as locked in the gloomy vault, are not dead. We see them, hear them, and know they are not dead. They are with us, — more than ever ours. Spiritualism has come with all this good news. O glorious religion! May thy banners be unfurled, and thy peaceful influences spread, until all the world shall know thy beauty, and worship at thy feet!

Even this is not the whole of the mission of Spiritualism.

ITS OUTSIDE WORK

is greater, if possible, than anything yet mentioned. Spiritualism has already re-made the religions of the

country. Where is the minister who has not re-made his discourses in obedience to its behests? Where is the minister who now preaches a hell of fire and brimstone? What has become of the doctrine of total depravity, with its etceteras? What has become of the anger that rankled so in the bosom of an orthodox God forty years ago? Ah, these things are all gone! What killed them? I answer — *Spiritualism!* The people have had a taste of Spiritualism, and will not turn from it to the husks they have been wont to get from the pulpits. The result is, the ministers have been compelled to re-make their discourses, or preach to empty pews. This will go on until Spiritualism proper will be preached in every pulpit in the land. O glorious day! Speed it, Heaven!

A WORD TO SPIRITUALISTS.

Spiritualists, the work I have spoken of in this chapter, already accomplished, is grand. Our religion has already saved thousands from many miseries in this life, and the tormenting fear of untold agony in the next. Many honest, useful, rational citizens to-day owe their happiness, if not their sanity, to the kindly and timely interference of Spiritualism. Now permit me to ask you, what would you take for your Spiritualism? Suppose I had the money to pay into your hands now, how much would it take to buy you out? Remember, I am to buy your part of Spiritualism, and the work it has done, out of the world! You are not to know that it exists. I am also to buy its indirect influences through the churches and through society over you, so you shall be morally and mentally where you would have been had Spiritualism never

been heard of. In its stead a yawning, fiery hell ; in short, old theology, with all its devils and goblins grim, shall stare you in the face.

Now you are ready to talk to me. How much will you take for your Spiritualism? Ah, if all the world were in one scale, and Spiritualism and its consequences in the other, I think I see you getting into the scale with Spiritualism. Now, let me tell you, there are thousands in this world to-day, almost, if not quite, where you were before Spiritualism put its tender hands so lovingly under you. Do you realize that every new truth brings new duties? This great spiritual boon came to many of you not only without money and without price, but absolutely unsought, unwanted, and, in not a few instances, unwelcomed. Now it is your privilege to co-operate with the angels, and carry this work forward.

If Spiritualism has made you happy, it is reasonable that it would do the same for your neighbor. Could you not make a little effort to lay it before him? Millions are being squandered every year to send the gospel to the heathen, and millions more are exhausted in preaching a worse than heathenish gospel to your neighbors. You have the power to at least partly counteract that work. Will you do it? If you are alone in this blessed knowledge, will you at least make one thorough effort to get our lectures and literature before your neighbors? If you are not alone, will you co-operate with your brethren in trying to speed this cause in your own immediate vicinity? You may thus be a means of blessing, and being a "savor of life unto life" to others, as you have been blessed, and thus bring a double blessing to your own soul.

The privilege of assisting in this work now, while you are needed, is extended to you. Do, I beseech you, step into this gap. There is not a drone in all the hives of our adversaries. Let us emulate their example.

“If you can not in the conflict
 Prove yourself a soldier true —
 If, when fire and smoke are thickest,
 There's no work for you to do:
 When the battle field is silent,
 You can go with careful tread, —
 You can bear away the wounded,
 You can cover up the dead.

“Do not, then, stand idly waiting
 For some greater work to do;
 Fortune is a lazy goddess —
 She will never come to you.
 Go and toil in any vineyard;
 Do not fear to do or dare;
 If you want a field of labor,
 You can find it anywhere.”

That Spiritualists may realize what the angels have done for them, and show their appreciation of this work by a consecration of their all, and concentrated and concerted action in behalf of the truths they love, and that their works may be crowned with more abundant success in the future than in the past, is the most earnest desire of the writer of this volume.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE CUI BONO OF SPIRITUALISM.

A proper Inquiry.— Its Work slow. — Jesus' Argument. — "By their Fruits shall ye know them." — Author's Experience. — A Struggle with Poverty. — Letter from Dr. Newton. — Reflections on the same. — Author takes Courage. — Dr. Newton's three Months' Work. — Suicide of a Girl. — Her dead Mother kept her from Sin. — Worldly good of Spiritualism. — Serfs liberated. — Lizzie Keizer and the Apple Pedler. — Experience as a Healer. — Cure of a withered Hand. — A Lady saved. — That Bread Fund. — A Medium saved from a Railroad Accident. — A Train of Cars saved by Spirit Interposition. — Peter West saves a Train of Cars. — A Collision avoided. — A Conflagration saved by Spirits. — Pair of Shoes sent to a Beggar. — Inventions by Spirits. — Moral good of Spiritualism. — A Methodist Lady in Trouble. — A Dialogue. — Petty Tyranny. — A Drunkard saved. — A Case in Wisconsin. — Case in Chicago. — Spirits curing Appetite for Tobacco. — A Medium compelled to restore his ill-gotten Money. — Other Stimulants to Purity. — "Be sure your Sins will find you out." — Mental good of Spiritualism. — Lady saved from Insanity by her Spirit Son. — Asylums cheated out of Subjects. — Case in Iowa. — Only a few Grains. — Spiritualism in a dying Hour.

THOUGH we may not be able at first sight to see all of the good of things newly discovered and developed, and sometimes not any of it, yet it is always proper to inquire after the good of any thing that comes to the world, more especially those that man seems to have some hand in bringing about. It is true that even the advocates of new systems can not always tell the good that is to grow out of them. When Benjamin Franklin was questioned as to the good of his electrical experiments, he confessed that he could not see just what good would come from them. Ask our telegraphic operators, or any one who knows anything of

the workings of the Atlantic cable, and they will tell you the good of past experiments with the electric forces.

It is conceded that a new theory, calculated to supplant old institutions and not put something better in their place, can not work for the benefit of humanity. He is a villain who would tear down your house, and leave you without shelter in the street. He who would persuade you to leave your house for a better one, you would class among your best friends. So, if Spiritualism has come simply to tear down old institutions, and raze the foundations on which society is built, and not put something better in their place, its work is purely that of an incendiary; the quicker it meets its doom the better for the world. Yet it must be remembered that large bodies move slowly. "The Pyramids were not built in a day," nor do revolutions always spring into life and accomplish their work in a few weeks.

It may be that the inquiry the world is now making after the good already accomplished by Spiritualism, is just a little premature. Though Spiritualism has always been in the world, it is not yet a quarter of a century since it commenced the work of forcing itself upon the public mind as a distinctive religion. It has had no standing armies, no political parties to enforce its tenets upon the people. It may not, in twenty-four years, have accomplished so much good as Christianity has in the centuries of its dominion, yet that is offset by the fact that it has not done so much evil. It has not founded many institutions of learning, neither has it produced a Saint Bartholomew's Day, where *one hundred thousand* lives were sacrificed to its chief Mogul in a single day. Thus it may not have

done as much work as older religions. It takes a new phase of faith a long time to get recognition at all, and still longer to work its adherents over, and entirely root out old prejudices, and clear away the obstructions to its work. The ground must be torn up, mountains leveled down or tunneled, valleys filled up, and much that looks like incendiary work done, before railroads can be built. When this work is going on, the question as to the good of railroads can not be answered by pointing to any particular good that one has done.

Notwithstanding Spiritualism is only beginning to get ready for operation, not being yet organized and harnessed into its work, I know of no Spiritualist who is not willing that the question of its *cui bono* shall now be submitted to the world, its works in every instance to furnish the answer.

I know of no better course to pursue in this investigation than that adopted by the Judean reformer. When John sent word, "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" Jesus said to John's agents, "Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see: The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk; the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear; the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them; and blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me." (Matt. xi. 3-6.)

Jesus intended that the divinity of his system of religion should be attested by its works. If his logic was good, the divinity of any religious system can be attested in the same way; if not, we still want proof that the world is better for having Christianity in it.

In speaking of agitators that were to come into the world, Jesus was very careful to instruct his pupils not to reject every new religious idea or teacher that should arise, — only the *false* ones were to be rejected; and the rule by which to try them was plain. His advice on the subject reads as follows: “Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree can not bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruit ye shall know them.” (Matt. vii. 15–20.)

That last sentence, “By their fruit ye shall know them,” is right to the point. I wish people would abolish every rule of trying men or their religions, except by their fruit. That is as Jesus says: the way to try fruit trees, I care not how crooked, knotty, and scrubbed a fruit tree may be, if it bears an abundance of nice, luscious, healthy fruit, the farmer calls it a good tree, and takes care of it. Again, let the tree be ever so thrifty, straight, and grand, if it bears no fruit, or if its fruit is bitter or tasteless, — if its only production is thorns or thistles, it is pronounced a “corrupt tree,” and cut down and burned. By this rule Spiritualists are willing their religion shall be tried. If Spiritualism has by this time produced no good fruit, though it is hardly old enough to be noticed as a tree at all, I am willing to help cut it down.

This, the only course of argument for me to pursue,

will make the case turn almost wholly on personal experiences; so permit me to record some experiences and some personal observations of the experience of others.

When Spiritualism came to me, it came with much such an announcement as it did to Saul of Tarsus: "I will show him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake." (Acts ix. 16.) Spiritualism faithfully warned me that it would yet deprive me of both friends and property. Could I at that time have taken the full meaning of that prophecy, I now think I should have looked back with no small amount of hankering for the "leeks and onions of Egypt;" but a partial unbelief was kindly vouchsafed me in this time of need. "But," added the good angel, "don't let this discourage you; new friends will soon gather around you, and your property will only be bread cast upon the waters,—you will gather it again."

Thus far the angels have been as good as their word. No sooner was I compelled by conviction to renounce the old and take hold of the new than every old-time friend was my enemy. Old friends went faster than new ones came. One misfortune followed another, until I found myself several hundred dollars in debt, and not a dollar to pay with. What was to be done? One Sunday morning, while residing in Milwaukee, my "cruse" not only scraped the bottom of the barrel, but it scraped when there was nothing there! There was a wife and four hungry children in the house, but not one bite of anything to eat, nor as much as five cents in money! Now I had come to my rope's end, what could I do? The children would soon be crying for bread, and no possibility of supply-

ing, unless by begging or stealing. Kind reader, place yourself in that position, and many poor, who now rest under your censure, will instead receive your pity. It was at this time that I fully made up my mind — well, not exactly to renounce Spiritualism, for that can not be done, — but to renounce my work for the angels. I said, Spiritualism is true; but, *cui bono?* My spirit friends care nothing for me. I have given up all for them, — have served them faithfully ever since I knew of their existence, and yet they care nothing for me, — they would let me starve. Tomorrow morning I will accept a situation offered me in the city, and let Spiritualists and Spiritualism take care of themselves. “No,” said my best earthly friend, “you will not.” I went to the post-office and found a letter, which I opened, and read as follows:—

“NEW YORK, August 6, 1866.

“MOSES HULL.

“My Dear Brother: I am impressed that you are in great need. Enclosed find my mite. I am very busy. Letters must be as brief as telegraphic despatches. Twenty thousand patients have been benefited by my magnetism since the first of May.

“Truly your brother,

“DR. J. R. NEWTON.”

When I took the letter in my hand, for a few moments I did not stop to discuss the news contained in it. I was busy with another subject. Never, in my history, had ten dollars come so opportune, nor were words ever more fitly spoken. I reflected as follows: Who told the doctor that I had spent my last penny? How did he get the “impression” that I was ir

“great need?” What impulse was that? Why did it happen to move him at that time? Why was I selected as the subject? Why does this impression manifest such an intelligence and such an interest for me? Is not this the fulfillment of the promise made by my spirit friends, “Your bread and water shall be sure.” I there and then resolved to trust the angels, and never, under any circumstances, renounce my allegiance to them. At that time the tide turned, and that which had flown from me began to flow back. I have ever been a poor, stubborn servant of the angels, — often a poor tool for them to use, — but have never, for one moment, felt to distrust them.

Now, permit me to invite attention to the news contained in the letter. “*Twenty thousand patients have been benefited by my magnetism since the first of May.*” Supposing Spiritualism never has done any good, excepting relieving pain. Again: supposing it never did any of that, except through the mediumship of Dr. Newton. Again: we will suppose they never used this one man only during the three months mentioned in this letter! Even then has not Spiritualism done some good in the world? Nay, have all the doctors in the city of New York done as much in any three months in their lives? Let me carry this argument further. You may throw off ninety per cent. of the number of cases that the doctor reported to have benefited by his magnetism during the three months mentioned in his letter, and then I submit that Spiritualism comes with *better* credentials from the angel-world than any other religion. Go to the poor sufferer, tortured with pain and scorched with fever, and ask him whether he could see the good of the power that

would relieve him? And you have answered the question of the good of Spiritualism.

There I stopped writing long enough to glance at the Springfield Republican, just thrown into my door, and the first thing that met my eyes was so appropriate, that I yield to the impulse to copy it. Here it is:—

“THE SUICIDE OF AN AMERICAN GIRL IN LONDON occurred under very sad circumstances, about three weeks ago. She drowned herself at Waterloo Bridge, and the motives which impelled her to the act are vividly set forth in this letter, which she left behind her: The crime that I am about to commit, and what I suffer hereafter, is nothing compared to my present misery. Alone in London, not a penny, or a friend to advice or lend a helping hand, tired and weary with looking for something to do, failing in every way, footsore and heart-weary, I prefer death to the dawning of another wretched morning. I have only been in Britain nine weeks. I came as nursery-governess with a lady from America to Wick, in Scotland, where she discharged me, refusing to pay my passage back, giving me my wages, £3.10s. After my expenses to London, I found myself in this great city with only 5s. What was I to do? I sold my watch. The paltry sum I obtained for that soon went in paying for my board and in looking for a situation. Now I am destitute. Every day is a misery to me. No friend, no hope, no money: what is left? Oh, God of heaven, have mercy on a poor, helpless sinner; thou knowest how I have striven against this, but fate is against me. I can not tread the path of sin, for my dead mother will be watching me. Fatherless, motherless, home I have none. Oh, for the rarity of

Christian hearts. I am now mad ; for days I have foreseen that this would be the end. May all who hear of my death forgive me, and may God Almighty do so, before whose bar I must soon appear. Farewell to all, to this beautiful and yet wretched world. ALICE BLANCHE OSWALD. I am twenty years of age the 14th of this month."

Was there ever anything more touching ? " I can not tread the path of sin, for my dead mother will be watching me." How many thousands have been kept from sin by the same watchful care of those on the other side ? How kind in that mother to tempt that poor, homeless, wandering, orphaned, outcast daughter over to the other side ? There was not room for her in this world ! No road open for her, except that of sin and shame. Let us rejoice that death's door ever stands ajar, and the deep waters always welcome such guests ! What shall be said of the lady (?) who discharged the poor orphan girl in a strange country, without paying her enough, so that she could re-return to her native land ? Is there blood enough in all the animals of the Jewish system, or the saviors of all others, to atone for her heinous sins ? One can but wish the poor unfortunate had given the name and address of the " lady from America." It would be well to know what church has the responsibility of the salvation of such a soul.

But I am ahead of my subject. Permit me now, under a distinct heading, to discuss the

TEMPORAL GOOD OF SPIRITUALISM.

Dr. J. G. Fish, in his debate with Mr. Dunn, in Rochester, N. Y., said, " Under the direction of his

father — through Mr. Home as medium — the Czar of Russia liberated twenty millions of serfs. Abraham Lincoln, under the influence of his spiritual advisers, signed the Emancipation Proclamation at Washington.”

The above is strictly true. Twenty-four millions of men and women, with their offspring, are to-day indebted to Spiritualism for their liberty. If liberty is a temporal blessing, Spiritualism has come laden with such.

The following I take from the same source. Mr. Beck, the gentleman with whom Lizzie Keizer resides, and Lizzie herself, have told me the same story. Those well acquainted with Miss Keizer, know many similar incidents in the history of her mediumship. I give it as related by Mr. Fish: —

“Lizzie Keizer, the medium, passing one day down the street, was accompanied by a person whom she supposed to be mortal. As they passed a building used for public purposes, the individual says to Lizzie, ‘Look on the steps.’ There sat an old man, careworn, diseased, starving, and sick. The individual says, ‘That is my father, but he can not see or hear me now.’ ‘Why,’ said Lizzie, ‘I thought you was in the body.’ ‘No, I am a spirit; that is my father; he wants to go to St. Louis, and wants money to buy bread.’ Lizzie asked her name. ‘My name is Elizabeth.’ Lizzie went to the old man, and said, ‘You are tired, sick, hungry, and want to go to St. Louis.’ ‘That is all true,’ said the old man, ‘but how did you know it?’ Said Lizzie, ‘Your daughter Elizabeth told me.’ ‘My daughter Elizabeth? Why, my daughter Elizabeth has been dead many years.’ ‘Yes,’ said

Lizzie, 'I know that ; but her spirit came along with me, and pointed you out to me, and told me all about it.' Tears rolled down the old man's cheek. He was destitute. 'The good girl gave him two dollars, *all she had in the world*. He went on his way. I wrote to the place where he went, and received a reply from the postmaster that he arrived safely, and died a few days after his arrival.'

It was *five* dollars, and that of borrowed money, instead of two, that Lizzie gave the poor rheumatic sufferer. Probably the printers made the mistake in Mr. Fish's account of the matter. However, had it been only five cents, it was enough to help the old gentleman to his friends to die ; and the test from his daughter Elizabeth afforded more pleasure than gold or silver could have purchased from the poor sufferer. Thousands of such incidents as these can be pointed out as a few of the good things resulting from communion with the world of angels.

A few personal experiences, under this heading, may not be inappropriate. After a somewhat extended investigation of the religions of different nations, including that of the Jews and Christians, I concluded that it had been an extensive, if not universal custom among ancient nations, for ministers or priests to be healers. So, to follow the example of the ancients, as well as benefit humanity, I concluded I would do the double work of preaching the gospel and healing the sick. This I followed more or less for several years, with a degree of success that would have warranted my continuing the same, could I, in justice to myself, have longer carried the double burden. In cases of healing by my own hands, if

there were no other evidence of the good of the power which used me, I have found all I need on this part of the argument.

I have no authority to use names in the following case, yet I will furnish, for private use, names and address of witnesses, if wanted. At a hotel in a western city I was introduced to Col. —, a gentleman who had no faith in Spiritualism; but as he had but little faith in other religions, and naturally inclined to investigate new things, he attended, and manifested a deep interest in my lectures. He came into my rooms several times during the week to talk over our philosophy. During one of his calls, something seemed to say to me, "You can cure his arm." I then noticed, for the first time, that his arm was useless, and apparently dead. Yet I could not pick up the courage to ask the unbelieving colonel to permit me to treat it. The next day he came to my rooms, and said, "I've come to test the virtue and power of your spirits. I have one of my awful headaches to-day. Nothing ever has cured my head when it commenced aching; it never quits until it gets its ache out." A moment convinced me that I could cure him. In five minutes more he was well. Then the impression came so strongly that I must work on that arm, that I could not resist the impulse to beg the privilege. "Certainly," was his reply; "but the arm is dead. You may as well go to the graveyard and try to manipulate a dead arm there to life. This arm has neither sense of feeling nor power of motion. It was shot with a poisoned arrow during the Indian war in Minnesota. It's a wonder I had not died. Everybody else beside me, that was wounded, died. In my

case, only this arm died." Feeling a heavy influence upon me, I took hold of his withered, helpless hand. In a moment I felt a twitching in his fingers. In another moment the tips of his fingers were covered with perspiration. In thirty minutes he had the use of his hand and arm ; and in an hour he was holding a composing-stick in that hand and setting type. This man had spent a small fortune in doctoring that hand, and received no benefit.

Now let us suppose there is nothing of Spiritualism except the healing of a few otherwise hopeless cases, similar to the one mentioned above, is not that enough of itself to answer the question as to whether any good is to result from the communion established between the two worlds ?

In the village of Allegan, Mich., I once delivered one of my most earnest and violent lectures against Spiritualism. Fully believing Spiritualism to be immoral in its tendency, I never left an opportunity unimproved to warn the people against what I believed to be its delusive snares. At the conclusion of the lecture, a Spiritualist, with whom I had a passing acquaintance, asked me to hear his story, and, if possible, harmonize it with my theory. The following is the substance of what he related :—

“ Not long since I attended a circle. After several interesting communications, a medium, in a deep trance, said to me, ‘ Go out on the street ’ (designating the place), ‘ and you will find a lady engaged in a low conversation with a man. She is needy ; give her some money.’ I went, and found the lady as directed, and handed her the amount of money I supposed she needed. As soon as she received the

money, she said, 'Sir, you have saved me. This amount of money I must have had to-night, or my household goods would have been set in the street to-morrow morning. I could not pay my rent. I was never used to doing business before my husband was killed in the war. Now I am alone in the world, and have the care of four helpless children. I have tried every honorable means of obtaining a livelihood, and failed. I have labored and prayed earnestly for some way to open by which I could make an honest living; and now, as a last resort, I had proposals, and would have been compelled to sell my virtue for money to buy bread for my children and pay my rent.' Now, said he, if Spiritualism is evil, and all evil, as you represent, how do you account for this, and a thousand similar cases?"

Sure enough, a few such cases are worth more to determine the effects of Spiritualism than all the theories in the world. I do not relate this to show the moral effect of Spiritualism, as illustrated in the salvation of the lady's virtue, for it did not save her virtue. I do not regard a lady as having lost her virtue because external circumstances *compel* her to sell herself to save her children from the poorhouse, any more, nor as much, as I regard the lady who marries for a home and position in society as being a prostitute. The salvation in this case consisted, at least in part, of a *temporal* blessing, — the relief of her immediate wants. In addition to that, she saved herself the humiliation of being compelled to surrender her ladyhood for a living.

The Spiritualists of America are aware that the firm of William White & Co., of the city of Boston, every

week of the world dispense spiritual light and food to the multitude through their widely-circulated Banner of Light. They may not all be aware that there is connected with this publishing-house what they call a "bread-fund;" that the poor can go there at any time and get tickets for enough bread to supply their immediate necessities. But I often wonder whether the hundreds of persons who have been supplied with bread from this source, that otherwise must have suffered, know that they are directly indebted to the spirit-world for that supply? That "bread-fund" originated in the spirit-world. The necessity of such a fund, and method of operating it, was suggested by a departed human spirit, through the mediumship of Mrs. Conant. Probably one half of the money that has been contributed to sustain it has been given under the direct influence, or at the earnest request of departed human spirits. Does this look as though Spiritualism had come to do any good?

I know a medium who owes his life to the fact, that the spirits took him by force out of a railroad car, and off of the train at the last station, before it collided with another, killing several passengers, among whom was the one occupying the seat he vacated. Could all the passengers have been under the influence of such wise and tender guides they might all have been saved. Could engineers and conductors all come under such power, what a world of accidents could be prevented! This alone would make Spiritualism worth more than all the religions of the world. Many such cases have occurred.

A mediumistic engineer, near Eyota, Minn., saw the familiar form of an old lady jump on to his train

in the night. She stood and looked at him for a moment, and said, "For God's sake, stop your train!" He immediately whistled "down brakes," and got his train stopped within about four feet of where the track was torn up. He learned the next day that the old lady had been in the spirit world only about an hour when this occurred.

When Peter West, a noted medium from Chicago, was returning home from the army, he run out of money, and got the privilege of firing from Albany to Buffalo. He had never been over the route before. Suddenly a spirit came to him, and said, "The bridge just around the curve is broken." He said to the engineer, "Is there not a bridge just ahead?" On being answered that there was, he said, "There is a spirit here that tells me to have you stop the train, as the bridge is broken down." The train was stopped, and scores of lives saved. The railroad officers were so grateful that they furnished a pass, sending the poor medium to Chicago, and the passengers attested their gratitude by presenting him a purse of money.

An engineer on the P. Ft. W. & C. R. W., by the name of Aimes, a personal acquaintance of the writer, stopped and switched his train at Hobart, Ind., in obedience to a spirit command, just in time to save a collision with a late train from Chicago.

Father Lindsley, at Rural, Ohio, started to meeting one night, but was commanded by spirits to go back, as his house was on fire. He turned, and hastened home, just as the flames were bursting up from coals that had fallen on the floor. He saved his house by spirit direction.

An entranced medium, in the city of Worcester, Mass., handed me two dollars, stating that I would meet a barefooted little girl, and I might get her a pair of shoes with it. The same evening, the 8th of March, 1864, I met a little barefooted beggar girl in the city of Lynn, who said, "Please sir, give me five cents to buy a candle with; my pa is dead, and my ma is sick, and we have no milk for the babe." I opened my pocket-book to give the child five cents, when I noticed that two-dollar bill lying by itself; it brought the spirit message to my mind. I then noticed that the child was barefooted, although it was snowing. I handed her, in addition to the five cents with which to buy a candle, the two-dollar bill. Said she, "Are you going to give me all of this?" "Yes," said I; "it is all yours." "Oh, goodie, goodie, goodie!" said she, "I have enough to buy a pair of shoes." Reader, that little girl, for the first time in many months, was happy then; and I never felt so well over an agency in my life, as in the fact, that I had been the agent to carry that two dollars to that little girl. Does Spiritualism come with temporal blessings in its hands?

I personally know of more than a dozen useful inventions, given by the spirits, that have been patented. The artesian well of Chicago, and more than a score of oil wells in Pennsylvania, were located by spirits. Lost wills, deeds, property, and people have been found, and stolen money discovered and recovered by spirits; and yet people say, *cui bono?*

Permit me now to enter upon the investigation of the

MORAL GOOD

resulting from Spiritualism. For the argumentative part of this division of the subject, I will refer the reader to a former volume,* and to former parts of this work. I will here only relate a short dialogue, and a few incidents.

Not long since, a gentleman in one of Indiana's leading towns, who had recently renounced Methodism, and taken hold of Spiritualism, asked me to go and spend the night with him. Said he, "I don't know how my wife will treat you; she is very bitter in her opposition to Spiritualism, but has consented to have you spend a night and a day in our house. I hope you will do her some good."

I found the lady, as announced by her husband, very bitter in her opposition, and violent in her language. I tried to reason with her that night and the next morning, but to no purpose. After her husband had gone to his work, she came into my room, bathed in tears, and said, "Mr. Hull, please do not lead my husband further on the road to ruin. Only just think; one year since, he was a respectable man, and a class-leader in the Methodist church!" Said I, "You must not think Spiritualism is leading everybody to hell, because your husband has become a bad man from his connection with it. Evil will work out; and your husband's evil would have come to light in some other way if he had not become a Spiritualist." Our dialogue then assumed about the following form: —

* Question Settled, pp. 40-45, published by William White & Co., Boston. Price \$1.50. Postage 16 cents.

Lady. My husband's *evil*, did you say? Sir, I want you to understand that he is not a bad man.

Hull. Oh, I misunderstood you! I had supposed, from what I had learned in the village, that he was a good man; but your representations had changed my mind. You tell of the high and respectable position from which he has fallen: I inferred that Spiritualism had made him bad.

Lady. In a certain sense it has; but then he does not do any really criminal things.

Hull. He is not so good a husband as he was when he became a Spiritualist, is he?

Lady. Well, if it is any of your business, he is as good. There never was a better husband in the world than mine.

Hull. But is he a good father? Does he provide well for his children? Does he treat them well?

Lady. Why, his children are seemingly his idols; no father could treat his children better than he treats his. If anything, he is not so rigid with them as when he belonged to the church.

Hull. I am really glad he is as good a husband and father as in his Christian days; there are, according to that, two relations in which Spiritualism has not spoiled him. The fact of his not being so good a neighbor as in former times, may be accounted for on the ground that the prejudice of his neighbors against Spiritualism may have caused them to treat him differently from what they did before his change of sentiment.

Lady. But he is as good a neighbor as he ever was. Spiritualism has not injured him in the least in that respect.

Hull. It has not? Well, if Spiritualism has not injured him as a husband, father, or neighbor, please tell me what injury it has done him? Is he not as good a Christian as ever?

Lady. So far as doing his duty by everybody and thing by which he is surrounded is concerned, he is; otherwise he is not.

Hull. In what sense is he not a Christian?

Lady. Why, he would prefer to spend his Sundays in the fields, or woods, or reading old Davis's books, or, sometimes I think even fishing or hunting, rather than going to the church, where in former days he took such delight.

Hull. I see the point. He prefers to go into God's great library and read the bibles God printed on all nature, to reading a man-made book, that you call the Bible. He prefers to read the writings of A. J. Davis, rather than to attend the church. His crime is against the Methodist ministry and church. That is unpardonable. Now, if you will show me that he has sinned against God or nature, I will try to point out to him the error of his ways.

Lady. I do not claim that he is a great sinner; I only claim that I don't want Spiritualism to ruin my family.

Hull. Is your family on the verge of ruin? I am sorry.

Lady. O, I don't know as it is; but I did tell him, when he began to attend circles and talk about Spiritualism, that I would not live with him if he embraced it.

Hull. That is the way Spiritualism ruins families. One party embraces it, and the other says, I won't

live with you unless I can dictate you in matters of religious opinion. Now he does not object to your being a Methodist : if you will be as liberal as he, all will be well. When I commenced this conversation, I expected to find your husband a bad man ; instead, I find you a very illiberal, sectarian woman, chagrined because he will not permit you to take charge of his conscience. Permit me to say here, that in every case where I have attempted to investigate the evils of Spiritualism, I have, instead of finding it evil, found a petty tyrant trying to dictate a course of life to another. You have no more right to dictate your husband's faith to him, or call him a bad man because he will not throw away his judgment for yours, than you have to dictate when and what he shall eat or drink, or when he shall rest or sleep.

Suffice it to say that this conversation put her on a new train of thought, which culminated in her investigating her husband's character from a different standpoint ; also, in her indorsing the very reading and preaching that she condemned her husband for studying, including even what she had designated as " Old Davis's works." In a majority of cases where we hear charges of the immoral tendency of Spiritualism, an investigation brings the same result.

Not many years since I had a talk with the president of a Spiritualist society in one of our principal cities. I spoke of my full belief that the tendency of Spiritualism was toward, and not from, morality. He said, " I am a partial illustration of what Spiritualism can do ; I tell you, because you can use it for the benefit of others and the advancement of the cause. I inherited from my father an appetite for intoxicating

drink. I was drunk before I was six years old, and every opportunity between that and the time I was thirty-six. I never paid any attention to Spiritualism, or thought anything of it, but effectually tried the other religions, and the doctors, and about everything else of the age, to cure me of my ungovernable appetite for intoxicating liquors. All proved of no effect; my money, the use of my brains, my happiness, and that of my family, were all exhausted. I would have traded my last pair of boots for soul and body poisoning alcohol.

“I was in this condition when a series of Spiritual meetings were being conducted in this city. The lecturer, one of the most popular lady lecturers we ever had, on returning home from meeting on Sunday, received a request from one of her spirit guides to go into a drinking saloon and take me out. My mother had requested this spirit to do this work. Though her friends, many of them leading Spiritualists, protested against this act, she went into the saloon, found me, more than half drunk, and though I was an entire stranger to her she took me home, preached to me, magnetized me, put me under spirit power, and took from me that inherited appetite for intoxicating liquors. Though that was near seven years since, from that day to this no intoxicating drink of any kind has ever touched my lips.”

This man lived six years longer, a sober, honest, industrious, and with the exception of his Spiritualism, a *respectable* man. As long as he could speak his lips praised the religion that had prepared him for the better world. Among his last requests was the one that a Spiritualist should preach at his funeral, and use

the victories he had obtained as an evidence of the good of getting in communication with our ascended brethren. This case is only a sample. There are hundreds like it in many particulars. Say, do such things prove Spiritualism to be a temporal and moral blessing? The name of the individual above mentioned, and the names and addresses of witnesses can be given by application to the author of this volume.

I personally know of several other cases of a similar kind. An old man in Wisconsin was saved, and effectually cured of the habit of intoxication by his son, who had been killed in the army, appearing from time to time to him in the drinking saloon, entreating him not to drink, sometimes knocking a well-filled glass out of his hand, and finally bringing him under an influence by which he controlled his appetite. A man in Chicago was saved in the same way by the return of a spirit daughter who gave him a prescription, the use of which cured him of the disease called "common drunkard." Only this morning an incident was related to me, by a responsible party, of an inveterate chewer and smoker of tobacco, being saved from that useless and filthy habit by the spirits causing tobacco to make him sick. This was the last resort: all other means had failed.

A man who is now one of our best Spiritualistic writers, thirty years since, when a respectable member of a church, paid his fare on a steamboat; the clerk, by mistake, handed him in change two five-dollar bills instead of one. His first thought was, I will return the extra bill; after that he reflected that the steamboat company was rich and he was poor; he would keep the bill; the company would never miss

it, and certainly there could be no harm in his taking the advantage of that circumstance. Thus his conscience was eased, and he kept the money near twenty years, until he became a medium. As soon as he came *en rapport* with the spirit world, he was told of that stain on his soul, and no rest was given him, day or night, until he went to the company and paid them that money with the interest. No atonement — nothing but integrity, *strict, unswerving fidelity to justice*, could avail in his case. If every pretended Christian in the world could to-day exchange his imputed righteousness for such an influence, the world would stand morally higher than it does. Why should not Spiritualism lead to a higher and purer life? It ever approaches man's best faculties, always appealing to the very highest social qualities of his nature. Even admitting that your very best friends in the spirit world are not with you, the *thought* entertained by Spiritualists that they are, will have much the same effect as though they were present. Spiritualists generally believe that their spirit friends are with them, watching and guarding, pleased with their efforts to rise in the scale of purity, and grieved with their violations of the principles of rectitude — that their most secret thoughts are read by their spirit friends as readily as an expert would read an open book. This is not all: the commission of sin envelopes the sinner in an atmosphere of sin that can be seen, tasted, and *felt* by every sensitive medium with whom he comes in contact.

Spiritualists do not believe that there are or can be any secrets. They believe that every stone, to the one who can read, tells how it was made; that every

tree of the forest tells of every dry or wet season through which it passed; that knots and scars tell to the reader, of accidents which occurred a century since; so they claim that even your *sins* will find you out. It will be impossible to flee from either your sins or their scars. This world and the other will read them all; that the final and total consequence of sin must fall upon the one who commits it; nothing can step in between the act and the actor. Believing this, will they not be more inclined to try to live stainless lives? I believe the history of Spiritualists and Spiritualism will, when fairly written, show such to be the fact. The thought of being surrounded by the pure and good, must lead to thoughts and acts of the same kind.

“With a slow and noiseless footstep
Come the messengers divine,
Take the vacant chair beside me,
Lay their gentle hands in mine.

“And they sit and gaze upon me,
With those deep and tender eyes,
Like the stars, so still, and saint-like,
Looking downward from the skies.

“Uttered not, yet comprehended,
Is the spirit's voiceless prayer
Soft wishes in blessings ended,
Breathing from their lips of air.”

THE MENTAL GOOD

Growing out of Spiritualism can not, in this short chapter, be told. It has, in almost every case, developed and quickened the mental powers of its mediums, not only so, but its soothing power is beyond computation. Among the instances of the mental soothing effects of Spiritualism only two will be

told. The first I give in substance as related to me by witnesses, the second came under my own observation.

A young man in Chicago persuaded his widowed mother to let him go to the war. When she gave her consent, she urged upon him the immediate necessity of embracing Christ, as his new perils would render his life more precarious and uncertain than ever before. His response was, "Mother, I would if but for your sake if I could, but as I have often told you, I am unfortunate in my organization; I can not believe in your religion." Thus he went to the war an unregenerated infidel. He fell in his first engagement with the enemy. When the telegraph flashed the news back to the old Christian lady, that her son was killed, she exclaimed, "*My boy is in hell!* He did not believe in Christ; he was a good boy but not a Christian: I must go to hell with my child; I could not leave him in that horrid place alone. No, a mother's love will follow her son there; I will go with my child."

Her minister told her that her son was a good boy, and tried to persuade her that he was not in hell. He had died in his country's cause. In an hour of peril like this, the cause of the country was next to the cause of Christ; there was hope for her son. All this argument was wasted on the old lady; she had drunk deeply of the doctrines of the church. She argued logically, too; that her son had died out of Christ, and hence exposed to hell. The church had no consolation for her; she became partially insane, and it was only by the most vigilant and patient watchfulness that she was kept from committing suicide, in order, as she said,

to join her boy in hell. At last, after a great deal of persuading, she was induced to visit a test medium. Soon her son came, but unable to control much, gave place to his father, who related the circumstances of the boy's death, and told of his condition in the spirit world, giving her new light with regard to both hell and heaven. This interesting seance was concluded by inviting the old lady to visit another medium, giving the name and place, and informing her that it was probable that her son could control the medium. The taste she had got was enough to cause the old lady to long for more. She visited the other medium, and got tests from her own dear boy. This of course was followed by other manifestations, resulting in her complete emancipation from the church and its dogmas. The result was, she became calm and even happy. Her mind was restored to its balance, and the lunatic asylum cheated out of a victim.

Was this good? Every other help had been sought, and failed. No arm was found strong enough to rescue this old lady, except Spiritualism. There are thousands in the asylums to-day who have gone there from similar causes to that which come so near sending this old lady into a lunatic's cell. Let us extol the religion that would make even insane retreats houses of praise.

The only remaining incident to which I would refer, happened in Iowa. An ordinarily good man, in the heat of political controversy, became offended at something said, and swore he would have the life of the offender. During a fit of insanity, caused by intoxication, he undertook to execute his threat, and lost his life in the attempt. The man's brother, who was

a minister, said, "My brother was a wicked man. He was a drunkard, and died with murder in his heart. My brother is in hell; I know he is." He went to the newly-made widow, even while her husband's corpse was yet in the house, and said, "I would not have a funeral sermon; no minister can do his duty without telling you your husband is suffering the eternal burnings." The lady became distracted, and at times perfectly insane. The church had no consolation for her; even the Universalists could not console her; their theories seemed so much like hypotheses that their words had no effect. About sixteen miles from where this happened there lived a medium. Suddenly an irresistible influence came to him, and he ran as straight as a bee-line to the widow; he jumped fences and walls, ran through swamps and creeks, and scaled steep hills, letting nothing swerve him from his course, or purpose after he got there. When he reached the lady's house he demanded to see her; and though all regarded him as crazy, he was granted a private interview. What he said or did is not definitely known to outsiders, but one thing is known: the distracted lady became calm and cheerful; she said she had heard from her husband; that he was working out his own salvation on the other side, as he would have been compelled to have done on this, had he staid here. She found in the spirit world itself the consolation which could not be furnished by any of the religions by which she was surrounded.

I have now gone through an entire chapter, picking up here a grain and there a grain of good that has come from Spiritualism. I would not represent this as the harvest of good to be reaped, as the result of the

new religion. These are a few of the *specimens* only which have been gathered from "wayside gleanings." The great Spiritual mines are filled with such and better. "Eye hath not seen, ear hath not heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive the things Spiritualism has provided for the world."

The great boon of all, the one needed when no other can reach the case, is the consolation it affords to those about to exchange worlds. The fear of death is gone! The fires of hell have been extinguished! The walls are taken down from the celestial city! The ivory or golden throne is removed, and flowers planted on the spot it occupied! Its God is not a tyrannical king, with a crown upon his head and a scowl on his face, but a loving father and mother ever looking after the welfare and comfort of all the children! The dying Spiritualist knows he is not to be forced millions of miles away from those in whom he has an interest; he is not going away, but remains to bless and be blessed by those yet on earth's side of death's river. O, may the blessed consolations of Spiritualism cheer both reader and writer in the hour of dissolution!

CHAPTER XV.

MINOR QUESTIONS.

Asking and answering Questions, the difference. — Can not answer every Question. — Spiritualism necessarily crude at first. — May be modified. — How do Spirits operate? — Their Power over the Will. — Does Mediumship indicate a weak Mind. — The controlling Spirit not necessarily with the Medium. — Author's Experiments. — Spirits control more than One at a time. — Sometimes control without knowing it. — A. J. Davis and Professor Vaughan. — "Arabula" and "Human Nature." — E. D. Keene gives a Communication from a Man yet on Earth. — Why do Spirits lie? — Fault often in the Medium. — Psychological Experiments. — Cause of Failure. — Reason why some get better Tests than others. — Why do not all Mediums give Tests. — Tests not always from personal Friends. — Psychology and Spiritualism. — All are Mediums. — David and his Mediums. — Philosophy of Dark Circles. — Biblical Manifestations in the Dark. — The Explanation. — Morality of Spiritualism. — Mediumship a Quickener. — Spiritualism and Sunshine. — Webster, Clay, *et al.*, whittled down. — The Explanation. — How to receive Spiritualism. — Why so many Indian Spirits. — The Indian Element positive. — Belongs in this Country. — Better Magnetizers. — More easily imitated Humbugs and the Self-deceived. — Experience of the Author. — Where are the Ancients. — Reasons why they do not return. — What Good can Spiritualism do? — For what should we go to Spirits. — Demonstrates a Future. — What will Science do? — Spiritual Sense. — Immortality Triumphant.

THIS chapter I design as an answer to the ever recurring questions concerning the *modus operandi* of many of the spirit manifestations. Nearly everything that I shall say here will be said by the request of individuals who have handed in questions which they wished answered in the present volume.

Asking questions is an easy matter. Answering them is sometimes a hard one. Questions are generally based on the ignorance of the one who asks;

answers, if correct, are always based on the knowledge of the one answering ; and as there is so much more that we do not know than that we do know, it can not be expected that any one can throw all the light on any department of any subject that can be desired. I have classified the questions received during the last few months, and propose to answer such, and only such, as seem to have been asked in a spirit of candid inquiry. Those asked for strife and illegitimate contention will not be noticed.

It can not be expected that in a book of no greater dimensions than I design to make this, written to elicit the attention of those who would not touch a heavier volume, every objection can be met, and every question answered. I do not design to do that, yet there are hundreds of honest people in the world, who only need an explanation of a few "whys" and "wherefores," to enable them to see the most perfect harmony between the philosophy and phenomena of modern Spiritualism. For the benefit of such this chapter is written.

Every theory of philosophy or religion is necessarily crude and undigested at the first ; but potent and persevering investigation will lead to the discovery of truth. If Spiritualists, as they are led to more thoroughly and critically examine their system, should in many instances be induced to modify it somewhat, it would be no more than others have done. My hope is that Spiritualists will be more swift to re-shape, remold, re-make, or retract extravagant views, than have been their orthodox neighbors. It is much better to turn a coat, which in haste was put on wrong, than to obstinately refuse to adjust a garment because

your friend, or even an enemy discovered the mistake before it was discovered by yourself; so, if, in answering questions, I should prune Spiritualism of some of its excrescences, let no Spiritualist tremble lest I should fell the tree. Spiritualism has a strong hold of life, and can endure harder thrusts than my poor pen could give it if I were disposed to write it down. I only intend to cut away a few of the thorns and thistles, so that the spiritual tree can live a tamer, sweeter life, and bear "much fruit." The deliciousness of which certainly would be marred if the work were left undone. "What is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord."

QUERY NO. 1.

How do spirits get into media, and what becomes of the medium spirit while the organism is being controlled by another?

Answer. It has been supposed that spirits control by getting into the physical system of the medium. Even Bible Spiritualists supposed that spirits entered into media. Ezekiel says, several times, that "The spirit entered into me." Mediums and spirits often speak in the same way. The truth is, spirits can, and often do, as I will demonstrate, control, without knowing how they do it. The idea of spirits entering into the mediums is a mistake. Spirits do not enter into the media, but control them by coming into psychological *rapport* with them, as the psychologist controls his subject. A psychologist enters into his subject in every sense of the word that a spirit does into his. They each control by will power alone; the will, the mind, and spirit of the subject become negative, and yield to the positive power of the operator. The volunta-

ry organs of every living creature are controlled by the creature ; so when the operator gets control of the *will* of the subject, he, through that will, controls the physical organism. He may thus, when the control is perfect, enable the subject to speak any language he himself understands, or tell anything which he himself could tell. This control of a subject by an operator in the form, is *real* and *spiritual*, as much as any spirit control ; the only difference being that one operator is clothed in flesh and blood, and the other is not.

QUERY NO. 2.

In that case is it not the weaker mind that is controlled by the stronger ?

Answer. No ; not necessarily. There is a difference between strength of mind and strength of will. A weak mind may accompany a strong will, and a strong mind a weak will ; but neither the mind nor the *will* of the medium is necessarily weak. Mediumship implies the power to hold still and catch the positive influence that may be at work ; “ only this and nothing more.” A state of sound sleep is as strong evidence of a weak mind, or weak will, as can be found in mediumship. Mediumship signifies the power to become passive, negative, quiet. Strong minds may sometimes pass into that condition more readily than weak ones ; yet as strong minds are more liable to be positively engaged in some positive work, they may not always be so receptive as minds not so active. Large spirituality, with a disposition to approach the intellectual through the intuitional, rather than the spiritual through the intellectual, would perhaps render a person a better subject for influences.

QUERY NO. 3.

Are spirits necessarily present when they control mediums?

Answer. I think I have proof that they are not always within a few feet of the one controlled. I am personally acquainted with the fact of a spirit going into a circle, and through a medium who knew nothing of the subject of astronomy, giving a very interesting lecture on that subject. The same night, at the same hour, the same spirit purported to control another medium more than two hundred miles distant, and gave the same lecture. It might here be added, that this spirit had controlled each of these mediums on former occasions. I have myself, after psychologically controlling subjects, exercised a positive control over them when they were many miles away. I have made two mediums at the same time dream out the description of the scenery on the Hudson River as it passed before my eyes, as I passed up the river on a beautiful moonlight night, neither of the mediums at the time being within three hundred miles. These thoughts of course suggest

QUERY NO. 4.

Can spirits control more than one medium at a time?

Answer. Yes, most emphatically. Who has not seen speakers control whole audiences? Go to any protracted revival meeting, when in the height of its glory, and see how the audience can be swayed by its leader or leaders. This control is spiritual, and yet is often effected not only without the operator's having

a knowledge of the *modus operandi*, but in many cases without his even having a knowledge of the fact of his control over the audience.

Many suppose they know a good deal of Spiritualism; but the truth is we are as yet hardly into its alphabet. I am convinced that spirits often control, and enable mediums to deliver eloquent discourses, without even themselves knowing they are exercising any control over the mediums. I have several times, when I have been thinking on a particular theme, met friends who, after exchanging a few preliminary compliments, would of their own accord enter into conversation, taking up the very thread of my thoughts, and in a few instances, upon questioning the parties, I learned that they never before entered into a conversation on that particular subject. What was this but a positive influence passing from mind to mind, which, if I had been out of the body, might have been called a spirit communication.

Several peculiar circumstances now occur to my mind, which will serve to throw light on some of the laws governing mediumship.

1. It will be remembered that A. J. Davis once gave the world some thoughts which were handed him from the higher spheres, on the philosophy of rain and the manner of producing it. About the same time Professor Vaughan came out with a lecture on the same subject, embodying the same ideas. Mr. Davis was accused of plagiarism. I fully believe that Mr. Davis was in this and all other instances honest, and that his thoughts came as he reported. Yet I can not see why the lecture may not have originated with Professor Vaughan. Why not? The positive

thoughts originated in Mr. Vaughan's brain, or passing through it from a higher source, reached Mr. Davis, and he was sufficiently negative to catch them, and fasten them on paper. The medium attracts the thoughts sent out by positive minds, in many instances without the sender knowing it. As the earth to-night drinks the rain which falls upon it, so very many mediums are sponges which absorb and give out again the thought that comes in their reach.

2. Not many years since "Arabula," a book of great merit, was produced through the mediumship of A. J. Davis, but the readers of "Human Nature," a magazine published in London, know that at the same time *the same thought, and sometimes the same words*, for page after page, were being published in Europe. The magazine above referred to, in the year 1868, I think it was, placed many paragraphs from the two works in juxtaposition, thus illustrating that they were essentially the same. Now, who plagiarized? I answer, no one. The thoughts which *some* one, who was sufficiently sensitive, caught as they passed through the old world, were caught by Mr. Davis when they came here, and perhaps in neither instance did the one who gave off these thoughts realize that they were contagious, or knew anything about these men catching them. If this idea should prove to be a truth (and it will), will we not all try to be more careful even of our secret thoughts, for they go out as positive entities, to work on the sensitives or mediums.

3. I have never met a better test medium than Edwin D. Keene, of Philadelphia; but in giving tests in the city of Washington, in April, 1870, this medi-

um said, "There is a spirit here who says his name is — [The names I do not remember.] He wishes to talk to —. He says he wronged you once; he feels badly about it, and that he can not progress until he confesses it, and obtains your forgiveness." He then proceeded to give the particulars of their difficulty, containing several remarkable tests, after which he again asked forgiveness for the great wrong he had done. The man, after telling the spirit that he was forgiven, responded that all was true, but he did not know that — was dead; the last known of him was that he lived in Providence, R. I. A telegram was sent to Providence the next day, and the facts were all found to be true, *except that the man was at that time alive and well.* Now, how is this? I know of no explanation only that the medium came *en rapport* with the *acts* and *thoughts* of that individual; these acts and thoughts representing themselves as positive entities. If this is the true philosophy of mediumship, a spirit can as easily influence a dozen at a time as one. The power is not so much in spirit, as in the number of receptive individuals who come into his sphere. Who has not seen psychologists influence a dozen at a time, — sometimes making one believe that he was a minister, another that he was a desperate sinner, who needed salvation, and so on almost *ad infinitum*?

QUERY NO. 5.

Why do spirits so often tell that which is not true?
Answer. I doubt whether spirits often indulge in telling willful falsehoods. The communications proving to be false are usually either deceptions on the

part of the medium, a reflection from the mind of those to whom the communication is made, or the result of an imperfect control. The best that can be done, a spirit can not always make a medium speak the truth. During the last half score of years I have had a very extended experience as a psychological operator, which has enabled me to look with more charity on the false in phenomenal Spiritualism than in former days. I have learned that, do the best I can, it is impossible to find a medium that can always be made to speak the truth. They can often be made to talk eloquently, and sometimes logically, but no one can be made to always talk truthfully. Let one case suffice as an illustration. As I have not the privilege of using names, allow me to supply their place with blanks. At a large dinner party in an eastern city, I once introduced a conversation on the wonders of psychology, when I was requested to produce some experiments. There was present in the room a Miss D., whom I had previously put under psychological control, and found as good as any subject I had ever seen. After obtaining her consent she was placed *en rapport* with my own spirit, and then requested to give tests of various kinds, which she did with astonishing success. She was thoroughly blindfolded, and in that condition could read any sentence brought before my eyes, tell anything I could have told, and even at our request look through solid walls, and tell what was going on in other rooms of the house. Finally the lady of the house led her to the pictures on the wall, and notwithstanding her eyes were closely bandaged, she correctly described every one, and told who every painting or photograph was made to

represent. But this state of things was not to continue. While in the height of our success, she was led to a large portrait of a former husband of the lady who led her. "Who is that?" said the lady. "That is your brother," responded the clairvoyant. "A mistake," said the lady; "look again." After a moment's hesitation and a little closer observation, she responded, "It is your brother." All this time I used all of my will power to make her say husband. Finally I spoke in a positive tone of voice, and said, "Miss D., that is Mrs. H.'s husband." "Why," said she, "is not Mr. H. her husband?" "Yes," I responded; "but this is the first husband, who is now in the world of spirits."

"Well," said she, "the first thought came husband; but when I saw Mr. H. standing by my side, I could not say husband, I was compelled to say brother."

Now, what was this? I supposed the medium to be entirely unconscious; but the facts were, that some latent power of her brain was all the time reasoning on the impossibility of the lady having two husbands, and the idea of a very near relative was thrown on the mind, and hence she said, brother. Now, had I been in the spirit world, and influenced that medium as I did, she would probably have made the same mistake, and then I, as a spirit, would have been accused of lying, when in reality it would have been impossible for me to have made my medium tell the truth. The laws controlling mediumship are very subtle, and as yet only partially understood. A more thorough understanding of them may teach us to be cautious about accusing our risen friends of deliberately telling that which is not true.

While spirits control media by will power alone, we should not be astonished if the will of those forming the circle may partially spoil an otherwise good and true communication. One thing has been noticed, that is, that some persons get more truthful communications than others. The reason of this is, their mind or will is in a condition to permit spirits to more properly represent themselves than they can do in the presence of others.

QUERY NO. 6.

Why can not all mediums give names, dates, and other tests ?

Answer. Spirits have ever been more ready in answering questions of a philosophic character than those of a test nature. The reason I understand to be this. Questions of a philosophic nature are usually out of the reach of the mediums, hence their mind can not so easily become active on them, as on questions containing tests. When a test question is asked, many mediums instantly fear they will fail to answer. This fear renders them so positive that the spirit can not approach them with the answer. I am not one who believes that every one in the spirit world can return and communicate. I doubt whether all or half that have gone to the spirit world can manifest through media at all. I do not believe that one test spirit manifestation in twenty comes directly from the spirit giving the test. I know that no more than one in twenty whom we meet in every-day life would succeed as practical psychologists ; it is reasonable to suppose that those who could not psychologize a person in earth life, would not do it in spirit life. Of

course this suggests the query, How do the spirit manifestations come? I answer, I have many times seen persons put under psychologic control, and then the operator put *en rapport* with persons in the room, who, under ordinary circumstances could not have controlled the subject. Yet all the while the operator kept supreme control, and others were by *his* will brought into and driven out of communication with the subject. So in spirit control. Each medium is surrounded with his or her spirit guides, who may, for the benefit of friends on either side of the river of death, serve in connection with the medium, as a connecting link between the two parties. Now take into consideration the peculiarities of the medium, then the peculiarities of the control by which he may be surrounded, and that all these peculiarities must in cases of test be overcome, and any one can see how difficult it may be to always give tests, and yet how easy it may be to give discourses where the power controlling has only his own thoughts to utter.

QUERY NO. 7.

Why can not all be mediums and see spirits?

Answer. There is a sense in which all are mediums. Paul says, "But the manifestation of the spirit is given to every man to profit withal." (1 Cor. xii. 7.) Every one who has a spirit, has something that can come *en rapport* with spirit. Hence all are mediums, though all may not have that one gift of seeing. In Paul's enumeration of the gifts, in the above mentioned chapter, he has them as follows:—

1. The Word of Wisdom.
2. The Word of Knowledge.

3. Faith.
4. The gifts of healing.
5. The working of miracles.
6. Prophecy.
7. Discerning of spirits.
8. Diverse kinds of tongues.
9. Interpretation of tongues.

There are very few but that have, or could have, some of these or some other gifts. All can, by complying with proper conditions, be mediums.

As to seeing spirits, it requires a peculiar kind of mediumship to enable a person to see them either clairvoyantly or psychologically. These are the only ways persons as mediums can see spirits. Spirits sometimes, in the presence of certain organisms, gather a body from elements there are in the room; then all can see them without the aid of mediumship.

A clairvoyant sees spirits by means of having his spiritual eyes opened. A psychological subject sees them by passing *en rapport* with some power who wills him or her to see them. Mediumship, for extraordinary manifestations, has always been withheld from the masses of mankind. David was a smart man and good poet, yet, when he wished to "inquire of the Lord," he did not use his own mediumship, but sent for Nathan the prophet, or Gad the seer. Thus all could not be mediums, even for the Hebrew God.

Balaam could not see the angel that was plainly visible to the animal on which he rode. Elisha's servant could not see the hosts of angels by which he was surrounded until Elisha had put his hands on his head. It is no more strange that all can not be clairvoyants, than it is that all cannot be poets or orators.

The Longfellows, Whittiers, Patrick Henrys, and Wendell Phillipses are about as scarce as the Swedenborgs and A. J. Davises.

QUERY NO. 8.

Why is darkness required for certain forms of manifestation?

Answer. Before entering upon a direct reply to the above, permit me to ask a few questions. Why were the great Biblical manifestations nearly all performed in the dark? Even when heaven and earth were created, it was in the dark; "and darkness brooded on the face of the deep." (Gen. i. 1-2.) The Bible God "dwells in the midst of thick darkness." (1 Kings viii. 12.) When God threw Jacob in his wrestling-match it was in the dark. As soon as it began to be light, he pleaded, "let me go, for the day breaketh." (Gen. xxxii. 24.) The miracle of pulling Pharaoh's lincpins out was done in the dark. (Ex. xiv. 20-30.) Jesus' resurrection, the greatest of miracles, occurred in the night, so that he appeared to the woman before daylight. (John xx. 1.)

All who have investigated the subject tell us that darkness is a negative condition of the elements. The reason spirits can not speak to us in the light as well as in the dark is, they can not speak to our physical ears without forming physical organs of speech; these organs are organized from elements in the presence of a medium. Light is an agitator, traveling at the rate of twelve millions of miles per minute: it so agitates the elements that spirits can not gather and use them. There is not a reader of this book who can sleep as well in the light as in the dark. Machinery will run

more easily and with less friction in the dark than in the light. If spirits can not sufficiently control elements to appear in a physical form as well in a lighted as in a partially darkened room, how can it be expected that they can pick knots, or chemically separate and join together particles of iron or steel, as well in a lighted room as in the dark? I yet hope to see Spiritualism reduced to a more perfect science when these things can be done in the light.

QUERY NO. 9.

Is Spiritualism sometimes immoral?

Answer. No, never. Always directly to the contrary. Yet mediumship may sometimes call into activity the slumbering devils of the organism. I do not understand that mediumship ever does more than to arouse the latent powers of the organism. Mediumship quickens. A person with a large front brain will therefore be more intellectual under spirit influence than without it. Mediumship stimulates and calls all the latent qualities of the brain into activity. So a large top brain will be more reverential or devotional under influence than without it. A large back brain, with no frontal brain to balance it, will, of course, be stimulated under influence, and the conduct of the medium will be prompted by the back brain. That being the case, he may be more destructive, combative, or amative under influence than without. Does the reader, from this, draw inference that Spiritualism is bad? That is illogical. The shining of the sun, the falling of the rain and dew, certainly quickens and calls into activity the latent germs of life in the earth. Beans, peas, and potatoes,

hyacinths, roses, and dahlias, grow under these combined influences ; so does pig-weed and deadly-nightshade. Shall we drag the sun from the heavens, or declare against the summer showers, because they develop thorns, thistles, and poison? Nay, while Spiritual influence develops, and calls into activity that which we call evil in the human organism, it also calls out the good. If a person has the good parts of his organism dwarfed by the theologies of the present and the past, he may, for a time, be worse in his overt acts for becoming mediumistic, yet as sure as mediumship strengthens all there is of the medium, so sure it will eventually bring the moral and spiritual up to balance all other parts of the organism.

QUERY NO. 10.

Why do such spirits as Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, and Theodore Parker dwindle into such insignificance when they manifest through inferior organisms?

Answer. Every communication, at all times, partakes of the nature of the organism through which it comes. I have no doubt that Moses, Solomon, Paul, and Peter were inspired. Yet their inspiration did not destroy their distinctive peculiarities. No one can read the Song of Solomon without deciding that he would have all the wives and concubines he could get. The learning and logic of Paul, and the want of erudition and logic in Peter, are traced through all their inspirations. Inspiration, like water, assumes the shape of that through which it passes. A stream of water, coming through a round hole, will come round ; through a flat crevice, will come flat. So let Daniel

Webster throw a flood of inspiration down upon a circle, and it will cause each one to act in part his own peculiar nature. One having a massive brain, with the causality and comparison of Mr. Webster, will manifest Webster. Another, with small intellectual and large veneration, will go to praying, while another, with large mirthfulness, would, in a jocose manner, try to get off the thoughts that were thrown into his mind. Probably the same inspiration on different persons would result in all trying to hand out the same thought; but, while one would hand it out in syllogisms, another would use poetry, another prayer; and so on, to the end of the chapter, each one preserving his peculiarities. Again, we doubt whether Theodore Parker or Daniel Webster ever heard of one in ten of the mediums who profess to be under their control. There are hundreds in the spirit world, who, like many here, love to assume some big name, when by that they can get a hearing that, under other circumstances, they could not get. For my part, I do not care what spirit communicates to me. It may be Jesus Christ, General Jackson, or Jack Brown: all I want is *thought* coming from the spirit world. If Webster, or some one in his name, makes a fool of himself, I will listen to him as to any other fool. If a clown hands out a proposition, the carrying out of which will benefit the world, I will take it with the same gratitude as though it was the voice of Him that sitteth upon the throne.

My hope is that Spiritualists will soon get beyond seeking so many personal tests, and strive earnestly to come into more close communion with the world of spirit, the world of *thought*, of *good*, of *God*.

QUERY NO. 11.

Why is so large a percentage of communications from Indian spirits?

Answer. I think I see why more communications of that character than any other should come to us.

1. The Indian is born here, has always lived here, and now belongs here, and nowhere else. It is therefore natural that in the spirit world he should linger about this country, seldom, if ever, leaving it. Not so with the Europeans: they are emigrants here, and even those who are born here are children or grandchildren of those who emigrated to this country. They are more cosmopolitan, and would incline to roam over the world more than those who never knew or desired any other country than this.

2. Indians have been passing to the spirit world from this country for many thousand years, while it has only been a few hundred years since the first white person launched from this country into the spirit world. The Indian element is still, therefore, the positive element in this country. That being the case, there are more of them to control, and they can do it better, more perfectly, than the whites.

3. In this life, Indians are said to be better magnetizers than the whites. They are more the children of nature, are more in harmony with nature, therefore have more power than others who have spent a lifetime in destroying their natural powers, after the order of eating, drinking, sleeping, and living prescribed by a fashion-loving world.

4. In this life, Caucasians are more apt to have a business, and follow it closely, than Indians; there-

fore would not be so apt to leave their business and come to manifest their powers of controlling media, as would those who could do that better, and yet could not do some other more important work as well.

I believe the rule in the spirit world, as in this, should be to put each one to the highest business he or she is capable of performing. Presidents of colleges can teach children their alphabet; but while there are others who could not preside over colleges, who could succeed quite as well in expounding the mysteries of a, b, c, to the child, it would hardly pay to employ the heads of our universities to do that business. The superintendent of the Pacific Railroad could teach boys to play marbles, or girls to dress dolls, but is it expedient for him to leave his business to do so when there are so many who could do that as well as he? General Grant could have gone into the army as a private; but when privates were so plenty, and good generals so scarce, it was hardly prudent for him to do so. So when there is nothing to do in a circle but to give tests of a life beyond, Indians can, to say the least, demonstrate that as well as could Henry Clay or Daniel Webster, if they were present. So let the Indians come: while they give us a lesson of immortality, we may give them a lesson of progress, and thus we may mutually benefit each other. There is such a thing as preaching the gospel to the dead.

5. There is still one more reason why many communications purport to come from Indians. I can not, —individually I *do not choose to disguise* the fact, — a large percentage of what they call Spiritualism is downright humbuggery. I do not mean by that that mediums in the general are guilty of using deception.

In very many instances it is done without the medium knowing it; yet, I am sorry to say, there are those who knowingly and willfully deceive. Such may not have the ability to represent a truly great man, but find it easy enough to jabber broken English in the name of an Indian. Again, there are deceptions which are not willful. In my experience as a medium, I ever found that what purported to be an Indian spirit came first, then came a devotional spirit, then came a philosopher, who gave evidence of erudition entirely beyond my development or study. I now believe all these manifestations came from one and the same spirit. The influence first came to the back brain, which brought physical strength; made me feel well and good-natured; gave me a desire to talk, but no great ideas, so I jabbered: this kept me negative until the top brain was magnetized by some unseen power, then my thoughts ran in a devotional channel; soon the influence passed to the frontal brain, then I began to philosophize. Under that influence I never failed to have an answer to any question of a philosophical character. The retiring influence usually took me back through the same performance of praying and jabbering. May it not be that this is the case in hundreds of instances where the medium never mistrusts but that he has had a different spirit controlling for every different phase of manifestations.

QUERY NO. 12.

Why do we not more frequently get communications from ancient spirits?

Answer. I must confess my doubts as to whether

Solomon, Solon, Socrates, Plato, Pythagoras, Peter, or Paul ever return to communicate. There are epochs in man's existence, and will be throughout eternity. Each is a birth into a higher condition,—a throwing off of a grosser and putting on of a finer body. Those, therefore, who have been long in spirit life may have died to the spheres immediately connected with the earth existence, and hence not be able to come directly *en rapport* with only earthborn mediums. Furthermore, their work is more for those in spirit life than in earth life. To illustrate: Were I to pass to spirit life, I would leave a wife and four daughters, besides a host of other friends to whom I feel a strong attraction. This would fix my work here in earth life for a time. I would be inclined to seek every opportunity to communicate with and bless my friends yet on earth; but every year would bring a new recruit of my friends to spirit life, thus weakening my earth attractions and strengthening those of spirit life. In the course of threescore and ten years all of my earth friends will have gone into "the better country;" then all my attractions will be there, as a consequence of my work there; hence I shall but seldomly return, especially to gratify the caprice of curiosity-hunters. Possibly I may discover a medium through which I can do a great work, and may for many years work through that source. It is more probable, however, that should my name become great, and carry great authority with it, some other spirit would assume it for the sake of benefiting humanity, than that I shall control very many media five hundred years hence. The fact should not be disguised, that there are spirits who, like Paul, "be-

come all things to all men, if by any means they may save some."

Let this account for ancient spirits not returning. When a spirit gives us the name of Adam, Eve, Tubal Cain, or Vulcan, we put them down, not as the original persons who had these names, but as more modern spirits, who were honored with these or some other names.

QUERY NO. 13.

If spirits are subject to such temptations to impose on the credulous as persons are in this life, and as the answer to the above question would indicate, what good can Spiritualism do?

Answer. In important matters there is a way to test spirits. The divine admonition, "try the spirits," in many cases should be put in practice. In many cases it makes no more difference who the spirit than who the medium is. If we go to the spirit for *thought*, for *ideas*, we care not what spirit imparts them any more than we care what medium it is through whom a test comes. If we are after a test of individuality, and not simply of spirit existence, *try them*. There are rules by which it can be done. Your mother can speak words to you that no other person can. You should always wait for those words before you recognize her.

As to the direct good of Spiritualism, I answer, whether a test was ever given or not, whether a spirit ever told the truth or not, Spiritualism is a demonstration of an existence beyond this. A man, by telling a falsehood, proves his consciousness and ability to choose between a lie and the truth, hence his

ability to tell the truth. Thus Spiritualism demonstrates another world, and that that world is filled with the diversity of character that there is in this, thus indicating that the inhabitants of that country emigrated from this.

QUERY NO. 14.

May not a new scientific discovery spoil all there is of Spiritualism?

Answer. No, it can not. A new discovery may, in some measure, modify many theories respecting Spiritualism, but can not overthrow it. A new scientific discovery may modify the modes of teaching mathematics, but no future discovery in any science will change the fact that two multiplied by two will bring four as a result, or that two added to five will make seven. So whatever discoveries may be made, nothing can overcome the one already made, that we are not dependent on our five senses for all our knowledge; that men have seen through solid walls and granite mountains; that they have heard words spoken a thousand miles distant; have been told by an unseen intelligence something they did not know before. Do you call it "mind reading"? Be it so. It was not done with the physical senses; then there are spiritual senses which bid defiance to all the laws governing gross matter. If they do that, and it is proved by the spiritual phenomena, then this spiritual sense bids defiance to death, and *Immortality is triumphant.*

CHAPTER XVI.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES AND SPIRITUALISM.

An interesting book. — Then and now, the Analogy. — A solemn Warning. — Skepticism of the disciples. — “Infallible Proof.” — Better Manifestations Today. — The waiting Time. — The Promise. — What is the Comforter? — Jesus’ coming. — The Holy Ghost. — The two Men. — Synopsis of Acts II. — The Cripple healed. — How it was done. — Peter in Court. — Admissions of his Adversaries. — House and Furniture shaken. — Ananias and Sapphira. — Shadow Cures. — The Same now. — Case in St. Louis. — Apostles imprisoned. — Liberated by Spirits. — Report of the Committee. — A modern Case. — A “Mysterious Man.” — Stephen’s Sermon. — Stephen a Clairvoyant. — Assassination of Stephen. — Peter as a developing Medium. — Simon does not understand the Matter. — Philip a Medium. — Angels talk to him. — A Spirit carries him away. — Author carried by Spirits. — Another Case. — A new Star.

ONE of the most interesting books in the Bible is the one which, in our English translations is called the *Acts of the Apostles*. A more correct rendering would have been the “*Practice of the Apostles*.”

No person, who believes at all in apostolic example, can refrain from admiring that book, as it is the only one that gives us anything of an idea of apostolic practices. It is, however, not for the purpose of exhibiting the minutiae of apostolic preaching and example that this chapter is written, but to exhibit their sayings and doings on the one question of Spiritualism, and the analogy in their and our relation to the world. Bible believers may draw great profit from such a lesson.

Before commencing a commentary on this Book of

Acts, I would call attention to an apostolic warning. When the Jews disputed the phenomena attending the new religion, Paul used the words of the prophets as follows (Acts xiii. 40, 41): "Beware, therefore, lest that come upon you, which is spoken of in the prophets. Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish; for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you."

From this we perceive that it was hard to get a skeptical sectarian to believe in the work [manifestations] of the apostle's day. This skepticism does not seem to have been confined to the outside world; even the disciples were doubtful on many of the manifestations they themselves witnessed. It was said of those who were Jesus' most intimate earthly companions (Matt. xxviii. 16, 17), "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they worshiped him: but some doubted."

While some doubted, others believed the manifestations to be entirely conclusive. The writer of the book under consideration, in speaking of the manifestations to the apostles, says, "Until the day in which he was taken up, after that he, through the Holy Ghost, had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen. To whom also he showed himself alive, after his passion, by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." (Acts i. 2, 3.)

Here the proofs that Jesus was alive are declared to be *infallible*: and what are they? Why, nothing more

than that "he showed himself alive," and was *seen* forty days, and *spake*. All of these manifestations, and more, are witnessed at Moravia, N. Y., and other places, every day. Did those referred to in these verses prove that Jesus was alive, then we have all the evidence that could be desired to prove that our friends of yesterday, who to-day are in the spirit world, still live. If that text under examination does not prove that Jesus is alive, then there is no text that does, and Christianity can not be proved.

One more point in this text deserves consideration. This Jesus told his disciples that they should *wait* for the fulfillment of a promise which they had heard from him. That waiting consisted in their forming a circle, and sitting in it until the day of Pentecost, which was ten days from this fortieth day, the last on which Jesus was seen, until seen by Paul some years after. This promise, to which he refers, can be none other than that found in John xiv. 16-26.

There are so many good points in the "promise" and Jesus' comments, that I must trouble the reader with a lengthy extract. "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever. Even the spirit of truth, whom the world can not receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you. Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also. At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you. He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that

loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him. Judas saith unto him, — not Iscariot, — Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world? Jesus answered, and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him. He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings: and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me. These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."

Here the promise is of a Comforter: but who is the Comforter? "Even the spirit of truth." That may refer simply to a spirit *power*, and not imply any definite spirit. The next sentence, however, does not. The expression, "Whom the world can not receive, because it seeth *him* not, neither knoweth him." was a proof of clairvoyant power, by which they could see and recognize the spirit, here called the "spirit of truth," and the "comforter." Let it be observed, also, that the spirit here introduced is spoken of as the third person, singular number, and masculine gender. After this, Jesus more than intimates that he himself will be the spirit that they will see and recognize, and the world will not see. "I will come to you," is a positive promise that can not be misunderstood. Even this is not the best part of this promise. He will come as the spirits do at Moravia, so that he can be seen. "The world seeth me no more, but ye

see me ; because I live, ye shall live also." What could be plainer ? Surely nothing, unless it is another sentence in the same promise. "*I will manifest myself to him.*" That was a puzzler to Judas. He could not see how a dead man could manifest himself, so he asks, "How is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not to the world ?" How many there are to-day who put the same question, reversing the order. Why can't I see spirits as well as others ?

This Comforter Jesus defines to be the Holy Ghost: Greek, *Pneumatos Hagion* : that is, good spirit. What so appropriate a comforter as a good spirit ? This good spirit, or Holy Ghost, is to *teach*, and bring things to their remembrance. How glorious the harmony between that text and the manifestations of to-day !

But I must return to the Book of Acts, and try to confine this chapter to a consideration of the Spiritualism of that book. Even the first chapter, before the apostles enter upon their ministry at all, has the following record : "And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven, as he went up, behold two men stood by them in white apparel, which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven ? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts i. 10, 11.)

These two beings, who stood by the eleven, as their visions were opened to see Jesus ascend, were called *men*. They were men, but not men in the flesh. Their description and garments correspond exactly with a majority of the descriptions of spirits to-day. But these men spake : "This same Jesus," &c. This Spiritualists would call a spirit voice.

In a former volume I have thoroughly overhauled the second chapter of Acts, so here I shall do no more than make the briefest statement of the evidence it contains.

1. The Holy Ghost, or good spirit, came and lit upon the mediums.

2. A *diversity* of tongues appeared to *each* of the mediums, enabling each to address strangers in their own language.

3. Peter, after meeting the objection urged by the opponents, that these mediums were drunk, quotes the prophecy of Joel to prove that manifestations of a spiritual character were to occur in this dispensation.

4. He tells them that Jesus, whom he calls "a man approved of God" (not a God), "shed forth what you see and hear."

5. He exhorts the people to repent, and put themselves in a condition to receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, informing them that the promise of the Holy Ghost extended to them and their children, and *all* who are called.

6. "And fear came upon every soul, and many wonders and signs were done by the apostles." (v. 43.) These wonders and signs were just what Jesus had promised should attend the believer, and such, probably, as attend modern mediums.

The next manifestation indicated in the practice of the apostles is recorded in Acts iii. 1-8. "Now Peter and John went up together into the temple, at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour. And a certain man, lame from his mother's womb, was carried, whom they laid daily at the gate of the temple which is

called Beautiful, to ask alms of them that entered into the temple, who, seeing Peter and John about to go into the temple, asked an alms. And Peter, fastening his eyes upon him with John, said, Look on us. And he gave heed unto them, expecting to receive something of them. Then Peter said, Silver and gold have I none ; but such as I have give I thee : In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk. And he took him by the right hand, and lifted him up : and immediately his feet and ankle bones received strength. And he, leaping up, stood, and walked, and entered with them into the temple, walking, and leaping, and praising God."

The facts of healing by spirit power are now so numerous that I need not quote circumstances parallel to this. A word might be said on the mode of performing this cure.

1. Peter fastened his eyes on the cripple.
2. He commanded the cripple to look on him.
3. He used the name of Jesus, the one whom he supposed to be his controlling influence, as a charm. They, by looking at each other, as recorded in this instance, were brought into psychologic communication. The use of the name of "the man approved of God by signs and wonders," rendered the patient negative, and consequently receptive — more so, probably, because of his frequent recent appearances. When the people rushed together, astonished at the wonderful phenomenon, Peter explained that he was not the power by which the cripple was healed. He was only an instrument in the hands of spirit powers. His words are (v. 12), "Ye men of Israel, why marvel ye at this? or why look ye so earnestly on us, as

though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk?"

In the next chapter, Peter is brought before a tribunal to explain the phenomenon. His answer is (v. 9, 10), "If we this day be examined of the good deed done to the impotent man, by what means he is made whole; be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole."

The full admission of the people, that there was a supermundane power with these mediums, also an ability to preach, though they were unlearned and ignorant men, is recorded in the following (v. 16): "What shall we do to these men? for that indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them, is manifest to all them that dwell in Jerusalem; and we can not deny it. But that it spread no further among the people, let us straightly threaten them, that they speak henceforth to no man in this name."

The next wonder wrought by the mediumship of these men, is of the same kind as that of moving chairs, tables, and pianos. It is recorded in verse 31 of the same chapter. "And when they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the word of God with boldness."

This phenomena occurred at what the churches would call a prayer meeting. Spiritualists would call it a circle. No comment is needed. It was a spirit manifestation — nothing more.

In Acts v. 1-10 is the circumstance of Ananias and Sapphira trying to deceive the influences operating through the mediumship of Peter. Peter, being a clairvoyant, could not be deceived. A physiologic power, undoubtedly from the angel world, killed them both. Thus they are made a warning to all others to deal honestly, especially in dealing with risen friends. The extract, like many others in the Book of Acts, is too lengthy for a place in this volume.

In verse 12-16 of this chapter is another instance of the great healing power manifest through the mediumship of those apostles. The following is the record: "And by the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people; (and they were all with one accord in Solomon's porch: and of the rest durst no man join himself to them: but the people magnified them: and believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women;) insomuch that they brought forth the sick into the streets, and laid them on beds and couches, that at the least the shadow of Peter passing by night overshadow some of them."

I do not think the recorder of the Acts of the Apostles would pretend that there was any virtue in Peter's shadow passing over the sick people. The virtue was in their getting near enough to him to come in communication with his healing power. If this healing was done by a miraculous power from God, instead of a healing power from the spirit world, which they are able to use in the immediate atmosphere of the medium, why have them pass within the shadow of Peter? Why must they touch the hem of Jesus' garment?

This power I have seen in modern Spiritualism several times. In St. Louis, Mo., when preaching and healing, a lady who had been a long time sick was brought into the meeting, for the purpose of having me try my healing power on her. After meeting, when she was introduced, she said, "You have been recommended to me as a healing medium, and I came here to be treated of a disease of long standing. I have been a great sufferer for several years, and seldom go out of the house. I suffered intensely when I came in here this morning. But there was something in your magnetism, or your discourse, which has entirely relieved, and I trust cured me." The lady attended my meetings for five Sundays, and took no other medicine. The magnetism imparted in the delivery of my discourses effected the cure. In the above record we are informed that "unclean spirits were cast out." Were the same thing recorded in modern Spiritualism, it would be, "Undeveloped spirits were cast out." Such manifestations were not to be tolerated, so the writer adds: "Then the high priest rose up, and all they that were with him (which is the sect of the Sadducees), and were filled with indignation. And laid their hands on the apostles, and put them in the common prison." (vs. 17, 18.)

When spirits that understand their business have such mediums as these early Christians, how useless are bars, gates, and handcuffs. Luke goes on to say, "But the angel of the Lord by night opened the prison doors, and brought them forth, and said, Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life." (vs. 19, 20.)

The keepers had watched this prison all night, but somehow the spirits got their mediums out unobserved. The committee appointed the next day to investigate the affair, said, "The prison truly found we shut with all safety, and the keepers standing without before the doors: but when we had opened, we found no man within." (vs. 22.)

Probably no Christian would dispute this story. Angels had the power to let their mediums out of prison, but when similar stories are now related, it is entirely too great a stretch of credulity to believe it. "Consistency is a jewel." Will those who believe these men were let out of prison, believe the same story about mediums in the United States? We have sworn testimony that Mr. Rand was let out of the Oswego, N. Y., jail by spirits. This gentleman had been incarcerated for giving tangible evidence of Spiritualism.

There is enough in the sixth chapter of Acts to convince the unbeliever that its hero, Stephen, was a medium. Verse 8 shows him to be one of the "mysterious men" of his times. Its words are, "And Stephen, full of faith and power, did great wonders and miracles among the people."

Verse 15 says, "And all that sat in the council, looking steadfastly on him, saw his face, as it had been the face of an angel." Nearly all Spiritualists have seen the countenances of mediums lighted up in the same way, in their inspired moments. In this condition Stephen gave the discourse which follows in the next chapter. In that memorable discourse, Stephen makes the following reference to Moses and his mediumship: "And when forty years were ex-

pired, there appeared to him in the wilderness of Mount Sinai, an angel of the Lord, in a flame in a bush."

This first Christian martyr relates this incident of Moses seeing and talking with an angel, surrounded with a spirit light, without any apparent consciousness that he was relating anything wonderful. After pursuing this course of argument as far as profitable, he shows the opposition that always has obtained against present manifestations, and compares them to their fathers, who put the mediums of their times to death. His language is, "Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which showed before of the coming of the Just One; of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers; who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it." (vs. 51-53.)

"Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost." How true! Every generation has its worshipers of past generations: these usually resist the manifestations of their own day. "Ye received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it." What a flood of light that throws on the Old Testament. Instead of the God of the universe personally coming down, and speaking his law in the hearing of all Israel, and writing it with his own finger, we have Jehovah, an angel, the spirit of a dead man, manifesting this interest in behalf of his earth friends.

This "Holy Ghost," that enabled Stephen to talk at once so eloquently and truthfully, also rendered him clairvoyant, so that he could see the "glory of God." We would call it the splendor of the other world, and his old friend Jesus, standing on the right

hand of some one he supposed to be God. The record is as follows: "But he, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God."

This clairvoyant manifestation and eloquent discourse, referring in such glowing terms to his friend Jesus, of whom he says they were betrayers and murderers (vs. 52), was too much for this religious mob. He was assassinated on the spot.

In Acts viii. 6, 7, we read, "And the people, with one accord, gave heed unto those things which Philip spoke, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did. For unclean spirits, crying with loud voices, came out of many that were possessed with them; and many taken with palsies, and that were lame, were healed."

In another place I will show that these unclean spirits that were cast out were none other than the spirits of dead men. The miracles would only be called wonderful manifestations, if they occurred to-day. The healing of palsies and cripples is to-day being repeated in many places in this country.

In verses 17-21 the writer says, "Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost. And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost. But Peter said unto him, Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought

that the gift of God may be purchased with money. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right in the sight of God."

The first lesson here taught is, that "the Holy Ghost, or medium power," was imparted by having the apostles' hands laid on the ones to be developed. The Hon. John Hay, of Texas, is now a developing medium, who does nothing else but go from place to place and develop mediums, by putting his hands on them. He, being *en rapport* with the spirit world, brings subjects in closer connection with spirits, by himself acting as a conductor to bring Heaven's blessings to them.

The second lesson taught in this chapter was, that Simon, though a medium, did not understand developing mediumship. He was not a developing medium, and supposed the power could be purchased with money. The third lesson is, that money can not purchase this gift. If the person has not the organism for it — is not naturally a medium, though he might offer all the gold in California, he has "neither part nor lot in this matter."

Simon was not alone in not being a developing medium. Philip, the great preacher and healer, brought to view in a former part of this chapter, lacked this power. So when those who were made believers by Philip's preaching and works, were developed as mediums, developing mediums had that work to do. Verses 14 and 15 say, "Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, who, when they were come down,

prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost."

The angels conversed with Philip as freely as they ever do now with any mediums. In verse 26 of this chapter we read, "And the angel of the Lord spake unto Philip, saying, Arise, and go toward the south, unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert."

The man who was riding in the chariot was converted and baptized. Then occurred a wonderful physical manifestation, recorded in the following words: "And when they were come up out of the water, the spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, and the eunuch saw him no more, and he went on his way rejoicing. But Philip was found at Azotas: and passing through, he preached in all the cities until he came to Cæsarea."

I find hundreds of persons to-day, who have no trouble at all in believing this declaration, who would not believe me under oath, when I tell them that I have been carried around a room sixteen feet square, by spirit power alone. When I state, and prove by good witnesses, that Andrew Potts, of Harrisburg, Penn., was carried by the spirits from Harrisburg to Mechanicsburg, a distance, I think, of seven and a half miles, inside of four minutes, I will be called a credulous fool, and my witnesses knavish liars. O, that church people could be induced to believe that the same God who superintended matters in the days of Philip, still lives. How soon would they learn that, "The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be: and that which is done is that which

shall be done ; and there is no new thing under the sun. Is there any thing whereof it may be said, See, this is new ? It hath been already, of old time, which was before us." (Eccl. i. 9, 10.)

This Book of Acts now introduces another character, who becomes so much of a *star* that all others are eclipsed. The reader needs rest and a chance for reflection before he is introduced, so permit me to continue the argument in a new chapter.

CHAPTER XVII.

MORE OF THE SAME.

Saul of Tarsus. — A good Manifestation. — The Points stated. — Ananias a Medium. — Did Paul see Jesus? — Another Case of healing. — Reanimation of Dorcas. — Cornelius's Vision. — A Test. — Peter's Entrancement. — Another Test. — Angel, Spirit, Man. — Peter's preaching. — Spirits eating and drinking. — A second Edition of Pentecost. — Peter's Defence before his Jewish Brethren. — Agabus prophesies under Spirit Power. — Peter released by Spirits. — Particulars of the Case. — Peter at the Gate, his Angel. — Is this true? — Elymas's psychological Blindness. — Paul on the Appearance of Jesus. — Paul heals a Cripple. — Narrative of Paul and Barnabas. — Who is the Man of Macedonia? — Who is the Lord? — Paul and the female Medium. — Who was the Spirit cast out? — Paul and Silas let out of Jail. — Prison shaken and Bands fall off in the Dark. — Iron Rings removed. — Strange Gods. — Apotheosized Men. — Heathen Gods once Men. — Developing Circle at Ephesus. — "Handkerchiefs and Aprons." — A Minister denying his Bible. — The Spirits and the Sons of Sceval. — An Accident. — Paul prophesies. — Another Medium prophesies. — Paul relates his spiritual Experience. — Paul in a Trance. — Takes sides with the Pharisees. — Communication to the Sailors. — A Ship saved by Spirits. — Among Barbarians. — A Snake Bite. — Success as a Healer. — A few Questions. — A word of Warning.

NEARLY all of the remainder of the Book of Acts is devoted to the history of one of the most wonderful mediums of ancient times. He was formerly called Saul of Tarsus, but for reasons not necessary to name here, his name was afterward changed to Paul.

In chapter ix. 3-9, is the account of the wonderful manifestation which took this young and able lawyer out of the ranks of the opposition, and made a believer and medium of him. It reads as follows: "And as he journeyed, he came near Damascus: and suddenly

there shined round about him a light from heaven : And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me ? And he said, Who art thou, Lord ? And the Lord said, I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest : it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he, trembling and astonished, said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do ? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do. And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man. And Saul arose from the earth ; and when his eyes were opened, he saw no man : but they led him by the hand, and brought him into Damascus. And he was three days without sight, and neither did eat nor drink.”

Spiritualists claim that every point in this narrative meets its resemblance in modern Spiritualism. The following points are worth noting.

1. “A light from heaven,” that is, a spirit light, appeared.
2. “The voice of Jesus,” that is, a spirit voice, called out, “Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me ?”
3. Paul saw the spirit of Jesus, but the others did not.
4. “And when his eyes were opened.” This implies that his eyes were closed when he saw Jesus, so that he did not see with his natural eyes, but as mediums generally see spirits, with his spiritual vision.

This man, while physically blind, “saw in a vision a man named Ananias coming and putting his hands on him that he might receive his sight.” (vs. 12.)

This spiritual vision was fulfilled in the following manner:—

“And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house; and putting his hands on him, said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received his sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized.” (vs. 17, 18.)

In these verses, beside the fulfilment of this mission, we have the positive testimony that Jesus appeared to Paul. I would like to ask all who look for the second appearing of Jesus, which appearing this was? The fact is, there is no evidence that Jesus ever did, or ever will, appear in any other way than that in which our dead friends appear to-day. Another evidence that Paul really saw Jesus is found in verse 27: “But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles, and declared unto them how that he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him, and how he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus.

This was evidently the case, afterward referred to by Paul, when he said, “And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time.” (1 Cor. xv. 8.)

In verses 33 and 34 of Acts ix., is the record of another wonderful case of healing by Peter.

“And there he found a certain man named Æneas, which had kept his bed eight years, and was sick of the palsy; and Peter said unto Æneas, Jesus Christ

maketh thee whole; arise, and make thy bed. And he arose immediately."

The next instance of healing recorded in the Book is that of Dorcas, who was supposed to have been dead. Peter's mediumship was sufficient to overcome even supposed death. The author of this book of *actions*, records the matter as follows:—

"But Peter put them all forth, and kneeled down, and prayed: and turning him to the body, said, Tabitha, arise. And she opened her eyes, and when she saw Peter she sat up. And he gave her his hand, and lifted her up, and when he had called the saints and the widows, he presented her alive."

The tenth chapter of the Book under review opens with the history of Cornelius, a devout Gentile. It relates a manifestation which, taken in all of its parts, is so wonderful and so similar to modern manifestations, that I must give it more than a passing notice. It says of Cornelius, "He saw in a vision, evidently about the ninth hour of the day, an angel of God coming in to him, and saying unto him, Cornelius. And when he looked on him, he was afraid, and said, What is it, Lord? And he said unto him, Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God. And now send men to Joppa, and call for one Simon, whose surname is Peter." (vs. 3, 5.)

This part of the manifestation does not contain much proof of Spiritualism, aside from the fact that Cornelius saw and talked with an angel who told him of Peter, and where he lived. The sequel proved this communication to be correct. When the other parts of this narrative are brought to bear, the strength of the evidence in it will appear. Cornelius, determined

to know of the truth of his vision, immediately dispatched men to see whether the angels had told the truth. But, before the men arrived, Peter, by spirit power, learned the particulars.

“On the morrow, as they went on their journey, and drew nigh unto the city, Peter went up upon the house-top to pray about the sixth hour: and he became very hungry, and would have eaten: but while they made ready, he fell into a trance, and saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending unto him, as it had been a great sheet knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth: wherein were all manner of fourfooted beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air. And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter; kill, and eat. But Peter said, Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean. And the voice spake unto him again the second time, What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common. This was done thrice: and the vessel was received up again into heaven. Now while Peter doubted in himself what this vision which he had seen should mean, behold, the men which were sent from Cornelius had made inquiry for Simon’s house, and stood before the gate, and called, and asked whether Simon, which was surnamed Peter, were lodged there. While Peter thought on the vision, the Spirit said unto him, Behold, three men seek thee. Arise, therefore, and get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing: for I have sent them. Then Peter went down to the men which were sent unto him from Cornelius; and said, Behold, I am he whom ye seek: what is the cause wherefore ye are come?” (vs. 9–21.)

The case now begins to look stronger, but its strength has not yet appeared. From verse 10 we learn that Peter fell into a trance: no one at all acquainted with Spiritualism will have any trouble in understanding that. In verses 13 and 15 spirit voices spoke to him. In verse 19 the declaration is positive that this "voice which had been talking was a *spirit voice*, as it was a spirit that was doing the talking. In verse 20 the spirit says, "I have sent them (the men who were seeking Peter). But these men were sent by an angel. (See vs. 3.) Therefore, the angel of verse 3 was the spirit of verse 20. In verse 21 Peter gives these men a test by announcing himself as being the man whom they were seeking.

This matter still grows stronger as we proceed. Peter went with these men, as the spirit had bidden him. When he got to the house of Cornelius, and asked to what intent he had been sent for, Cornelius answered, "Four days ago I was fasting until this hour; and at the ninth hour I prayed in my house, and, behold, a man stood before me in bright clothing, and said, Cornelius, thy prayer is heard, and thine alms are had in remembrance in the sight of God. Send, therefore, to Joppa, and call hither Simon, whose surname is Peter; he is lodged in the house of one Simon a tanner by the seaside: who, when he cometh, shall speak unto thee." (vs. 30-32.)

Here, it will be observed, that Cornelius said, "*Behold, a man in bright clothing stood before me.*" In verse 20 that "man" announced himself to Peter as a spirit man. This man in bright clothing was "the angel of God." Thus we find another proof that the

angels of the Bible, like the demons and gods of the heathens, were the spirits of men, or spirit men.

Peter commences his preaching immediately, during which he relates the circumstance of the death, and the wonderful phenomena of the appearances of Jesus after his death. He says, "Him God raised up the third day, and showed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead." (vs. 40, 41.)

God showed Jesus openly: but how, and to whom? I answer, his appearance was always under the same conditions that spirits are seen now. "Not to all the people," is Peter's language. Who were those "witnesses chosen"? If they lived to-day they would be called clairvoyants. But Jesus ate and drank after he arose from the dead. Probably he did. Spirits do that almost every day in the circles of Mrs. Keigwin, of Jeffersonville, Ind. The phenomena which attended or followed Peter's preaching were similar to those of the day of Pentecost. The record says, "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God." (vs. 44-46.) As this manifestation is so similar to that of Pentecost, comment is needless.

This matter does not terminate thus. Peter's Jewish brethren were not satisfied. They supposed these phenomena belonged exclusively to the circumcision,

and hence called Peter to account for preaching the gospel to the Gentiles. I make two extracts from Peter's defence. In chapter xi. 5, he says, "I was in the city of Joppa, praying: and in a trance I saw a vision: a certain vessel descend, as it had been a great sheet, let down from heaven by four corners; and it came even to me." Here is the relation of both a "trance and a vision." In verses 12, 13 he says, "And the spirit bade me go with them, nothing doubting. Moreover these six brethren accompanied me, and we entered into the man's house: and he showed us how he had seen an angel in his house, which stood and said unto him, Send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter." I do not like to dispute the words of Peter; but if the reader will take the pains to turn back to Acts x. 30, he will read Cornelius' story. There is not one word in it about an angel. He says, "Behold, a man stood before me in bright clothing," &c. Thus we have it again, that which Cornelius calls a man, Peter calls an angel, and in verse 19, a spirit. The fact is, men, when they pass into the other world, become angels or spirits.

I cannot pass from this chapter without quoting verses 27, 28: "And in these days came prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch. And there stood up one of them named Agabus, and signified by the spirit that there should be great dearth throughout all the world: which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar."

Why are none of these examples followed in the church to-day? Where are the church's prophets? How thoroughly do churches, in their practice, deny

the power of godliness. It was a spirit that enabled this Agabus to prophecy.

In Acts xii. is one of the most wonderful cases of spirit manifestation recorded in ancient or modern history. Though the extract is lengthy, I see no place to divide it, and therefore I give it entire.

“Peter, therefore, was kept in prison: but prayer was made without ceasing of the church unto God for him. And when Herod would have brought him forth, the same night Peter was sleeping between two soldiers, bound with two chains: and the keepers before the door kept the prison. And, behold, the angel of the Lord came upon him, and a light shined in the prison: and he smote Peter on the side, and raised him up, saying, Arise up quickly. And his chains fell off from his hands. And the angel said unto him, Gird thyself, and bind on thy sandals. And so he did. And he saith unto him, Cast thy garment about thee, and follow me. And he went out, and followed him; and wist not that it was true which was done by the angel; but thought he saw a vision. When they were past the first and the second ward, they came unto the iron gate that leadeth unto the city; which opened to them of his own accord: and they went out, and passed on through one street; and forthwith the angel departed from him. And when Peter was come to himself, he said, Now I know of a surety, that the Lord hath sent his angel, and hath delivered me out of the hand of Herod, and from all the expectation of the people of the Jews. And when he had considered the thing, he came to the house of Mary the mother of John, whose surname was Mark; where many were gathered together praying. And as Peter knocked at

the door of the gate, a damsel came to hearken, named Rhoda. And when she knew Peter's voice, she opened not the gate for gladness, but ran in, and told how Peter stood before the gate. And they said unto her, Thou art mad. But she constantly affirmed that it was even so. Then said they, It is his angel. But Peter continued knocking: and when they had opened the door, and saw him, they were astonished."

Notice the points of similarity in this and modern Spiritualism.

1. After stating that Peter was put into prison, and bound with chains, and put between soldiers to sleep, and keepers placed at the door, an angel or spirit went into the prison.

2. "A light shined in the prison." This was what we call a "spirit light."

3. When the angel smote Peter on the side and raised him up, the chains fell off. Such manifestations occur with the Davenportes and others.

4. "The iron gate opened of its own accord." I think this is a mistake. Gates do not have accord. Where there is no mind there can be no accord. Peter was simply not sufficiently clairvoyant to see the angel who opened the gate. Modern spirit mediums, who have been let out of prison, have not been able to see the angel who opened the door.

5. Some power led Peter to where his brethren were holding a prayer-meeting or circle.

6. When he got to the house, and knocked at the door, and the little girl recognized him, those who did not believe the child first urged that she was insane. They could not see how it was possible that iron chains could be taken off of Peter, and an iron door opened.

After arguing a few moments, they decided that the girl was not mad, but that what she saw and they heard rapping at the gate was "his angel." Several times in the course of this and a former volume I have shown that angels were the spirits of dead men. Jesus once said, "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, That in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." (Matt. xviii. 10.)

The early church believed, as many do now, that each person was under the training of an angel. They believed also that persons grew to look like the angels under whose charge they were. This may account for their supposing that it was Peter's angel rather than Peter himself that stood rapping at the gate. If they had not believed that spirits could rap, why should they say, "It is his angel"?

This truly wonderful manifestation is in every part corroborated by modern Spiritualism. The Davenport, Dewitt C. Hough, Laura V. Ellis, and others, have similar manifestations. Why shall I believe what my eyes have seen, and refuse to believe that others have experienced the same, or witnessed similar phenomena? Or why shall I believe this Biblical story, and refuse to believe the occurrences of to-day which so fully corroborate it?

In Acts xiii. 8-11, we have the following: "Then Saul (who also is called Paul), filled with the Holy Ghost, set his eyes on him, and said, O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord? And now, behold, the hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be

blind, not seeing the sun for a season. And immediately there fell on him a mist and a darkness, and he went about seeking some to lead him by the hand."

It does seem that mediums in those days were, as some are now, jealous of each other. Elymas undertook to work against Paul. Paul was the best medium, and being filled with the Holy Ghost (another expression for spirit influence), "he set his eyes on him," and while looking him in the eye, pronounced a curse on him, rendering him blind for a season. This I have seen done psychologically many times. The blindness, however, does not continue, as it did not in this case. Being only psychological, it lasts only while the psychologic spell lasts.

In this chapter, Paul delivers a discourse, from which I make a short extract: "And when they had fulfilled all that was written of him, they took him down from the tree, and laid him in a sepulchre. But God raised him from the dead: and he was seen many days of them which came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are his witnesses unto the people."

Jesus is the subject of whom Paul is speaking; "God raised him from the dead." The body was dead, and God raised Jesus from it, or out of it. How does Paul know? He answers, he was *seen*, but not by all the people, as he evidently would have been had his body been raised, but by "certain ones who were his witnesses unto the people." When the people wished to know anything about the appearance of Jesus, they had no way to find out but by consulting those who, from time to time, were enabled to see him after his resurrection. I often wonder how it is that people could ever twist those texts so as to make them

teach a reorganization and re-living of the body rather than the spiritual phenomena.

In Acts xiv. is a case of Spiritualism worth recording; it reads as follows: "And there sat a certain man at Lystra, impotent in his feet, being a cripple from his mother's womb, who never had walked: the same heard Paul speak: who steadfastly beholding him, and perceiving that he had faith to be healed, said with a loud voice, Stand upright on thy feet. And he leaped and walked." (vs. 8, 9, 10.)

There are mediums now who could perform as great wonders.

Acts xv. is about the only chapter that does not contain the record of some greater phenomenon than is practised by any of the churches, or any others, save spirit mediums. That gives the narrative of Paul and Barnabas concerning matters not elsewhere recorded. Verse 12 says, "Then all the multitude kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them."

In those days the whole proof of the ministry seemed to lie in the ability to do works called miracles.

In verse 28, the spirit influence, or good spirit, is referred to as follows: "For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things."

A manifestation, the origin of which can not easily be mistaken, is recorded in Acts xvi. 6-10. "Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia, after they were come to Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia: but the spirit

suffered them not. And they, passing by Mysia, came down to Troas. And a vision appeared to Paul in the night: There stood a man of Macedonia, and prayed him, saying, Come over into Macedonia, and help us."

This Holy Ghost that forbade their preaching the word in Asia, was the same spirit that would not allow them to preach in Bithynia. It is probable, too, that this was the man of Macedonia, who said, "Come over and help us." This was a spirit man. Paul was in a spiritual condition when he saw this man, who, by the way, was a Macedonian. This being true, it follows that the spirits of Macedonians can come back and say, "Come over and help us."

What plainer evidence could be required that the "Holy Ghost," "spirit," and "men," are all the same? So, also, are the angels, as proved by the tenth chapter of this book, and the saints, as proved by other portions of the Bible. And from this they gathered that the Lord had called them to Macedonia to preach. Surely the Lord who called them this time was the man of Macedonia.

Reader, permit me to whisper in your ear, that the Lords that figured so extensively throughout the Old and New Testaments, were always either men in the form, or spirits of dead men. In this instance it was the latter. In verses 16-18 of this chapter, is the following record: "And this did she many days. But Paul, being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee, in the name of Jesus Christ, to come out of her. And he came out the same hour."

Here is another instance of jealousy, and the triumph of the greater over the weaker mediumship. This woman, certainly under this influence, preached

the same gospel as that preached by Paul, and recommended Paul and Silas to her friends; but Paul was a crusty old bachelor, who did not believe in having his preaching eclipsed by that of a woman. He had said, "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." (1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35.)

Again: "Let your women learn in silence, with all subjection." (1 Tim. ii. 2.)

Paul cast the spirit of divination out of this girl. I do not know why the translators put the word "divination" there. They have put the word Python in the margin,—the Greek word is *Pythones*. Then it was the spirit of Pythones that was driven from this medium. And who was Pythones? I will tell you. Python was a great snake, killed by the god Apollo. But it is not reasonable to suppose that the spirit of a snake obsessed this lady, so we must look further into heathenism for a solution of this question. After Apollo killed Python, he gave the name to an old woman dressed in girls' clothes, who had the power of telling fortunes. So any one who could tell fortunes by power from the dead was afterward called a Pythoness. This spirit of Python either means the spirit of this old lady of heathen fable, or simply spirit power. (See Tooke's "Pantheon," pages 39–44.)

So this case only proves to be one medium casting the spirit of a dead woman out of another. There is jealousy even among the spirits. "The Lord thy God is a jealous God, and his glory he will not give to another."

The next manifestation recorded in this Book is found in verses 26, 27 of this chapter. "And at midnight Paul and Silas prayed, and sang praises unto God: and the prisoners heard them. And suddenly there was a great earthquake, so that the foundations of the prison were shaken: and immediately all the doors were opened, and every one's bands were loosed."

1. This manifestation occurred at midnight, the best time during the twenty-four hours for physical manifestations.

2. "The foundations of the prison were shaken." Is not this a manifestation of a similar kind to that of shaking and tipping of tables, chairs, and pianos?

3. "The doors were opened, and every one's bands were loosed." Whatever power may have opened the doors, the bands were loosed by the same power now used to accomplish the same work. Probably the bands were what now would be called handcuffs. I have been in seances where solid iron rings, so small that the hand could not be forced through them, have been put on and taken off of the medium's arm by spirit power alone. True, in the case of Dewitt C. Hough, and others, these things were done in the dark. So did this occur in the dark. Verse 29 says, "Then he (the jailer) called for a light, and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas."

If I am asked for an explanation of why darkness was required for this manifestation, I can at present only refer to the chapter in this volume entitled "Minor Questions."

In Acts xvii. 18-20, the writer refers to heathen

philosophers, as follows: "Then certain philosophers of the Epicureans, and of the Stoics, encountered him. And some said, What will this babblers say? other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods. because he preached unto them Jesus, and the resurrection."

It is not to be inferred from this that Paul preached Jesus as a god; but he preached Jesus and the resurrection. This doctrine was well known among the Grecians. They nearly all believed in what they called the *Apotheosis*, that is, that some men at death were elevated to the position of gods. When Paul preaches the *Anastasis*, that is, the rising of Jesus, they understood him to teach their own doctrine of *apotheosized* men; that Jesus at or about the time of his death had been exalted to be a god. Hence they said Paul's doctrine was that of other and strange gods. As they wanted to get acquainted with this Jesus, whom they regarded as a new god, they invited Paul into their own *Areopagus* to present the evidence of Jesus' *apotheosis*.

Almost every work of Grecian mythology will show their gods to have once been men on earth. Tooke says, "After Ninus had conquered many nations far and near, and built a city, called after his name Nineveh, in a public assembly of the Babylonians he extolled his father Belus, the founder of the empire and city of Babylon, beyond all measure, representing him not only worthy of perpetual honor among all posterity, but also of an immortality among the gods above. He then exhibited a statue of him, curiously and neatly made, to which he commanded them to pay the same reverence that they would have given to Belus while

alive. He also appointed it to be a common sanctuary to the miserable, and ordained 'that if at any time an offender should fly to this statue it should not be lawful to force him away to punishment.' This privilege easily procured so great a veneration to the dead prince, that he was thought more than a man, and, therefore, was created a god, and called Jupiter, or, as others write, Saturn of Babylon, where a most magnificent temple was erected to him by his son."—*Pantheon*, p. 18.

On pages 21, 22, the same author says, "And lastly, to this class also we must refer those gods and goddesses by whose help and means, as Cicero says, men advanced to heaven, and obtained a place among the gods; of which sort are the principal virtues, as we shall show in the proper place."

Dr. Campbell says, "From the days of Titan and Saturn, the poetic progeny of Coelus and Terra, down to Æsculapius, Protius, and Minos, all their gods were the departed spirits of human beings, and were so regarded by the most erudite of the pagans themselves."

Tooke thus describes the earth life of Apollo, page 41: "Apollo was advanced to the highest degree of honor and worship by these four means, viz., by the invention of physic, music, poetry, and rhetoric, which is ascribed to him; and, therefore, he is supposed to preside over the Muses. It is said that he taught the arts of foretelling events, and shooting with arrows; when, therefore, he had benefited mankind infinitely by these favors, they worshiped him as a god."

The next instance to which I shall refer is found in **chapter xix.** Paul went to Ephesus, and finding some

brethren there, "He said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." (vs. 2.)

That is, he asked them concerning this spiritual influence. They responded they had heard nothing of these manifestations. The truth is, they had been baptized by Apollos, one of John's disciples, who knew nothing of this new development. Paul explained the matter to them, and they formed a developing circle, which resulted in making mediums of them. Dr. Luke, the historian, records the matter as follows: "And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied."

Paul next went to Asia to preach, and give manifestations to the Jews and Greeks. Though Luke, the writer of this Book, was a "beloved physician," his jealousy did not prevent his making the following record: "And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul: so that from his body were brought, unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them." (vs. 11, 12.)

Dr. Wilbur, a medium in Chicago, performs many cures by sending magnetized paper to the patient. I myself have removed disease in the same way. The principle is the same as that by which Paul healed in the above instance. In one of my lectures, I once related the circumstance of Dr. Wilbur, curing an obstinate case of dropsy,—a case that doctors had pronounced incurable. The doctor used magnetized paper, *and no other remedy*. A Methodist minis-

ter, of small brain and large assurance, was present, who said, "I take it upon myself to pronounce that story a *hoax*: no case of the kind ever occurred." I replied, "I have no witnesses in this audience to prove my story. I will, however, give the names and post-office address of witnesses to which you can refer. I will further state that I know mediums who have healed persons by sending pocket-handkerchiefs to them, and I have printed documents here to show that another medium, whom I never saw, has done the same thing."

To this the minister replied, in substance, as follows:—

"I have no doubt Mr. Hull could furnish witnesses. As he and his friends do not believe in Christianity, they might be induced to testify to almost anything that would forward their cause. So far as printed statements are concerned, he who would tell a lie could be induced to print one. So I would not believe any printed document of the kind. Such things are all printed in the interest of Spiritualism, and must be considered *ex parte* evidence. The humble Christian must trust in Jesus and reject them."

"And yet," I replied, "I must read my printed evidence. If my friend does not believe it, some others may. It is found in the Actions of the Apostles, chapter xiv., verses 11, 12." I then read the verses above quoted, and said, "We allow Methodist ministers to dispute the Bible: such plain historical statements, corroborated as this one is by modern history and my own experience, I cannot dispute."

A case occurs in Acts xix. 13-16, which can not really be classed with apostolic acts, yet as it is a case

of spirit obsession, a mediumship that seven exorcists were not able to overcome, I quote it :—

“Then certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists, took upon them to call over them which had evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth. And there were seven sons of one Sceva, a Jew, and chief of the priests, which did so. And the evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye? And the man in whom the evil spirit was leaped on them, and overcame them, and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded.”

This case of wonderful physical strength under the influence of this evil or undeveloped spirit, is well attested. The next verse says, “And this was known to all the Jews and Greeks also dwelling at Ephesus; and fear fell on them all, and the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified.”

In Acts xx. 9–12 is another manifestation of healing. The following is the narrative :—

“And there sat in a window a certain young man named Eutychus, being fallen into a deep sleep: and as Paul was long preaching, he sunk down with sleep, and fell down from the third loft, and was taken up dead. And Paul went down, and fell on him, and embracing him, said, Trouble not yourselves; for his life is in him. When he therefore was come up again, and had broken bread, and eaten, and talked a long while, even till break of day, so he departed. And they brought the young man alive, and were not a little comforted.”

In this chapter, the influence called the Holy Ghost,

talks again to Paul. Paul says, "And now, behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there: save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me." (vs. 22, 23.)

In chapter xxi. 4, the spirit again speaks: "And finding disciples, we tarried there seven days: who said to Paul through the spirit, that he should not go up to Jerusalem."

In verse 11, a spirit influences a medium by the name of Agabus, and gives a prophecy, which the writer refers to as follows: "And when he was come unto us, he took Paul's girdle, and bound his own hands and feet, and said, Thus saith the Holy Ghost, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles."

This prophecy proved true in all its parts.

In chapter xxii. Paul relates the wonderful phenomenon that converted him, a history of which was given in chapter ix. I have not the space for Paul's lengthy remarks. A brief extract from Ananias's communication to Paul is as follows: "And he said, The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldst know his will, and see that Just One, and shouldst hear the voice of his mouth. For thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard."

In verses 17-21 Paul relates some things Jesus said to him when he was entranced: "And it came to pass, that, when I was come again to Jerusalem, even while I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance; and saw him saying unto me, Make haste, and get thee

quickly out of Jerusalem: for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me. And I said, Lord, they know that I imprisoned and beat in every synagogue them that believed on thee: and when the blood of thy martyr Stephen was shed, I also was standing by, and consenting unto his death, and kept the raiment of them that slew him.”

In chapter xxiii. 7-10, Paul declares his belief in spirits, and the Pharisees confess their faith that spirits and angels talk with him. -“And when he had so said, there arose a dissension between the Pharisees and the Sadducees: and the multitude was divided. For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit: but the Pharisees confess both. And there arose a great cry: and the scribes that were of the Pharisees’ part arose, and strove, saying, We find no evil in this man: but if a spirit or an angel hath spoken to him, let us not fight against God.”

In chapter xxvii. Paul relates his “perceptions” when at sea. He says to the officers of the ship, on which he was a prisoner, “Sirs, I perceive that this voyage will be with hurt and much damage, not only of the lading and ship, but also of our lives.” (vs. 10.)

Paul’s warning was not heeded. The *reckless* captain was disobedient to the warning, and, as a consequence, had his vessel *wrecked*.

After their first disaster, the historian says, “But after long abstinence Paul stood forth in the midst of them, and said, Sirs, ye should have hearkened unto me, and not have loosed from Crete, and to have gained this harm and loss. And now I exhort you to be of good cheer: for there shall be no loss of any

man's life among you, but of the ship. For there stood by me this night the angel of God, whose I am, and whom I serve, Saying, Fear not, Paul; thou must be brought before Cæsar: and, lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee. Wherefore, sirs, be of good cheer: for I believe God, that it shall be even as it was told me. Howbeit we must be cast upon a certain island."

This prophecy proved true, and but for spirit advice, through the organism of Paul, all would have been lost. After the worst of their trouble was over, Paul again uttered a prediction which proved true. Luke records it as follows: "And while the day was coming on, Paul besought them all to take meat, Saying, this is the fourteenth day that ye have tarried, and continued fasting, having taken nothing. Wherefore I pray you to take some meat: for this is for your health: for there shall not an hair fall from the head of any of you." (vs. 33, 34.)

These opponents of Spiritualism, and Paul the Spiritualist, found themselves cast away among barbarians; but they were like the great majority of heathens, a kind and hospitable people. The record says, "And the barbarous people showed us no little kindness; for they kindled a fire, and received us every one, because of the present rain, and because of the cold." (xxviii. 2.)

Following this is the record of a wonderful manifestation. "And when Paul had gathered a bundle of sticks, and laid them on the fire, there came a viper out of the heat, and fastened on his hand. And when the barbarians saw the venomous beast hang on his hand, they said among themselves, No doubt this man

is a murderer, whom, though he hath escaped the sea, yet vengeance suffereth not to live. And he shook off the beast into the fire, and felt no harm. Howbeit they looked when he should have swollen, or fallen down dead suddenly; but after they had looked a great while, and saw no harm come to him, they changed their minds, and said that he was a god." (vs. 3-6.)

Comment is needless. It was just what Jesus said should attend the believers. It is just what churches do not, and *can not* do. Thus they prove their infidelity.

Another case of healing is brought to view in this chapter. "And it came to pass, that the father of Publius lay sick of a fever and of a bloody flux: to whom Paul entered in, and prayed, and laid his hands on him, and healed him. So when this was done, others also, which had diseases in the island, came, and were healed. Who also honored us with many honors: and when we departed, they laded us with such things as were necessary." (vs. 8-10.)

These cases of healing were similar to modern Spiritualism. How kind these heathens were! If our Christian Americans would treat the heathen Chinese as these barbarians treated Paul, our religion would stand higher before the world, and the heathen world could respect us more.

Now, patient reader, I have gone through the Book called the *Acts of the Apostles*. I pause to inquire of you, Who imitates the *practice* of these first Christians? Is there an evangelical Christian on earth who follows their example? Are they, or do they,

profess to be under the influence of the *Pneumatos Hagion*? Do they speak with other tongues? Do they lay their hands on the sick, and cause them to recover? Where are the cripples they have healed? When did one of them follow the example of Paul and Peter, and go into a trance? Do they have visions? Can they foretell the future, as did Paul on several occasions, after an angel had stood by him and talked with him? In what sense do modern Christians follow apostolic example? Alas, for them! The kingdom of heaven has been taken from them, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof! They have the form of godliness, but the power, if they ever had it, has departed from them.

O Orthodoxy, I counsel thee to purchase of the spirit world, by humble contrition and sincere repentance, "gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich, and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear, and anoint thine eyes with eye-salve that thou mayest see." He that hath ears to hear, let him hear what the spirit saith unto the churches.

Spiritualists, let us take warning, lest as bad or a worse thing befall us. I tremble for Spiritualism, lest when it becomes popular it should depart from its allegiance to the spirit world. Let us ever be receptive to the influence from our risen friends.

Had I time, and my readers the patience, to go through the whole Bible, as I have the Book of Acts, I could show it all to be but the prototype of the Phenomenal Spiritualism of the Nineteenth Century.

CHAPTER XVIII.

WHAT IS EVANGELICALISM?

A general Departure from Evangelicalism. — Bible on Infant Damnation. — The Gods of Orthodoxy. — Eternally begotten Son, meaning of. — Eternal Decrees. — Prayer and the Decrees. — Predestination and Reprobation. — Consequences of the Doctrine. — Presbyterian Justice. — The World made of Nothing in six Days. — The Fall of Man. — The Devil in the Snake. — All for God's Glory. — Adam totally depraved. — The Result. — Very God and very Man. — God his own Son and Father. — A naughty Ghost. — Mary God's Mother. — A Pyramid of Absurdities. — Justice satisfied. — No Power to will. — Who are the Called? — Elect Infants. — Doom of Non-professors. — Saved by Christ's Righteousness alone. — Is a second Payment demanded. — Catechisms on Punishment. — Sinfulness of Goodness. — Perseverance of the Saints. — Spiritualism, twenty of its Points of Superiority. — Conclusion.

THIS volume has already grown to nearly the dimensions I had calculated, and I must think of closing; and as I commenced with a chapter devoted to the question, "What is Spiritualism?" how can I more appropriately close the book than with a few thoughts in review of the other side of the question.

Ministers in their sermons and prayers, and authors in their writings nowadays so universally depart from their own religious systems, that a person could not gather the peculiarities of Evangelicalism from what is heard in modern pulpits, and read in modern books. Even a statement of what Evangelicalism is, is often disputed by those who pretend to follow its teachings. Lest religionists should lay this book down with a sneer, and charge of general misrepresentation, I pro-

pose to let Evangelicalism state itself. I shall, in the statement, quote from no other authority than the Orthodox Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, 265 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia. This Confession of Faith and these Catechisms are indorsed in the main by all who call themselves Evangelical Christians. Some of the minor points, such as the doctrine of Election, Reprobation, Infant Damnation, and a few others, may not be indorsed by some of the smaller sects of Christians. While Methodists would repudiate the former of these doctrines, John Wesley did assert in his doctrinal tracts that infants were liable to eternal damnation. I do not see why they should not be. The Bible teaches, as clearly as it teaches anything, that infants are liable to suffer under the wrath of God. When Moses gave his command to slay, he prefaced it with a "Thus saith the Lord," and made it read as follows: "Now, therefore, kill every male among the little ones." (Num. xxxi. 17.) If God would, in a fit of anger, make such universal havoc among the little boys, why should he so change as to save them? If he would kill little baby boys, why not send them to hell?

Ezekiel overheard God state the matter to his angels, as follows:—

"And to the others he said in mine hearing, Go ye after him through the city, and smite: let not your eye spare, neither have ye pity: slay utterly old and young, both maids, and little children, and women: but come not near any man upon whom is the mark; and begin at my sanctuary. Then they began at the ancient men which were before the house." (Ezek. ix. 5, 6.)

I must not at present say more on this subject; it will come more appropriately in another place.

It can not be expected that I can here note every point in Evangelicalism with which I would differ, nor go into a formal and very definite reply to any one point, for that the reader is referred to preceding portions of this volume. My chief design now is to allow Evangelicalism to speak for itself.

The first chapter of the Confession of Faith is devoted to an argument on the infallibility and perfection of the Scriptures. The second chapter to a description of the God, or rather the Gods of Evangelicalism. He is represented as being "without passions," and yet "hating sin," and will "by no means clear the guilty."

The following are the ingredients of which this God is compounded:—

In the unity of the Godhead there be *three persons*, of one substance, power, and *eternity*,— God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son.— *Confession of Faith*, chap. ii. sect. 3.

This looks a little like a plurality of Gods. Here is,
 "1. God the Father;
 2. God the Son; and,
 3. God the Holy Ghost."

These three imaginary beings are Gods, or they are not. If they are Gods, then there are *three* Gods and not one. If they are not Gods, then the above titles are wrong. Again: if they are not Gods, when taken separately, what are they? If they are men, then

three men make one God. Do the followers of this creed believe that? Of course they do not! Then, are they three angels? If so, three angels will make one God; and, to find the number of Gods, all that is to be done is to group angels into bunches of three! Of course orthodoxy will not accept this.

Is God Infinite and Almighty? The Confession of Faith and Catechisms say so. Very well, then; there are in God, the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, — three omnipotent Gods. Is not that rather more than is necessary? Does the reader say there is but one Infinite God? Then it takes three finites to make one infinite; or, these three Gods are not “of one substance, power, and eternity.” Would God the Father be God without the aid of the Son or Holy Ghost? If so, these other two partners in the God-firm are only honorary and unnecessary members. If not, we fall back to the position that three *some-things* make one Infinite God. Turn this matter as you may, the absurdity of this vital point of orthodoxy can not be avoided.

Once more. What is the meaning of “eternally begotten”? Does it mean eternally in the process of being begotten? If so, he is not yet begotten. Or does it mean he is begotten for all the remainder of eternity? If so, he is, in that respect, only equal to all of us, who are eternally begotten in every sense that Jesus was.

The next chapter of this book is entitled, “Of God’s Eternal Decrees.” That is a contradiction of terms. A decree is an *edict* or *law*, and can not go forth without there being a time when it goes forth, but if there is a time when it is issued, there is a time

before which it is issued ; but if there is a time *before* which it is issued, it can not be *eternal*. So there can be no "Eternal Decrees."

The first sentence of this chapter is as follows : "God from all eternity did by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass."

The above being true, things are generally and specifically fixed. God did not only, "from all eternity," ordain that orthodoxy should publish an almost senseless Confession of Faith, but "did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain" that I should expose its nonsense. I am no more to be blamed or praised for this *exposé* than is the pen in my hand. The pen writes because I compel it to do so, and I publish this book because it was decreed from all eternity.

How strangely inconsistent this thought seems to be with the idea of prayer. Why should the believers of this doctrine pray? There is no reason in the world for it, unless it is because it was *decreed* that Christians should pray. They certainly can not expect God to answer their prayers, as it could not be done without changing an *eternal decree* ! If God has decreed to do the thing Christians ask him to do, he will do them to save his decrees, not because Christians ask him. If he has not thus decreed, he has decreed the contrary, and could not be induced to violate his decree. Some of the results of this doctrine of decrees will be found in sections iii., iv., and v. of this chapter. Here they are : "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death."

These angels and men thus predestinated and fore-ordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it can not be either increased or diminished. Those of mankind who are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, he hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving him thereunto; and all to the praise of his glorious grace."

What a grand promoter of morality this must be! Your destiny is not made by your acts, but your acts and their consequences are predestinated!. "The number predestinated to everlasting life is so definite, that it can not be either increased or diminished." Reader, you have nothing to do, you could not do anything if you would, and if you could it would not have any effect, otherwise it might add to or diminish from your happiness here and hereafter. As God selected you to happiness or misery, without any foresight of faith or good works on your part, your salvation or damnation is all in the hands of an arbitrary tyrant. Your good deeds can not do you or any one else any good. If you are saved at all, it is through pure, unmerited grace. Section vii. says, "The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to

pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice."

This, with Presbyterians, may be "glorious justice;" with people who exercise more of the kind of sense called *common*, and not so much of the *dogmatical* kind, usually *dubbed theological*, it is the most damnable injustice. No demon incarnate could more thoroughly outrage every element of justice. A sovereign power that ordains "vessels of wrath," and then eternally damns them for being just what he made them, is, to say the least, fiendish. No wonder this book should urge upon its adherents to handle this doctrine of predestination "with especial prudence and care."

Chapter iv. gives the history of the Gods, whom it calls God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, making the world, and all there is therein, out of nothing in six literal days. The revelations of geology have caused many Christians to be careful about stepping on this rotten plank in their platform. I will only quote a single sentence. "It pleased God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, for the manifestation of the glory of his eternal power, wisdom, and goodness, in the beginning, to create or make of nothing the world, and all things therein, whether visible or invisible, in the space of six days, and all very good."

I now pass to chapter vi., devoted to the subject of the fall of man. I quote sections i.-iv.: "Our first parents, being seduced by the subtilty and temptation of Satan, sinned in eating the forbidden fruit. This their sin God was pleased, according to his wise and holy counsel, to permit, having purposed to order it to his own glory."

By this sin they fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body.

They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity descending from them by ordinary generation.

From original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions.

As this has been sufficiently noticed in the first chapter of this book, but little comment is here needed.

1. We learn that the Serpent, who tempted the woman in the garden, was a no less important personage than his Satanic majesty.

2. This sin was permitted because it was for the glory of God. It does not appear from this paragraph how God was glorified, unless it is in his skill in sending the devil in the shape of a snake to tempt man and woman, and then in his ability to pronounce an unjust judgment on those who were compelled by his almighty power to act their part of the farce.

3. Although it does not appear that they had ever done a righteous act, yet by this sin they fell from original righteousness, and became *dead in sin*. That is, totally depraved. They are "wholly defiled in all their faculties and parts of the soul and body."

4. The guilt of the Adamic transgression was *imputed*. Thus we are all actually partakers of this original sin, as really as though we, in person, had stood in Adam's place.

5. We are made opposite to all good. This, I presume, is for the glory of God. Are we to blame for being made opposite to all good? What a God that must be who is glorified by making such totally depraved creatures! Reader, is Evangelicalism, thus far, a system of religion that you can believe, love, and reverence? I think not.

Section vi. of this chapter, says, "Every sin, both original and actual, being a transgression of the righteous law of God, and contrary thereunto, doth in its own nature bring guilt upon the sinner, whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God, and curse of the law, and so made subject to death, with all miseries, spiritual, temporal, and *eternal*."

Is this true? Then what becomes of a former part of this harmonious creed? If man's actual sins bring guilt upon the sinner, binding him over to the wrath of God, and rendering him subject to death, with all miseries, spiritual, temporal, and eternal, won't these actions of men spoil some of God's eternal decrees? Suppose one predestinated to eternal life happens to sin, will God save his decree by saving the man, or save this section of the Confession of Faith, and spoil his decree by damning him? If a man is damned at all, will it be because of the decree, or because of his actions?

A want of space forbids an examination of every chapter and section of the platform of Evangelical Christianity.

Section ii. of chapter viii. is so universally believed by Arminian as well as Calvinistic Christians, that I must make room for it.

"The Son of God, the second person in the Trinity,

being very and eternal God, of one substance, and equal with the Father, did, when the fullness of time was come, take upon him man's nature, with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin: being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin Mary, of his substance. So that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion. Which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only mediator between God and man."

Here we have a fine list of absurdities.

1. The Son of God is the very and eternal God. How can a Son be eternal? The word Son implies a Father, and the term Father implies priority of existence. But what can exist before this very and eternal God?

2. This very and eternal God is his own Son.

3. This very and eternal God is his own Father.

4. This very and eternal God is equal with his Father.

5. This very and eternal God was conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary.

6. Wasn't that a rather naughty Ghost?

7. Would such a Ghost now be called holy?

8. If the very and eternal God was conceived in the womb of the Virgin Mary, why is not Mary the mother of God?

9. What evidence is there, beside Mary's story and Joseph's dream, that Jesus was begotten by a Ghost?

10. Would you believe a girl now who would undertake to cover her shame with such a story?

11. If her lover believed the story, even though he may have dreamed that it was true, would you not put him down as a little demented?

12. If the Godhead and Manhood in Jesus were *inseparably joined* together in the womb of the Virgin, were they *separated* in death?

13. If not, then did God die?

14. If God died, then was the world three days without a God?

15. If God did not die, then we have only a human sacrifice. What a pyramid of absurdities can be crowded into one paragraph when dictated as an explanation of Evangelicalism! How grateful am I to my risen friends that I have not been left to these delusions.

Paragraph v., of the same chapter, says, "The Lord Jesus Christ, by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which he, through the eternal spirit, once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the justice of his Father, and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto him."

Here Jesus, the very and eternal God, offers himself as a sacrifice to the very and eternal God, — sacrifice himself to himself. Is not that a little selfish? This "has fully satisfied the justice of his Father." What a strange kind of justice that must be which decrees man to sin, and then slays his own innocent Son, the only one who is absolutely without sin, for the guilt of the world? God had decreed that man should sin; it is but just that the sufferings should be confined among the Gods; and as man only sinned

because God decreed it, it is but just that man, through the suffering of God, should escape. On the ground that God is to blame for man's sins, an atonement by a God suffering is just! In this he is only partly undoing the great wrong he did in Eden, by sending a snake to tempt the woman, and ruin humanity.

Chapter ix. is devoted to the subject of *Free Will*. Section iii. says, "Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation. So as a natural man, being altogether averse from that which is good, and dead in sin, is not able by his own strength to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto."

This is but another statement of the Total Depravity doctrine. "Man has *wholly* lost all ability of will to any spiritual good," and "dead in sin," &c. This being true, where is the use of exhortations? What means Peter's language, "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted." (Acts iii. 19.)

As man has no will of his own, all exhortations should be addressed to God; but as "he is unchangeable, and works all things after the counsel of his own will, and has foreordained all things, whatsoever cometh to pass," all exhortations and intercessions to him are lost! However, people will intercede if it is foreordained that they should, and my pleading is in vain. I have only one consolation: it was foreordained that I should make this plea!

"All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, and those only, he is pleased, in his appointed and accepted time, effectually to call." (Ch. x., sec. 1.)

Comments on this are unnecessary.

Section iii. says, "Elect infants, dying in infancy,

are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth. So also are all other elect persons, who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word."

What means the expression, "elect infants"? If it does not imply that there are infants who are not elect, there is no meaning in language. The next section fixes this matter beyond a peradventure. It is as follows:—

"Others, not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come to Christ, and therefore can not be saved: much less can men, not professing the Christian religion, be saved in any other way whatsoever, be they never so diligent to form their lives according to the light of nature, and the law of that religion they do profess; and to assert and maintain that they may, is very pernicious, and to be detested."

Those not elected, and not having gospel privileges, no matter who they are, no matter how obedient they may be to the word, "cannot be saved." See how one fatal sentence consigns over *eight hundred millions* of the present generation, who never heard of Christ, to the flames of an endless hell! "Much less can men, not professing the Christian religion, be saved in any other way whatsoever. To maintain that they are, is pernicious, and to be detested." Even admitting the truth of this beautiful (?) paragraph, why should Presbyterians be exhorted to *detest* this doctrine and its advocates? Surely it can do the elect no harm, and as for the non-elected, why not let them

enjoy this as well as any other delusion? Hell is their doom at any rate, and no false doctrine can render them more miserable in the hereafter.

Chapter xi. is entitled, "Of Justification." I confess to a strong desire to reproduce the whole chapter, but can not afford the space. The first section is as follows:—

"Those whom God effectually calleth, he also freely justifieth; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous: not for any thing wrought in them, but for Christ's sake alone: not by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience to them, as their righteousness; but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith; which faith they have not of themselves: it is the gift of God."

Here the doctrine of Justification, pardon of sin or atonement, is so clearly stated, that there can be no misunderstanding it. Notice how perfectly any "righteousness of the person, or any thing wrought in them, or done by them," is ignored. It is for Christ's sake alone, "by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ," "resting on him and his righteousness." Thus, Christ does it all; the sinner can do nothing. Indeed, no act of man can affect his condition in the other world. Yet these very people are afraid of Spiritualism, lest it should take away the stimulants to righteousness.

The next sentence assures us that "faith, thus receiving and resting on Christ and his righteousness, is

the alone instrument of justification ;” and this faith we are told, in the preceding section, is “the gift of God.”

Paul says, “How can they believe on him of whom they have not heard, and how can they hear without a preacher.” Where are the heathen who never heard of Christ? This theory “leaves them no refuge but hell.”

The first half of the next section says, “Christ, by his obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real, and full satisfaction to his Father’s justice in their behalf.”

Now, I submit, that if “Christ has fully discharged the debt,” that is all that could be justly asked. If a “proper, real, and full satisfaction” has been made in behalf of the elect, that is enough. Why should the penalty of sin, or any of it, be visited on those for whom the debt has been fully discharged, and “full satisfaction rendered to the Father.” Does the reader realize what this penalty is that has been fully taken off from the elect, unless God is an unjust tyrant, dunning poor sinners for, and compelling them to pay a second time, a debt that has been fully satisfied? This Confession of Faith has said it is: “Death with all miseries, spiritual, temporal, and eternal.”

The Larger Catechism says, —

2. “*What are the punishments of sin in this world?*”

Answer. The punishments of sin in this world are either inward, — as blindness of mind, a reprobate sense, strong delusions, hardness of heart, horror of conscience, and vile affections; or outward, as the curse of God upon the creatures for our sake, and all

other evils that befall us in our bodies, names, estates, relations, and employments, together with death itself." (Question 28.)

In answer to Question 19, the Shorter Catechism says, "All mankind, by their fall, lost communion with God, are under his wrath and curse, and so made liable to the miseries in this life, to death itself, and the pains of hell forever." Thus we find, by all three of these standard works, that death — literal death — is the penalty of sin. Now, if "Christ has rendered full satisfaction to his Father's justice in behalf of the elect," why are they compelled to pay that part of the penalty? As no one escapes death, I must decide that there are no elect, or Evangelicalism is wrong. In either instance, would it not be well for Christians to re-examine the ground of their religion?

Section v. of the chapter under examination informs us of the impossibility of falling from grace. I wonder if the fact of so many leaving the church and coming to Spiritualism does not render some of the "elect" a little shaky on the point.

I must now pass several chapters without notice.

Chapter xvi. is a dissertation on good works. Section xii. says, "Works done by unregenerate men, although for the matter of them they may be things which God commands, and of good use both to themselves and others, yet because they proceed from a heart not purified by faith, nor are done in a right manner according to the word, nor to a right end, the glory of God, they are therefore sinful, and can not please God, or make man meet to receive grace from God." By unregenerate men, the framers of this paragraph mean *non*-Christians. What can unregen-

erate men, who should waste their time in reading this production conclude, but that the best they can do is to do the *worst* thing they can? Good works, which God commands, when done by them, "are sinful, and can not please God." Repentance is a good work; but, according to this, is sinful when practiced by the non-elect. Reader, according to this creed, it would be a sin for you, if you are unconverted, to haul a load of wood to keep your poor sick neighbor from freezing to death. Don't sin by taking a barrel of flour to a widow, or a pair of shoes to an orphan. This is Evangelicalism. How much will you have?

I now pass to chapter xvii.: "The Perseverance of the Saints." Sections i. and ii. certainly contain consolation for Christians. Here they are: "They whom God hath accepted in his beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace, but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved."

This perseverance of the saints "depends, not upon their own free will, but upon the immutability of the decree of election, flowing from the free and unchangeable love of God the Father; upon the efficacy of the merits and intercession of Jesus Christ; the abiding of the Spirit and of the seed of God within them, and the nature of the covenant of grace: from all which ariseth also the certainty and infallibility thereof."

What more could be required then? Salvation "depends, not upon their own free will, but upon the immutability of the decree of election." What can be so effectually calculated to kill all effort on the

part of the people to practice the right? Enough of this. Spiritualism has helped many Christians out of such dogmas.

Reader, I have gone through this much of the Confession of Faith, not to exhibit all of its errors, but for the purpose of handing you a sample of what you are invited to take in the place of Spiritualism. An illustration of the teachings of Methodism, Campbellism, and other of the more heterodox denominations, will exhibit quite as many absurdities as are to be found in the creed just examined.

In conclusion, permit me to say Spiritualism is better than any of the Christian systems, on, at least, the following points, and for the following reasons:—

1. Because it recognizes the soul as being the only absolute authority. It fully believes every man to have an inspiration, which, if followed, will guide him as unerringly as the instinct of a bird will guide it on its wing.

2. Because it teaches that all spirit is the same, whether in God or man, and that those whom we call the *lowest* can, by virtue of their relationship with the Deity, by proper effort, develop and bring into activity the God within.

3. Because, in denying the possibility of the pardon of sin, in any sense of the word, that would permit the culprit to escape the penalty, it teaches the world to refrain from sin as the only means of happiness here and hereafter.

4. Because the evidences of its phenomena are more in harmony with reason, and better certified, than those of the Bible. Its manifestations being established by living witnesses, its evidences are better than those

of the Bible. "A living dog is better than a dead lion."

5. Because it is the only religion that teaches the absolute equality of men. Even the supposed Author of Christianity calls the Gentiles "dogs," and urges that it is not meet to take the children's bread and give it to the dogs." When he commissioned his disciples to preach, his first commission was, "Into any city of the Gentiles enter ye not." The second would not allow them to turn to the Gentiles until after the Jews had rejected the gospel. "Begin at Jerusalem," was the command.

6. Because it teaches that perfection never having been obtained by any one in this life, there is room to live a better life than ever has been, and urges upon each to take as an example the good of all historic characters, and in themselves develop some good never yet illustrated in humanity.

7. Because it is the only religion that teaches that the standard by which every one is to be judged, can not be swerved by any extraneous power, such as prayers, baptisms, sacrifices, or the blood of atonement.

8. Because, instead of looking to a future day of judgment, when an arbitrary tyrant shall reward or punish men for the belief or disbelief of a dogma, it teaches that every one shall, here and hereafter, receive the consequence of every act.

9. Because it teaches that every man must be true to his condition. It would, therefore, treat the murderer or kleptomaniac as diseased, and find a refuge and proper medical treatment for him, thus *curing* him of sin, and elevating him beyond the possibility of crime.

10. Because it makes the practice of the virtues the only path to happiness here and hereafter. It allows no supererogative works, such as prayers, confessions, and sacraments, to step between man and his duty.

11. Because it places all men on the same basis, teaching that all are members of the same family; and believing that the ultimate destiny of all is to happiness, it, instead of saying, "Let him that is filthy be filthy still," works for the reformation of those whom others recognize as incorrigible.

12. Because it teaches the principle of the fellowship of the entire human family, while Christianity only teaches the fellowship of a certain class; it urges that some "are of their father the devil," that others, on certain conditions, may become the children of our Father in heaven.

13. Because it is the only religion that teaches man that the only method of elevating himself is by the elevation of others; thus giving him a stimulus to work for others in order to help himself.

14. Because its revelations and documents are always written in the language of those for whom they are written, thus saving its adherents the valuable time and money thrown away by others in the study of languages that no amount of erudition can enable one to perfectly understand, thus giving its adherents more time for the pursuit of ethical and scientific studies.

15. Because it teaches, as did ancient heathenism, as Paul was compelled to acknowledge, 'that man is the offspring of God, a part and parcel of Nature, and thus invites its adherents to a study of Nature, in

order that they may understand themselves. Thus time thrown away by the representatives of other religions, in the study of a book which teaches that God and Nature are at war with each other, is, by the Spiritualists, spent in looking through science to Nature's God.

16. Because it advocates the principle of self-abnegation here, in order to happiness here and hereafter ; thus enabling its adherents to endure the scoffs and sneers of an infidel Christianity.

17. Because it lifts its adherents out of a cold church materialism, and gives them a knowledge of endless life.

18. Because it calls the mind away from the weak, revengeful, passionate, illiterate human spirit the Bible calls God, and bids its adherents behold God in all Nature.

19. Because it does not compel its adherents, by forms, ceremonies, and memorials, to remember that Christ was once on earth, but bids them now find him in the persons of the afflicted, sick, imprisoned, and impoverished, and administer to his wants.

20. Because it to-day carries with it living tests that no other religion has ; that the ministers of other religions dare not even see, lest they should be converted and healed.

Reader, I am now done. You have in this volume a chance to compare Evangelicalism and Spiritualism. If I have offered a thought that will benefit you, I am made happier. Heaven help us to be humble and teachable.