

# Light:

*A Journal of Psychical, Occult, and Mystical Research.*

'LIGHT! MORE LIGHT!'—Goethe.

'WHATEVER DOETH MAKE MANIFEST IS LIGHT.'—Paul.

No. 1,373.—VOL. XXVII.

[Registered as]

SATURDAY, MAY 4, 1907.

[a Newspaper.]

PRICE TWOPENCE.

## CONTENTS.

Notes by the Way.....	205
L.S.A. Notices .....	206
Archdeacon Colley and Mr. Mas-	
kelyne.—Report of Libel Case .....	207
A Painful Surprise .....	210
'What is Man?' An Address by	
Rev. Addison A. Charlesworth 211	

Words from the Great Religions .....	213
Appreciations of 'LIGHT'.....	213
A Strange Manifestation .....	214
Modern Medical Methods.....	214
Experiences with Dr. Monck .....	214
Jottings .....	215
Huxley on the Bible .....	215

## NOTES BY THE WAY.

'Nature,' said a thinker and a sufferer, 'without a spirit to guide the Cosmos, would surely be a devil': and it must be admitted that Nature, in some of her moods and activities, does 'shriek against' the theory of a God of perfect love, unless we can be almost certain of an adjusting and compensating spirit-world. We say 'almost' because, as Douglas Jerrold once declared, 'If we were quite certain about Heaven, most of us might commit suicide. Who would stay here?' And Hamlet suggests the same in his wonderful soliloquy.

To tell the truth, the tremendous fears, the grisly spectres of this earth-life are sometimes enough to suggest getting out of it. But when we cry, 'I nothing am!' a light on the 'altar stairs' is dimly seen, and we become aware of a purpose and hold on.

These problems of the Universe are forcing themselves at last on the attention of every cultivated and honest mind, in spite of the old creeds which still seem to be in possession. Even Westminster Abbey is bearing witness to the larger thought, the brighter hope, the sinner faith, in a way that makes the ignorant or the timid turn pale: but we are all advancing out of the darkness towards and into 'God's marvellous light.'

It is an undoubted fact that what has been called 'Religion' is coming into sharp conflict with what has been called 'Morality,' or 'Ethics,' in the matter of education. It is an old doctrine that 'mere morality' is not sufficient, either for education or for salvation, but it is lamentably obvious that mere Religion is also often woefully deficient.

Dr. F. H. Hayward's well-informed Essay on 'The Science of Education: The Secret of Herbert,' ably discusses this particular subject, with a very strong argument in favour of moral or ethical education, and especially in favour of the practical value of mental occupation. In one keen passage he says:—

That moral evil is tameable only by religion can no longer be asserted, if this other agency possess the vitality here claimed. And Newman himself, who at other moments saw no power but the Catholic Church capable of conquering 'the fierce energy of passion,' goes far in the Herbertian direction. Since the time when St. Paul enumerated the fruits of the flesh and the fruits of the spirit, no writer has tabulated a more impressive list of the vices than the one drawn up by this man—vices attributed by him to absence of secular culture. 'Cultivation of mind,' he tells us, 'is not the same thing as religious principle; but it contributes much to remove from our path the temptation to many lesser forms of moral obliquity. Human nature is susceptible of a host . . . of little vices and disgraceful infirmities, jealousies, slynesses,

cowardices, frettings, resentments, obstinacies, crookedness in viewing things, vulgar conceit, impertinence, and selfishness. Mental cultivation, though it does not of itself touch the greater wounds of human nature, does a good deal for these lesser defects.'

Now, if it appears, after all, that many-sided interest is a foe, not only to these 'lesser forms of moral obliquity,' but to such of the 'greater wounds of human nature' as drunkenness and gambling, we have a right to claim that this is an agency equal to religion itself in the very province that religion regards as her own.

Herbert Spencer, in his cold but convincing way, put the matter very clearly in his Essay on Morals and Moral Sentiments:—

Morality, properly so-called—the science of right conduct—has for its object to determine *how* and *why* certain modes of conduct are detrimental, and certain other modes beneficial. These good and bad results cannot be accidental, but must be necessary consequences of the constitution of things; and I conceive it to be the business of Moral Science to deduce, from the laws of life and the conditions of existence, what kinds of action necessarily tend to produce happiness, and what kinds to produce unhappiness. Having done this, its deductions are to be recognised as laws of conduct; and are to be conformed to irrespective of a direct estimation of happiness or misery.

We call that 'convincing,' but, as we have said, it is 'cold.' Something seems to be wanting, unless one is all sheer intellect, and warranted to go right when properly wound up. But there are impulses and motives of the spirit which are, in some cases, of greater weight than reasoning, and more effective than the moral will.

'The Light of Truth' publishes a rousing Paper by Professor Willy Reichel, on certain experiences of his. One of these is not a little startling and unpleasantly instructive. He says:—

After having previously called attention to the relative value of spiritual communications, I have no reason to quote them, for the reader now knows that they are to be taken critically.

For instance, this time, an unhappy spirit—the control, 'Betsy,' said that she had been too much occupied to be able to prevent it stole into his séances. It was a female black spirit, that went about the circle of fourteen persons, striking and spitting upon nearly all of them, and continually using abusive language. She touched me on the left leg and said in English: 'You want to go to Europe with this medium—I'll fix you' (that is, I'll prevent the manifestations!) 'Betsy' told me afterward that this spirit had given a minister of the Episcopal Church two hundred thousand dollars, because he had promised her that, after her death, she should see Christ. As this had not followed, she was so furious that she injured Spiritualism wherever she conl. Whole companies of Jesuit spirits were doing the same, and in Europe Spiritualism would have advanced much farther, if such spirits, whose influences and thoughts hung like a pall over Europe, did not so eagerly oppose Spiritualism. The Church does not want to lose her power. The Church does not want to lose the stream of millions which, under the name of Peter's Pence, is annually directed to Rome, and happiness in the world beyond the grave is made dependent upon the means of grace of the Church. Christ's successor has become a bank director in the Vatican. It is no longer, 'Feed my lambs'! but shear my sheep!

We are free to believe what we like about the two hundred thousand dollars. What is probably true is that

certain spirits hate Spiritualism, and stick at nothing to bring it into discredit. If this is true, it is just as well that we should know it.

A thinker, now gone from our earthly sight, said: 'The Almighty is a Reformer: but He is also a Conservative—for millenniums.' It is true. 'God is a consuming fire,' said one. 'Thou renewest the face of the earth,' said another. 'With whom is no variableness nor shadow cast by change,' said a third. All were right. The Infinite Power conserves, but conserves to change. He is no wasteful evolver. The new grows out of the old, and for that purpose the old is protected. 'Without haste and without rest,' was the wise motto of the German philosopher; as descriptive of the mechanism of the solar system as it is descriptive of the life of a reasonable man: but that involves both conservatism and reform, between which there need be no quarrel except possibly over a point as to speed.

In relation to religious thought to-day, how true this obviously is! Those who are profoundly used to the old rate of speed, or the old point of rest, are bewildered and unhappy. They do not understand, simply because they are conservative only, and are, perhaps, influenced more by comfort than they imagine. It is so natural to sink into a familiar seat and be content! But God, as Time-Spirit, is ever saying, 'Get thee up from thy people, and go forth unto a land that I will show thee': and so He 'fulfils Himself in many ways' lest too long-continued conservatism should breed stagnation, and stagnation 'corrupt the world.'

Swedenborg, who had vision and insight, said, 'God is all wisdom and love: Man is will and understanding': and this God-given will involves in us great anguish. How far volition extends we know not, but that much of it is seeming is fairly certain. Mr. Bray affirmed that 'the will is the trigger of the mind,' and a certain class of religionists, accepting this, would say that as often as not the devil pulls the trigger. There is a slight, a very slight, element of truth in this suggestion. The will no more lets itself off than the trigger of a gun does. It is, as a rule, pulled by the stronger motive, as understanding, or emotion, or temptation may prevail.

Coleridge asserted that 'will is freedom': and yet the wiser we are the more freedom we have. Is it not truer to say that wisdom is freedom? It is wisdom that sits on the judgment seat and decides, that saves the will from sudden tyrannies, and makes it free.

#### SPIRITUAL PRAYERS (From many Shrines.)

O Thou Everlasting Hope of men! Why should we deem Thee a stranger upon the earth, as a wayfarer that tarrieth for a night and turneth aside? Thou art yet in the midst, if we but seek Thee with an open soul. May we begin anew to do Thy will, that we may know Thee as the Living God; renouncing every low desire which may turn the light that is within us to darkness, and surrendering ourselves to that love of what is pure and true, by which we become children of the Highest. In malice, may we be as infants; in understanding, as men; in truth, as the martyrs; in affection, as the angels.

We yield ourselves to Thee. We will be afraid of neither sorrow nor death in a world where many saintly souls have sanctified them by a divine patience, and amid a Providence wherein no evil thing can dwell. Clinging unto Thee, we shall not perish with the fashion of this world that passeth away. In Thee, O Lord, is our undying trust. Amen.

#### LONDON SPIRITUALIST ALLIANCE, LTD.

A meeting of the Members and Associates of the Alliance will be held in the SALON OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF BRITISH ARTISTS, SUFFOLK-STREET, PALL MALL EAST (near the National Gallery), on

THURSDAY EVENING, MAY 16TH,

WHEN AN ADDRESS WILL BE GIVEN

BY

MRS. LAURA I. FINCH,

ON

'THE PSYCHOLOGY OF MEDIUMSHIP,

With a Narrative of Recent Experiments, by herself and Professor Richet, of a novel character and suggestive of deeply interesting and illuminative problems.'

The doors will be opened at 7 o'clock, and the Address will be commenced punctually at 7.30.

Admission by ticket only. Two tickets are sent to each Member, and one to each Associate, but both Members and Associates can have additional tickets for the use of friends on payment of 1s. each. Applications for extra tickets, accompanied by remittance, should be addressed to Mr. E. W. Wallis, Secretary to the London Spiritualist Alliance, 110, St. Martin's-lane, W.C.

#### MEETINGS AT 110, ST. MARTIN'S-LANE, W.C.,

FOR THE STUDY OF PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA.

CLAIRVOYANCE.—On *Tuesday next*, May 7th, Mr. Ronald Brailley will give clairvoyant descriptions, with blackboard illustrations, at 3 p.m., and no one will be admitted after that hour. Fee 1s. each to Members and Associates; for friends introduced by them, 2s. each.

TRANCE ADDRESS.—On *Wednesday next*, May 8th, at 6 p.m., Mr. E. W. Wallis, under spirit control, will give an address on 'Mediumship: Its Laws and Cultivation.' Admission 1s.; Members and Associates free. No tickets required.

DEVELOPING CLASS.—On *Thursday next*, the 9th inst., at 3.45 p.m., Mrs. E. M. Walter will kindly conduct a meeting to help Members and Associates to develop their psychic gifts.

TALKS WITH A SPIRIT CONTROL.—On *Friday next*, May 10th, at 3 p.m., Mrs. M. H. Wallis, under spirit control, will reply to questions from the audience relating to the phenomena and philosophy of Spiritualism, mediumship, and life here and on 'the other side.' Admission 1s.; Members and Associates free. Visitors should be prepared with written questions of general interest to submit to the control.

MEMBERS have the privilege of introducing one friend to the *Wednesday and Friday* meetings without payment.

SPIRITUAL HEALING.—On Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, Mr. A. Rex, the spiritual healer, will attend between 11 a.m. and 1 p.m., to afford Members and Associates an opportunity to avail themselves of his services in magnetic healing under spirit control. Appointments must be made in advance by letter, addressed to the Secretary, Mr. E. W. Wallis. Fees, one treatment, 7s. 6d.; course of three, 15s.

'E. L.,' who is developing as a medium, sends us particulars of an experience which, she thinks, may be of interest to the readers of 'LIGHT.' While she was using a mirror for clairvoyance she was startled to see in it an appearance which she recognised as her mother, who was still alive and well. Feeling dismayed she put the mirror away and tried to dismiss the incident from her mind; but, on resuming her studies some time afterwards the same vision appeared, and she went downstairs, where, to her relief, she found that her mother was all right. Later in the day she returned to her room, and had scarcely seated herself when she heard her mother's voice calling her, but in answer to her inquiry her mother said she had not called. This happened three times, so she again went downstairs and found that her mother had been busy preparing for their tea, and denied having called. Three days later her mother had a paralytic seizure, and on the day before she passed away she said to 'E. L.,' 'I am going to leave you—No! I am not going to leave you—I am coming back!' 'E. L.' asks: 'Could it have been my mother's spirit that I saw in the mirror?'

## ARCHDEACON COLLEY AND MR. MASKELYNE.

## ACTION FOR LIBEL, AND COUNTER-CLAIM ON CHALLENGE.

In the King's Bench Division, on Wednesday, April 24th, before Mr. Justice Ridley and a special jury, the libel action brought by Archdeacon Colley against Mr. J. N. Maskelyne was commenced. The alleged libel was contained in a pamphlet issued by Mr. Maskelyne entitled, 'The History of a Thousand Pounds Challenge: An Object Lesson for Spiritualists.' In the pamphlet were the following words: 'He is not an archdeacon, and never was one. He went out to Natal and falsely represented to the deposed Bishop Colenso that the Archbishop of Canterbury had sent him out to act as Colenso's Dean, and in consequence Colenso nominated him for the position. But when Mr. Colley applied to have the degree conferred upon him, the Archbishop of Canterbury flatly refused it.'

These words constituted the libel complained of.

Mr. Maskelyne denied that he had uttered any libel, and pleaded that the words quoted in their fair and proper meaning, when read with the context, were true in substance and fact. He also pleaded that such words were published by him without malice, and in the course of a controversy invited by the plaintiff, and were expressions of opinion and fair comment, and in the *bona-fide* belief that they were true and for the public benefit upon a matter of public interest. The defendant further counter-claimed for £1,000 in regard to a challenge given by the plaintiff to produce, as a conjurer, any one of certain things which the plaintiff, in a lecture at Weymouth during the Church Congress week in 1905, had declared to have been done in his presence by Spiritualism, but which the defendant maintained had been done by Dr. Monck by means of trickery. Defendant accepted the challenge, and held that he had at St. George's Hall exhibited the things in question.

In reply to the counter-claim, the Archdeacon denied that the defendant had fulfilled the conditions of the challenge.

Mr. J. Eldon Bankes, K.C., in opening the case for the plaintiff, observed to the jury that they had nothing whatever to do with the merits of Spiritualism. Archdeacon Colley was a whole-hearted Spiritualist, while Mr. Maskelyne was a whole-hearted unbeliever in it. The plaintiff made the acquaintance of Dr. Monck in London and they became close friends. In 1876 the Archdeacon went to India, and on his return he found that Dr. Monck had been prosecuted and sentenced to three months' imprisonment.

Just before the adjournment of the Court for the day the singular arrangement was made between counsel, with the concurrence of the Judge, that the jury should visit Mr. Maskelyne's performance at St. George's Hall in the evening. They did so, and witnessed the illusion by which Mr. Maskelyne contended that he had complied with the conditions of the challenge, and was entitled to the £1,000.

The next morning, Mr. Bankes resumed his address to the jury, beginning with a reference to a correspondence on Spiritualism which appeared in 'The Daily Telegraph' in 1906. Mr. Maskelyne had written a letter denying a statement which had been attributed to the Rev. H. R. Haweis, to the effect that (Mr. Maskelyne) had said that he could not reproduce spiritualistic phenomena in a private room, as he should require three tons of machinery. Mr. Haweis had apologised for the error, and promised to withdraw the statements, 'but he never kept his word.' This remark, and another that Mr. Haweis 'was accustomed to lecture upon Spiritualism at ten minutes a time,' annoyed Archdeacon Colley, who then sent Mr. Maskelyne a challenge to produce at Stockton Rectory, Rugby (the Archdeacon's parish), any one of the things which the Archdeacon had said in his lecture had been done in his presence, or which had been written of in his pamphlet, 'Spiritualism not Satanic,' published in the office of 'LIGHT.' If such things were done, the Archdeacon's bankers would pay Mr. Maskelyne £1,000. Naturally Mr. Maskelyne did not accept the challenge, because he could not produce his illusions in a private residence. He showed the pamphlet which the Archdeacon had sent him, and wrote to him that his story 'knocked Baron Munchausen into a cocked hat,' at the same saying he had no doubt of the writer's sincerity; and also, that if he were not mistaken, the medium referred to had been several times exposed, and also imprisoned for fraud. After this, the Archdeacon sent another challenge, and it was with regard to this that the jury would have to consider whether Mr. Maskelyne had or had not won the £1,000. His challenge was one to produce Monck's manifestations in any way, anywhere, and at any time, as a conjurer. Mr. Maskelyne accepted the challenge in this form, and sent Archdeacon Colley notice of the performance to be given at St.

George's Hall. He also printed the pamphlet containing the libel, and gave a copy to every person attending the hall. Mr. Maskelyne had done what a conjurer could do, but he had not done what a conjurer could not do. The Archdeacon's pamphlet described not only the extrusion of spirit forms from the left side of the medium, but the taking back of the same forms into the body of the medium. In the performance which the jury had seen there was no attempt to evolve the figure, or to return the form into the medium's body. Mr. Maskelyne's pamphlet also quoted, from an ecclesiastical newspaper, a statement that the Archdeacon was said to have worn the hood of an Oxford Master of Arts though he had never graduated. That, said the learned counsel, was an absolute untruth—Archdeacon Colley had never done anything of the kind, and had never claimed the title. This was as serious a libel as it was possible to conceive. The plaintiff wrote to Mr. Maskelyne, demanding a retraction of the libel concerning himself, and an apology, under threat of an action, but not asking payment of damages. In reply, Mr. Maskelyne informed him of the name of his (defendant's) solicitors. The publication of the pamphlet was continued, and it was only on threat of proceedings that Mr. Maskelyne struck out the paragraph complained of. In conclusion, the learned counsel said he should ask the jury to say that there was no defence as to the libel, and that in regard to the challenge Mr. Maskelyne had failed to do what was necessary to win the £1,000.

Archdeacon Colley then went into the witness box. He said he was sixty-eight years of age. He went to Oxford for a time; his means failed, and he left, but subsequently returned. He was ordained deacon and priest. Some sermons of his were published in America, unknown to him, and he received a communication from that country, and some documents. (These related, it afterwards appeared, to the degree of M.A., forwarded to him from Tennessee.) In 1876 he was chaplain on board the 'Malabar.' Two years later he had some correspondence with Dean Stanley, and received an invitation from Bishop Colenso to go to Natal to receive a certain appointment; he had the choice of being dean or archdeacon at £300 a year, or incumbent of St. Paul's, Durban, at £500, and he chose the archdeaconry. He wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury, as his Provincial, to see whether he had any objection, and he had not, and he also consulted his own Bishop, the Bishop of Worcester. No ecclesiastical dignitary objected. In September, 1879, he arrived at Durban, and received his appointments on board ship; in the same month he was publicly inducted in the cathedral by the Bishop. It was an utter falsehood to say that he told Bishop Colenso that the Archbishop had sent him out to be dean. He acted as archdeacon until Bishop Colenso's death in 1883. In 1901 he was appointed to the rectory of Stockton, near Leamington, by New College, Oxford. He had always described himself as Archdeacon of Natal, and had been addressed as archdeacon by the Bishop of Worcester in that appointment, and also by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and by four bishops.

In the remainder of his examination-in-chief, Archdeacon Colley spoke of his strong interest in Spiritualism, and of his having become acquainted in 1873 with a Baptist minister named Monck, whom he knew from that time until 1877 or 1878. He was in India when Monck was prosecuted. He believed in Monck thoroughly. The defendant's performance at St. George's Hall was no more like the materialisation described in his (the Archdeacon's) pamphlet than chalk was like cheese; he had spoken of a vapour as coming from the medium's black coat like steam, scarcely visible, then intensifying, and of psychic entities coming from this, clothed in white raiment. At Mr. Maskelyne's he saw a jet of steam or smoke, which dispersed, and a hand or two hands having no connection with the smoke. There was no attempt to make the figure disappear into the supposed medium—it passed off at the side wings.

Mr. Gill, K.C., cross-examined the Archdeacon in a manner which caused much laughter in court, psychic matters appearing to be for the most part absolutely unknown. The witness was questioned upon the statements he had made in his pamphlet, and the details of phenomena which are familiar to Spiritualists were received quite in the humour of Mr. Maskelyne's phrase as 'knocking Baron Munchausen into a cocked hat.' Almost everything seemed to be extremely funny to an audience easily amused and evidently delighted with the breezy and ready counsel. The name of a gentleman named 'Moses' raised laughter, and the witness remarked, in grave reproof, that the gentleman was the late Rev. Stainton Moses, a clergyman of the Church of England. An account of the materialisation of a beautiful woman, 'clothed with a cloud,' was found very entertaining, and the witness protested against the laughter, adding, 'the words "clothed with

a "cloud" are in Holy Scripture ; see Revelation x. 1.' The Judge observed that no doubt those who had laughed were not aware of this. His lordship appeared to be rather indulgent to the merriment generally, however, and on another occasion he remarked that the things they heard of were so wonderful that a little laughter must be excused. It appeared that Monck had been trained at Spurgeon's Tabernacle for the Baptist ministry, that one of his controls was 'Samuel,' a fellow student, and that one of his materialisations was an Egyptian called the 'Mahedi,' who had written something alleged to have been declared by an authority at the British Museum to be 'ancient Coptic.'

On Friday morning Mr. Gill continued his cross-examination of Archdeacon Colley, questioning him as to an instance in which he had seized a materialised form, and had been levitated a distance towards the medium, whom he found in his arms, with some 'draper's stuff'—a silky muslin—on him. He retained this for a time, but it mysteriously disappeared. He had described the shock or impact as 'concur, collide, collapse.' In another case the 'Mahedi,' the materialised form, brought him a plate of apples from the sideboard, and he put an apple into the Mahedi's mouth ; the medium then said that he himself tasted the apple, and he spat out the core. This experiment was repeated at other times. A further case was that in which the medium, an Egyptian form (extruded from the medium) and the form of a lady, 'Lily' (extruded from the Egyptian) were seen standing in a line, in full light, and the account was signed by five witnesses.

A little colloquy took place with respect to Swedenborgianism, the witness having mentioned 'the Doctrine of Correspondences.' He added that he was a Swedenborgian. The Judge asked how he reconciled this with his position as a clergyman of the Church of England. The witness replied that his belief was not disallowed by the Church of England. The late Bishop of Worcester knew of his opinions, and in advertising for a curate the witness had said 'Doctrine of Correspondences not objected to,' and he received two hundred applications. The Judge expressed surprise at all this.

The witness having spoken of 'The Inner Circle' in connection with a séance, the Judge asked what qualified a person to be a member of that circle. The Archdeacon replied that he should be a teetotaler, a non-smoker, and if possible a vegetarian, and that he was recommended to have a Turkish bath before the séance, so that the body should be in a pure condition. He himself had been a teetotaler all his life. Dr. Monck was, however, an inveterate smoker, and they could not break him of it. Witness had protested against miscellaneous séances.

In the course of further cross-examination, the Archdeacon described himself as being no longer in the movement ; he had given it up, and knew of no medium who could produce materialisations as Monck had done. He should never go 'through the mill' again.

Mr. Gill read from one of Mr. Maskelyne's letters that the acceptance of the challenge would only prove the unwisdom of the challenger. Had that, asked the learned counsel, been fulfilled ? The Archdeacon replied that his unwisdom was manifest, for it had enabled Mr. Maskelyne to transfer the matter to his own stage, where he could employ the tons of machinery which he had denied having wanted. But to say that that was the same thing as the materialisations by Monck was absurd.

Asked whether there were any fraudulent mediums, the witness said, 'Of course there are frauds everywhere, in Church and State.'

A good deal of time was taken up with the question of the ecclesiastical dispute in regard to Bishop Colenso, and this was followed by cross-examination upon the subject of his application to Archbishop Tait for a Lambeth degree, and upon the Archbishop's statement as to what took place at the interview, the witness's impressions not having agreed with the Archbishop's account. With regard to the plaintiff's degree of M.A., he contended that he was an M.A., but stated that he informed Bishop Colenso that he was M.A. of Tennessee.

In re-examination by Mr. Bankes, the plaintiff said that so far as he had been aware, Monck was not receiving a penny in payment for the occurrences which had been described. The plaintiff went up for examination with other candidates for ordination, and all were examined by the same chaplain. Dean Stanley first suggested the plaintiff's going out to Natal under Bishop Colenso, of whom the Dean was a strong supporter. After the Bishop's death, the plaintiff remained as Archdeacon. Before the plaintiff sailed from England, he received a letter from his then Bishop, wishing him God-speed.

The venerable Alfred Russel Wallace, F.R.S., D.C.L., LL.D., was next called upon, and his evidence, which was very clearly

given, was listened to with profound attention by a crowded court. In reply to Mr. Bankes, he stated that he began to investigate the phenomena of Spiritualism in 1862, and in 1877 or 1878 he first met Dr. Monck. At that time he had never heard of Archdeacon Colley, who was a complete stranger to him until recently. He had read Archdeacon Colley's pamphlet, containing his lecture delivered at Weymouth.

In reply to Mr. Bankes, Dr. Wallace said that he first saw Dr. Monck at a house in Bloomsbury, where he witnessed a manifestation which was remarkably similar to that described by Colley, though not identical. It was early in the afternoon, on a bright day, and the room was not darkened in any way. Mr. Hensleigh Wedgwood and the Rev. Stainton Moses were also present. When the figure appeared he was certainly not more than seven or eight feet from the medium.

Mr. Bankes : Will you now, Dr. Wallace, describe in your own language what you saw ?

Dr. Wallace : Dr. Monck stood up, and appeared to go into a trance. I have no doubt he was in a trance. Then, after a short time, on the left side of his coat there appeared a very faint white patch, which increased in density and moved up and down and seemed to flicker, spread out a little and flickered still more, and at last grew up to the height of his shoulder and down to the ground, and then there was a separation from the part that seemed to come out of his coat and connect itself with his body. After a few minutes more the separation was quite distinct, and he then said to us 'Look !' and put his hand through the space. Then the white cloud or figure moved away till it was at least six feet from him, and it seemed as it moved to grow more distinct and to become the outline of a woman in flowing white draperies, allowing the face to be seen. Then he looked towards it and said 'Look !' and put up his hands and clapped them. The figure imitated the medium's movements and put out its two hands, and we all heard them. Then he stood still, and the figure moved slowly backwards and sideways and drew up to his side and began to diminish in brightness. Then the waving motion began again, and it went back into his body in precisely the same way as it had come out.

Mr. Bankes : So far as you were concerned, you were certain it was a spiritualistic manifestation ?

Dr. Wallace : I was absolutely certain it could not have been produced by any possible trick, even had Mr. Maskelyne been there with all his apparatus. It was in quite a small room, from fourteen to sixteen feet square. There was a single room and a back bedroom, connected with folding doors, which were shut.

With reference to Mr. Maskelyne's performance, Dr. Wallace expressed the opinion that he does not produce the slightest approximation to what Archdeacon Colley describes, to which description his own experience corresponded so strikingly.

Mr. Bankes : In what particulars ?

Dr. Wallace : There was no reproduction whatever of the white patch, smoking or filmy or steaming appearance, or anything you like, that came out of the coat ; there was none of the growing of the patch, not going away like a natural steam or smoke, but remaining a patch, and growing—not the slightest approximation to anything of the kind described by Archdeacon Colley. That is a most important difference. In Mr. Maskelyne's production the full form pokes an arm or a head out behind a black-coated figure which represents Dr. Monck, without any growing whatever. To me, it was perfectly ludicrous. Whereas the other, as Archdeacon Colley well says, was a most marvellous sight to see, and one never to be forgotten—to see a human form grow out, as it were, before your eyes. Then again, Archdeacon Colley and myself saw the thing in a well-lighted room at the distance of a few feet, with no background or red light rendering it easy to introduce figures behind a black screen, at the back of a person, without being seen. We were, the nearest of the audience, at least twenty feet from Mr. Maskelyne and his assistants, with a black screen behind them and a red light overhead ; whereas in the case described by Archdeacon Colley we saw everything quite clearly by daylight, nearer than persons are to me in this court. It was absolutely impossible to introduce anything, and if they could have done so, they could not have made it grow and disappear. I should call Mr. Maskelyne's performance an absurd travesty of what I saw and of what Archdeacon Colley describes.

Mr. Bankes : On the occasion when you were there, was there any attempt on Mr. Maskelyne's part to make the figure melt away ?

Dr. Wallace : Not the slightest. As soon as the figure came out the curtain dropped. She came to the front to the audience, and then walked away.

Cross-examined by Mr. Gill, Dr. Wallace said that a medium is a person through whom occult phenomena happen.

The Judge said he should like more particulars, and Dr. Wallace explained: 'We know there are certain things called ghosts which appear connected with certain places. But these other phenomena only occur in the presence of certain persons; when those persons are not present, the phenomena are not there at all, or with much less clear definition. I don't know the nature of mediums in the least.'

Mr. Gill then asked a number of questions on slate writing and other forms of manifestation, apparently with the sole object of eliciting replies which could be used to cause laughter in the court, or to discredit the mediums referred to.

The next witness was Mr. A. P. Sinnett, who said that he had seen Mr. Maskelyne's performance and sat in the front row. He had already read Archdeacon Colley's pamphlet. Broadly speaking, there was no resemblance between what the pamphlet described and the performance. A visitor had no chance of testing what was done, he was too far off and Mr. Maskelyne had a confederate beside him. The figure had no resemblance to what Archdeacon Colley had described, namely, that the form evolved from a mass of dense vapour at the side of the medium. At Mr. Maskelyne's there was no connection between the figure and the supposed medium. The woman was a complete and substantial form, projected by degrees, not evolved in any way, and it did not disappear, as in the case related by the Archdeacon.

The Judge asked how many of the jury had witnessed the performance, and most of them held up their hands.

The Rev. Dr. Brock, vicar of a parish in Herefordshire, stated that in 1881 he was ordained by Bishop Colenso at Durban and was examined by Archdeacon Colley for ordination.

This concluded the plaintiff's case, and the Court adjourned until Monday.

On Monday Mr. Gill opened the defence. He described the Archdeacon as a man of no importance, but with a passion for notoriety, and referred to Spiritualists as silly people who were preyed upon by rascals called mediums; learned men spending their lives in one pursuit, he held to be more easily imposed upon than others in matters which would not deceive a street news-boy. Mr. Maskelyne had from time to time exposed the tricks of mediums. Monck was a low, cunning trickster, who declined to be searched at Huddersfield in 1876, escaped from the house, and was sentenced to three months' imprisonment on what the judge termed overwhelming evidence. Why was not the identity of Monck disclosed in the Archdeacon's pamphlet? The libel action, the learned counsel suggested, had been brought by the Archdeacon as a means of getting out of the mess into which he had been brought by Mr. Maskelyne's acceptance of the challenge. With regard to the terms of the libel, Mr. Gill contended that Mr. Maskelyne was entitled to comment on the public conduct of the plaintiff.

The Judge interposed with the remark that he did not know that the statement that the plaintiff was not and never had been an archdeacon, was covered by the general proposition laid down by the learned counsel.

Mr. Gill contended that the plaintiff's appointment as Archdeacon in Natal was to an office in a place, and that that gave him no right to term himself 'Archdeacon' on his return to England.

Mr. Maskelyne then went into the witness-box. He said it was his accidental discovery of the principal trick of the Davenport Brothers that brought him before the public as an entertainer. They were, without doubt, the cleverest mediums that ever came forward. He had exposed every medium of note, but had left the small fry untouched. The statement that he required tons of machinery was not correct; he had used the same apparatus as the mediums whom he exposed. His references to the plaintiff's position were written with a knowledge of the correspondence between the Bishop of Cape-town and the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the remarks of the Bishop of London, with regard to the plaintiff. It was his opinion, then and now, that the plaintiff was not legally an archdeacon at all.

In cross-examination by Mr. Bankes, Mr. Maskelyne was asked: Did you mean by the reference to Mr. Haweis and his lecturing for money that he was paid to deliver a lecture on a subject that he did not believe in?

Mr. Maskelyne: I did not mean so then, but I have information now that he confessed on his deathbed that he had no faith in Spiritualism at all.

Mr. Bankes: You have said you always believed that the phenomena of Spiritualism are based upon a few genuine instances. Then there are certain phenomena which it is impossible to explain by the existence of any known cause?

Mr. Maskelyne: There are a few phenomena on which the fraud is based with which honest people humbug themselves.

Mr. Bankes: You admit that certain phenomena are unexplained?

Mr. Maskelyne: I do not see the means of explaining them.

Re-examined by Mr. Gill, Mr. Maskelyne said he had followed Archdeacon Colley's description of the materialisation as well as he could understand it. He had to produce one of the things as a conjurer.

The Judge: What do you say as to the disappearance?

Witness: To produce anything more than I have produced would be an anti-climax, and would spoil the effect.

Mr. D. Christie Murray, a journalist, said he had, for a number of years, taken an interest in the matters being examined into. He had read the pamphlet and had seen the performance, which was a very fair reproduction of the description in the pamphlet.

Mr. Child, critic of 'The Times,' said that in his opinion Mr. Maskelyne's performance was a very fair reproduction of the description in the pamphlet.

Mr. Gill submitted that in referring to the pamphlet the defendant was entitled to call attention to the position of the person who had written it, having regard to the description of himself given by the plaintiff; and that if defendant honestly believed what he stated to be the truth, he was protected, and the comments were fair.

Mr. Bankes contended that the words in question were not comment, but a statement of fact. The defendant did not say it was his opinion that the plaintiff was not an archdeacon, but, 'My excuse for any lack of respect for the reverend gentleman is the knowledge that he is not an archdeacon, and never was one.' He urged that there was no case of fair comment.

Mr. Gill, addressing the jury, asked them to find that Mr. Maskelyne had complied with the terms of the plaintiff's challenge, and that the plaintiff had failed on the question of libel.

On Tuesday morning, Mr. Bankes, speaking on behalf of Archdeacon Colley, said that his object had been to establish the *bona fides* of the Archdeacon, and he was bound to say that his genuineness had never been questioned. In calling Dr. Wallace, he wished to show the jury that there were men of eminence who entertained exactly the same opinions in regard to Spiritualism. Mr. Maskelyne had admitted that there were certain phenomena that were unexplainable by any known cause. The Archdeacon's view that these were due to the intervention of the spirit world might be right or wrong, but that being his opinion, it was a very short step for a person of religious mind to associate those phenomena with religion. It was an insult, therefore, to such a man to say, as had been said, that he had written in a blasphemous manner, and that charge ought never to have been introduced.

With regard to the challenge, in order to win it the conditions must be complied with. The 'producing of any one of the effects' did not mean producing only a *part* of one of the effects. Supposing that Mr. Maskelyne had produced only the smoke coming out of the coat, would that have entitled him to claim the £1,000? The 'description' which he said he had reproduced included the disappearance as well as the production of the figure; but the more difficult part of the manifestation had not been attempted. Therefore the learned counsel contended that Mr. Maskelyne could not succeed in his claim to the £1,000. The pamphlet described the appearance from the side of the medium as from the vapour; those of the jury who had seen the performance could judge whether there had been any attempt to produce the figure from the medium, and not from behind the medium, or to produce the evolution from the vapour and not a mere puff of smoke.

The learned counsel contended that the words of the libel were not comment, but a statement of fact. If Mr. Maskelyne had said, with reference to the Colenso controversy, that there was a question whether the plaintiff was entitled to call himself an archdeacon, there could have been no proceeding at law, but the statement was a positive one, and was as serious an accusation of masquerading under a false title as it was possible to conceive. Having summarised the proceedings and legal decisions in the matter of Bishop Colenso, the learned counsel said the plaintiff went out to Natal, was appointed Archdeacon and continued to exercise the office until after the Bishop's death. With regard to the use of the title by the plaintiff in this country, there were many persons who were known by the title of offices they had held abroad. Everyone knew of Bishop Welldon, now Dean of Manchester, formerly Bishop of Calcutta. The plaintiff had been addressed by Archbishops

(Continued on page 213.)



OFFICE OF 'LIGHT,' 110, ST. MARTIN'S LANE,  
LONDON, W.C.

SATURDAY, MAY 4th, 1907.

EDITOR ... .. E. DAWSON ROGERS.

Assistant Editors ... E. W. WALLIS and J. B. SHIPLEY.

## Light,

A Journal of Psychical, Occult, and Mystical Research.

PRICE TWOPENCE WEEKLY.

COMMUNICATIONS intended to be printed should be addressed to the Editor, Office of 'LIGHT,' 110, St. Martin's-lane, London, W.C. Business communications should in all cases be addressed to Mr. E. W. Wallis, Office of 'LIGHT,' and not to the Editor. Cheques and Postal Orders should be made payable to Mr. E. W. Wallis, and should invariably be crossed '— & Co.'

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—'LIGHT' may be had free by post on the following terms:—Twelve months, 10s. 10d.; six months, 5s. 5d. Payments to be made in advance. To United States, 2dol. 70c. To France, Italy, &c., 13 francs 86 centimes. To Germany, 11 marks 25pf.

Wholesale Agents: MESSRS. SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO., LTD., 23, PATERNOSTER-ROW, London, E.C., and can be ordered through all Newsagents and Booksellers.

APPLICATIONS by Members and Associates of the London Spiritualist Alliance, Ltd., for the loan of books from the Alliance Library should be addressed to the Librarian, Mr. B. D. Godfrey, Office of the Alliance, 110, St. Martin's-lane, W.C.

### A PAINFUL SURPRISE.

An astonished and anxious correspondent who has lately tried spirit-communication, with results, writes: 'I have had the pleasure of receiving a little spirit writing (automatic) and — has been easily controlled at a Sunday evening séance with two spiritual friends. The controls, from their messages, I recognise as relatives and personal friends, and welcome them as such. Nevertheless, previous to the entrancing, we received a severe shock. We received on one occasion, and at each succeeding sitting, messages from an entity giving the name of one of —'s old schoolfellows, saying she had passed over three years since. Upon investigation we discovered the personality in full vigour on this plane! Is there any proof that this is the *only* impersonator? and what safeguard can you suggest against further hoodwinking?'

Our correspondent is evidently a new-comer into this fascinating but bewildering territory: and it is perhaps a fortunate thing for him that he has so speedily and so cheaply learnt his lesson. When we have once got rid of the old notion of a hell where, say, one half of the departed are imprisoned in misery, and of a heaven where the other half are spell-bound with rapture, the immense thought dawns upon us that the myriads who pass out need not pass on—that, in fact, they may be more intensely here than ever. If we accept that and face it, the inference is, we admit, not altogether a pleasant one. A pleasant one it surely is; but it is also the reverse. It is an exquisitely delightful thing to know that in some inner world—some bright world within this dark one, some world too spiritually subtle and radiant for us to see—this or that beloved one spends the happy nights and days:—that a dear child, a darling mother or father, a wise teacher, might be still mindful of us, and be, in truth, more able to wisely and profoundly help.

But we cannot have that bright side without the dark. We have only to think of what happens every day in order to see what that dark side must mean. Think of the stream of human beings that is ceaselessly pouring into the spirit-world. What a motley crew! What a crowd of saints and sinners, truth-lovers and liars, gentle and pushing, careful and reckless, wise men and fools! We may take it for granted (it would be to suppose it an insane

universe if we did not) that all this is provided for; that law and order prevail 'over there'; and that there are forces that separate and attract as potent and as sure as any that prevail here; but we cannot go much farther, and we must leave a large margin for liberty and freedom of will, and, consequently, for personal action on the part of those who are there.

Now it is extremely difficult for us to comprehend how life acts and what motives urge there: and it is equally difficult for us to be sure that we ever get quite the right and intended meaning of any message that comes through. In a way, we are using different coins, so to speak, and the respective values are confused. An influence and a message intended to soothe may frighten; a communication meant to convey one thought may result in another: for we must remember that it is thoughts that are usually attempted to be got through, not words.

But now, as to this special trouble connected with impersonation. It is not perhaps as simple as it looks. We find out that a spirit has been giving a false name—that it seems to have lied; and we naturally say that it *has* lied, and there's an end of it: and the beginner thinks it very awful, and imagines that the whole thing has gone to pieces, or decides to have nothing more to do with it; or asks: 'What can I do to prevent being cheated?' But this is all on the surface: and we need to go much deeper.

Take the case put before us by our correspondent. There are at least half a dozen ways of explaining it. To name the worst first:—it may have had mischief in it. But that is not very likely, as it was to be expected that inquiry would be made, and that the lie would be found out. It is difficult to imagine what wicked motive there could have been in the lie. It is much more likely that it was a poor jest—just one of the soft and silly things that thousands of mentally soft and silly people are in the habit of doing every day; and that perhaps they go on doing 'over there' until they learn better or are tired of fooling.

On the other hand, for all we know, the imagined liar may have been some poor hungry soul that wanted to join in that circle, and just told its lie in order to get a footing, not intending to do any harm, and not particularly wanting to lie, but only to creep in and get something—God only knows what. And here the thought is suggested: Was not this a case of special interest—a case that ought to have been followed up—quite a useful subject for careful and persistent investigation, if that spirit could be kept in the dock?

Or is it not just possible that it may have been an experiment conducted by some one of the many thousands who live for experimenting and stick at nothing, from pinning down a smitten butterfly to vivisectioning a living dog? There must be millions of experimenters on the other side; and if they are only a tenth as wilful there as they were or may have been here, they would not be particular about giving any name to produce the necessary 'shock.'

Or is it not just possible that it was a case of doing evil that good might come? It was perhaps of very high importance that these new investigators should learn their lesson, and be put upon their guard. A lie is not to be justified, even for the sake of teaching a necessary lesson; but this particular lie would appear to be a specially harmless one. Only an old schoolfellow was involved, and for at least three years the medium had not heard of her, so that the 'shock' could not have been very 'severe': and the lesson was precious. One of the most thoughtful and experienced mediums we ever knew believed that such

deceptions were deliberately practised to prevent people harbouring the foolish and dangerous thought that all which came from the unseen was authoritative and true :—and she justified it.

### 'WHAT IS MAN?'

BY THE REV. ADDISON A. CHARLESWORTH.

An Address delivered to the Members and Associates of the London Spiritualist Alliance on Thursday evening, April 18th, in the Salon of the Royal Society of British Artists, Suffolk-street, Pall Mall; Mr. H. Withall, vice-president, in the chair.

(Continued from page 200.)

The next point I want to make is that man only gets his definition as he is united to, and contrasted with, others. His personality is a social phenomenon. We are not merely solitary, isolated units, glorious or inglorious, or, indeed, anything whatsoever, in self-sufficiency, but are then only on the road of personal significance when we are freely making our own, and determining ourselves in the purposes of that organisation of wills which we call society. It is not, as the anarchistic, individualistic Tolstoian would have us believe, alien and inimical to our well-being, but is just that fuller expression of the universal spirit in which we see, and lay hold of, and realise our own larger meaning. And I mark this out distinctly because it seems to me to be the one certain path by which we can turn our time-experience to account. To will the duties of our station freely, from those of which we are conscious in the relation of the family to those which come to us through our membership in the organic unity of humanity, to will them as the here and now significance of the Absolute Mind for itself, is to reach that immediate adequacy to self in which a relative satisfaction is found. Of course, the adequacy at once discovers to us its inadequacy; the ideal of society and mankind presents itself to the imagination in a higher form, and obedience to that vision becomes the rôle of a social reformer, the hard but splendid lot of one of the progressive spirits through whom humanity becomes aware of, and moves towards, its higher destiny.

Except as we, so to say, take mankind to our heart, and think and will ourselves in those large purposes which embody a good which is for each as it is for all, and is for all as it is for each, we are, and must remain, insignificant. The sarcastic word, 'Behold the Man!' has become an enduring tribute, not because of any miraculous, unattainable, and unique perfection, but because he of whom it was spoken willed himself as the organ of the highest good of which he was conscious, making his own the welfare of that society whose secret hopes and ill-conceived ideals he brought to light, and so lived that for all time, even in the blackest hours of reaction, they could never be lost again in the obscurity of the unknown. On the other hand, the tragedy of the decision, 'Not this man, but Barabbas,' lies in the choice for social recognition of one in whom the social, that is the moral, and ultimately infinite significance of manhood had its extreme denial. And the verdict of time, to speak metaphorically, not literally, thrusts him indignantly away—

'Into that sad, obscure, sequestered state,  
Where God unmakes but to remake the soul  
He else made first in vain; which must not be.'

The anti-social is the unhuman. And society will not, cannot, surrender any member of its organic unity to the predatory passions of his self-will, alien alike to his own meaning and the common weal, but, through insistent revelation of itself to the insurgent will as the deeper reality of himself, must recall his dissipated and destructive energies into the supreme and holy purposes of the universal good.

It is in the social consciousness, in the community of other minds, that we win our selfhood. The whole system of society, its laws, and customs, and institutions, its authoritative arti-

culatation of rights which involve duties, and duties which involve rights, is nothing else or more than the actualising of the means by which self-realisation may be achieved, by which man defines his own nature to himself and becomes man.

If we look at the human self-consciousness from the side of its ultimate nature, we say that it is spirit or mind comprehending itself at a finite level, realising its actuality by at once setting and transcending distinctions within itself. If we look at ourselves in the aspect of what we are to ourselves, we find that personality, or the self, is one element in experience, the element, namely, of its organisation, the grasping together as a whole of thoughts, feelings, volitions; the other element, of course, being just these thoughts, feelings, volitions which are so grasped. Now this experience is rich, significant, and satisfying according to its adequacy to the explicit reality of spirit in the actualised system of truth and good. So far as we are abreast of the knowledge and thought of our time, so far as we are the voluntary organs of the common life in the duties which that brings to us, so far, that is, as intellectually and morally we express the truth of the social whole in which we are part, have we reality, meaning, and freedom.

As we have seen, society is inadequate, intellectually and morally, to the reality of itself, but it is pressing forward, by an inward necessity, towards the fuller actualisation of its own meaning. Therefore, what we think of as personality, or the self, is not only a fact, it is also an ideal. We at once are and are not. We are ever becoming. The experience which organises itself is—through fuller knowledge, profounder thinking, broadening and deepening sympathies, righteousness more completely defined in the system of human relationships expressed in law and institution—growing richer, ampler, more adequate to reality, with the process of the suns. The self is developing for itself into what it is for God. It is learning its own nature. It is grasping its own meaning. No analysis can satisfy the craving for self-knowledge—no introspection will give it—only the process of experience will reveal it. We shall know ourselves as we become ourselves. The future of society is the future of the individual. The race of intellectual and moral giants, considered from the standpoint of present attainment, is no dream of a fevered or deluded mind. It is the necessity of that which implicitly we already are. Christ, Plato, Shakespeare are our imperfect insight into the magnificent possibilities. Our hopes, our aspirations, our imaginations, when they are given full scope and play, take us, with a daring which is, at the same time, the soberest common sense, into scenes of yet loftier thinking, mightier genius, sublimer character. The world of attainment is more truly conceived as the world of prophecy.

Finally, I come to the question of man in reference to the future. The question, from our standpoint of the transient earth life, forces itself, What is to be? With the phenomenon of death we are all pathetically familiar. The friends with whom we have thought and worked, on whom we have expended a wealth of affection, pass from the sunlight of our common day into the shadow, and, generally speaking, we henceforth, during our brief continuance on earth, see them not nor hear. Is this the end? is the world-old inquiry. Those to whom I speak have an answer which rings clear, emphatic, increasing in volume—No! it is not the end. You are missionaries to sad hearts and wistful minds of a solution which, on the basis of evidence so varied, so large in mass, so overwhelming as to convince many a keen and exacting scientific mind of its validity, asserts categorically the continuity of personal life. It is a great message to a sceptical age—and even where it does not entirely convince it must surely serve to give what Lafcadio Hearn calls, in another connection, the vague consolations of the Great Doubt. It is no longer possible to answer the question with pitiable and weary assurance in the negative. The message is on the side of our deepest yearnings, and our ineradicable hopes. For my own part, I am wholly with you; and the word of comfort, of cheer, of conviction which is the assured utterance of your own transforming experience, I speak in my own way in the

chamber of death, and by the side of the grave : 'He is not here ; he is risen.'

But given that, the larger question of immortality remains. No facts available, or to be gathered, are adequate to an induction in that sense. Continuity of life undoubtedly tells in that direction. But it is not proof. It is an ultimate problem only to be resolved in the thinking consideration of the essential nature of man. At the end of this paper I can only indicate the direction in which it seems to me the solution is to be sought. I shall have spoken in vain if along the lines of what I have been saying it is not evident that in one sense immortality is necessarily involved. The question is not one specifically of the future, but of the nature of man. If he is mind, if mind is that for which all else is, then death as much as birth is a fact within mind and not of it. Self-consciousness is no event in time. But the time process is that by which self-consciousness realises what it implicitly is.

Let me use what I hope has not become too hackneyed an illustration. A musical symphony is a whole, a complete and unique meaning, its expression is through notes which follow one another, in a time order. It itself is not the first note, nor the last, but through both all that lies between has its actual existence. It is implied in every note, in the first as well as the last, and unifies all in the completeness of its total meaning. Similarly events in the time series of our experience are the means by which it gains that significance for itself in which, while all are included, all are transcended. Time and change have their possibility and meaning in the permanent and the eternal. Further, are these individual selves, these self-comprehensions of mind in its finite actuality immortal ? From one point of view the answer must be in the negative ; and that just because personality is not fixed and definite, but ever expanding and becoming mere adequate to its implicit content. Suppose, for example, that in some far-off condition three-dimensional should become four or twenty dimensional apprehension, that there were not only vast increase in the range of experience, but radical change in the forms under which it is grasped—should we be the same persons as look one another in the face, and interchange ideas to-day ? The sense in which we should be far less definite than the sense in which we should not. We should be mind apprehending itself at a higher stage of reality. Yet it is no less true that we should be the same in the sense that that higher stage would be the making more fully manifest what we implicitly are in this fleeting moment of time. Is the implicit to be realised, and our self-consciousness to grasp itself at the level of full self-comprehension ? Well, it is not only true that we are mind comprehending itself, but also that mind so comprehending itself is 'we,' the organised and ever-expanding whole of a personal self-consciousness.

What we mean, in all the possibilities which lie within us, is what the Absolute Mind means for Himself in us. For Him in the fulness of His self-comprehension that meaning is already realised. But that realisation involves all the temporal strivings by which in us its actuality is attained ; and not less all the further experience of whatever kind in which it is completed. As God is for Himself He includes us and all we mean. But what we mean we have not found as yet, and it seems of the very essence of that self-positing infinitude in order to become actual to Himself, that its realisation should be perfect. If the question is raised whether that can ever be, there is, I think, a failure to grasp the truth that the process in time is a form at which, at a certain stage, or certain stages, of development we necessarily think. Even now, in some aspects of experience, as in the *aperyus* of art or the self-surrender of religion, we seem to escape it, and realise our identity with God.

As the matter presents itself to me, we may rest here. Those purposes which we are, are necessary to the being of the Absolute Mind for Himself ; for mind as absolute, *i.e.*, as fully comprehending itself, they already are in their completed form, and that completed form would seem to involve individuated self-consciousness in the infinite reality of its complete significance. In other words, absolute mind is a mere abstrac-

tion looked at in itself and for itself, apart from differentiation. The partial truth of it is what we see ; the whole truth of it is what that which we see implies. Absolute mind, ultimately regarded, seems to me best conceived as the unity of self-conscious minds, infinite in their self-comprehension, which are its experience, in and through which it eternally realises itself. What mode of self-thinking further, and yet more final, conditions of self-conscious being may bring ; under what aspects we shall think the universe, ourselves, and God, it seems to me futile and foolish to speculate. We cannot think beyond the limits set by the forms of thought under which to-day we imperfectly conceive reality. But we live and move and have our being in that Spirit for which all is ; and that Spirit has His life and being in the self-differentiations of Himself, which, by reason of their self-consciousness, are already out of time, and have their inmost significance in the eternal, that is, have an eternal or, in other words, an immortal significance.

Here I bring to an end my very imperfect answer to the question with which I set out. On the one hand I feel that it is too sketchy to be satisfactory. On the other I am not unaware that my own mind moving amid the mysteries is itself asking for fuller light. All I can hope, is, first, that I may have made intelligible a point of view from which it seems to me speculation is moving, and will continue to move to a larger and deeper comprehension of the infinite truth ; and second, that I may have succeeded in making some suggestion of the help which lies in it for the inquiring and earnest mind. At all events for me it gives to this earth life an extraordinary and inexhaustible significance. I see all its struggles, sins, and woes, as well as its attainments, righteousness, and joys, its most dismal failures not less than its finest achievements, its fears and hopes, its sorrows and exultations, in relation to a complete meaning, not only for the whole but for every part of that whole, in which effort issues in fruition, struggle in victory, the partial in the perfect. Life and death, this world, and may be many worlds, are but means to an end, stages in a process in which mind in its finitude grasps itself at ever higher and more adequate levels of its self-comprehension. What ultimately shall be when we have become for ourselves that already we are for God. All that is finest in the past, all that is greatest in the present, all the forecasts of genius at the moments of its highest experience, all the insight of the prophets, do but faintly suggest, flickering foregleams, and vague adumbrations of the glorious reality which to-day we aspire towards and worship in that Eternal Spirit who is over all, and through all, and in all, God blessed for evermore. (Loud applause.)

At the close several questions were asked and replied to by the lecturer, and the proceedings terminated with a unanimous and hearty vote of thanks to the Rev. A. A. Charlesworth for his profound and instructive Address.

---

THE late Professor Henry Kiddle said : 'Modern Spiritualism, while reverent, is entirely rational and conforms to our best intuitions ; it presents to the mind no dogmas for compulsory acceptance and belief, no insoluble mysteries and theological absurdities inconsistent with our reason or intuitive conception of a God of infinite love, wisdom and beneficence. It is universal and cosmopolitan, containing the good and the true of all religions. It is emphatically in its highest and divinest estate the wisdom religion of the ages, recognising God, and taking hold upon immortality.'

THOSE who complain of unpleasant influences, and believe themselves to be beset by spirits of a low order, would do well to read, and apply the thought contained in, the following passage : 'Infinite toil would not enable you to sweep away a mist, but by ascending a little you may often look over it altogether. So it is with our moral improvement ; we wrestle fiercely with a vicious habit, which could have no hold upon us if we ascended into a higher moral atmosphere.' Break away from present conditions by substituting new and different thoughts and interests. Forget and exclude troublesome influences by cheerful thoughts and all-engrossing efforts for the good of others, and then the obsessing ones will either go away or they will catch *your* thought and be influenced by you for good, and in that way you and they will all be benefited.



## ARCHDEACON COLLEY AND MR. MASKELYNE.

(Continued from page 209.)

and Bishops in correspondence, as 'Archdeacon.' Who, then, was Mr. Maskelyne, that he should decide that the plaintiff was not, and never had been, an archdeacon? Mr. Maskelyne's quotation from the 'Guardian' as to the wearing of the hood of an Oxford M.A., added fuel to the flame; and on that matter there was no evidence whatever. When asked for a retraction and an apology, Mr. Maskelyne replied by sending the name of his solicitor, thus inviting action, and he had persisted in that attitude to the present time. All the plaintiff's life in the Church was well known, and there was no imputation against his clerical character, except in regard to Spiritualism. Would the Bishop of Oxford have appointed the plaintiff to an office after his return from Natal; would New College, Oxford, have given him his present living, without being satisfied that he was a proper person for office? The libel stated that plaintiff falsely represented to Bishop Colenso that the Archbishop had sent him out to be Dean. But he had never made such a representation. Mr. Banks submitted that the libel was a serious and a cruel one, and in conclusion he asked was plaintiff to go back to his parishioners discredited or rehabilitated by the verdict of the jury? Was it right that the plaintiff's character should be taken away because he believed in Spiritualism?

The Judge, in summing up, said the words in which the defendant said that he had knowledge that the plaintiff was not and never had been an archdeacon, were not covered by privilege, but were imputations, and he had very little doubt that the jury would answer the question as to libel in the affirmative. With regard to their truth the plaintiff was not, in point of law, an archdeacon at all when the words of the libel were written; but the defendant had said that the plaintiff never had been an archdeacon, and that was a question of fact. The plaintiff stated that he acted as Archdeacon in Natal, holding visitations and examining candidates for ordination. As to the plaintiff's interview with the Archbishop, the statement of the latter was evidence that the plaintiff, in his sermon at Durban, went further than he ought to have done, but it did not show that he had made a false representation. The pith of the whole case was its relation to Spiritualism. The challenge referred, not to all the statements in the pamphlet, but to the production of materialised spirits. It was said that the defendant did not make the figure go back; on that he said he did not do so because it did not suit his line as a conjurer. It was for the jury to say whether he had fairly complied with the challenge. As to the pamphlet, did anyone ever see such a production? It described appearances of spirits, writing, talking, boxing people on the ear, and so forth—all alleged to be genuine and produced by a man who was known to be a fraud. These things, and the plaintiff's Swedenborgianism, told against him; but in his favour, the Judge thought he was genuine in his opinions, which he seemed to have held all along.

The jury, after an absence of an hour and a half, reported that they were agreed that the words in question were libellous and were not true, and they found for the plaintiff, damages £75. On the counter-claim they found that Mr. Maskelyne was not entitled to the £1,000.

The effect of this is that Archdeacon Colley wins his action, with £75 damages, and that Mr. Maskelyne loses his claim to the £1,000 upon the challenge, and has to pay the costs on both sides.

The counsel in the case were: For the plaintiff, Mr. J. Eldon Bankes, K.C., and Mr. Ralph Bankes, instructed by Mr. E. R. Serocold Skeels, 55, Chancery-lane. For the defendant, Mr. Gill, K.C., and Mr. Stroud.

## WORDS FROM THE GREAT RELIGIONS.

Mrs. Besant, writing in the 'Theosophist' on 'The Brotherhood of Religions,' takes the view that diversity in religious belief is not harmful, except when it leads any particular religion to set itself up as the only true one. She says:—

'The antagonism between religions is a plant of modern growth, grown out of the seed of an essentially modern claim—the claim of a single religion to be unique and alone inspired. . . . It was this claim of Christianity to be the only true religion which gave birth to religious persecution, first of Christianity, then by it. For as long as your religion is yours, and mine mine, and neither claims to impose his religion on the other, no question of persecution can arise. . . . The multiplicity of religious beliefs would be an advantage, not an injury, to religion, if the religions were a brotherhood instead

of a battlefield. For each religion has some peculiarity of its own, something to give the world which the others cannot give. God is so great, so illimitable, that no one religion, however perfect, can express His infinite perfection. It needs a universe in its totality to mirror Him, nay, countless universes cannot exhaust Him. And so also a religion can only show forth some aspects of that myriad-faced existence.

'What does Hinduism say to the world? It says *Dharma*—law, order; harmonious, dutiful growth; the right place of each, right duty, right obedience. What does Zoroastrianism say? It says *Purity*—stainlessness of thought, of word, of act. What does Buddhism say? It says *Wisdom*—knowledge all embracing, wedded to perfect love, love of man, service of humanity, a perfect compassion, the gathering of the lowest and the weakest into the tender arms of the Lord of Love Himself. What does Christianity say? It says *Self-sacrifice*, and takes the Cross as its dearest symbol, remembering that wherever one human spirit crucifies the lower nature and rises to the Supreme, there the Cross shines out. And what does Islâm say, youngest of the world's great faiths? It says *Submission*—self-surrender to the one Will that guides the worlds, and so sees that Will everywhere that it cannot see the little human wills that live only as they blend themselves with It.'

Mrs. Besant thinks that we cannot afford to lose any one of these words, each summing up the characteristics of a great faith, and that we may so recognise the differences of religions that we may learn rather than that we may criticise. The moral is that 'all the great truths of religion are common property, and do not belong exclusively to any one faith.' Mrs. Besant goes on to particularise, and finds that the universality of religious truths is shown by community of symbols, doctrines, stories, and morals. 'Dig in the field of your own religion,' she says, 'and go deeper and deeper till you find the spring of the water of life gushing up pure and full.'

## APPRECIATIONS OF 'LIGHT.'

Miss Josephine Jenkins, of Boston, U.S.A., a niece of the poet, N. P. Willis, is one of the most ardently appreciative readers of 'LIGHT,' and in a recent personal letter to a friend she says:—

'What good things have been in "LIGHT" lately! How well edited it is—dignified and convincing in its tone.'

The constantly increasing appreciation of the value of this fine and significant journal is a fact which is as justly prized by all the *clientèle* of 'LIGHT,' as it may be by the editors, on whose admirable work and discrimination it reflects such credit. It is giving honour where honour is due. 'Excellence encourages one about life generally,' says George Eliot in the person of 'Daniel Deronda' in her great novel bearing that title; 'it shows the spiritual wealth of the world.'

With so valuable a journal, by means of which all who realise the importance of the fullest possible circulation of the true philosophy of life, for which 'LIGHT' so ably stands, it is certainly worth some personal effort on the part of each reader to endeavour to extend and increase its subscription list. At personal sacrifice undreamed of, the editors are devoting energy and talent to the conduct of this journal which, if given to the secular Press, would insure them a far greater financial return. They choose to devote themselves to their earnest work for truth and enlightenment, and, as Goethe well said, 'Every work that is greatest in the world not only does not afford money, but requires money to carry it on.' Invariably is this true in any great work for the elevation of humanity. It is worth doing; it is worth the sacrifice; and no one need regret engaging in this noble effort; but, in the meantime, let us all *share* the burdens and the sacrifices, and co-operate in every possible effort to contribute true knowledge and larger enlightenment on all that pertains to man's immortal life.

Hôtel Bellevue,  
39, Ave. de l'Opéra, Paris.

LILIAN WHITING.

MR. S. JOHN ELLIOTT, the author of 'Elliott's Astrological Axioms' and 'Everybody's Astrological Guide for 1907,' writes: 'I owe so much to Spiritualism from the knowledge and comfort received through its teachings that I have decided to set aside for one month 25 per cent. from the sale of my books to aid the Spiritualists' National Fund of Benevolence.'

## A STRANGE MANIFESTATION.

BY AUDREY FOSTER.

The following short account of a curious experience was told to the writer by an intimate and entirely trustworthy friend. I give it almost in her own words :—

‘My father died suddenly. He was an old man and preferred a bedroom to himself, so that my mother slept in another room. One day we went to call him, and he was dead. He had apparently passed away in sleep, and probably quite painlessly, at the close of an honoured and happy life. For years he had been churchwarden in a large suburban parish, and our home had been an open house for the clergy.

‘His death occurred in December, the fatal month which, in our family, witnesses the last scenes of its members.

‘After the funeral I set to work to move the furniture in my father’s bed-room, so that the aspect of the place should appear as different as possible from that of former days. Only the bed, being large and heavy, had to remain in its old position, but it was made up in the ordinary way as though waiting to be occupied. Now comes the strange part.

‘I used often to go into that room, which had remained altogether unused since the death, and each time I entered there would be the distinct impression upon the outside of the bed of a human form—just as if someone had been taking a nap, and had arisen without smoothing away the indentation. I used to re-arrange the clothes carefully, but on the next visit the bed would again look as if it had been occupied.

‘I tried in every way to account for this appearance, but in vain, and still said nothing to my mother. One day, however, she asked me the plain question :—

“Do you notice anything strange about your father’s bed? I am continually going in and straightening it, and each time it looks as if somebody had been lying on the outside.”

‘Then, of course, we discussed the matter together, but without finding a solution of the mystery, and soon after the house was let, and we removed to another neighbourhood.’

It would be interesting to know whether any reader of ‘LIGHT’ has met with a similar experience to the foregoing.

Merton, Pope’s-grove,  
Twickenham, S.W.

## MODERN MEDICAL METHODS.

Dr. Stenson Hooker’s new book on ‘The Higher Medicine,’ published by the Celtic Press, 38, Chancery-lane, W.C., price 2s. 6d. *net*, is an amplification and elaboration of his pamphlet on ‘The Trend of Modern Medicine,’ which we noticed last year. Dr. Hooker draws a striking contrast between the progress and order which have been introduced into modern surgery, and the position of medicine, ‘still groping in the mist of uncertainties, and only seeing through a glass very darkly.’ He thinks, however, that medicine has shared in the refining influences which have entered into modern life, and that the effects of the tendency towards the ‘Simple Life’ and ‘Reformed diet’ are very apparent—‘there is an all-round improvement, physically, morally, mentally, and spiritually.’ When he comes to speak of vegetarianism, he gives some simple yet attractive samples of daily diet for winter and summer, and hints that two meals a day are quite sufficient.

After brief but pithy chapters on homœopathy, hydrotherapeutics, the light and electricity cure, the nature cure, and massage (in which he recognises that psychic emanations may form an important factor), Dr. Hooker describes the soothing and stimulating effect of blue and red light respectively, as well as the remarkable value of music in mental and nervous diseases. Then he enlarges upon the influence of personality, in the chapter entitled ‘The Man behind the Method,’ and intimates that even in an organic disease, such as phthisis, the personal factor has more to do with recovery than either the locality of the sanatorium or the line of treatment pursued. This leads up to ‘Psycho-Therapeutics,’

described as depending on suggestion and the awakening of what the author calls the soul force. In this respect, he says, suggestion has a great advantage over hypnotism, which he regards as acting only on the sub-conscious mentality, while suggestion, sustained by cheerful surroundings, can penetrate to the very deepest self, which is soul, not merely mind. Referring to magneto-therapeutics, including spiritual healing, Dr. Hooker says : ‘This power will be admitted and acted upon to a greater extent in the New Age of medicine which is surely coming in apace.’ It is however, as he points out, very necessary to distinguish between people of strong animal magnetic force and those of true spiritual power, and he thinks that this difference would be very apparent to a psychometrist or to one who can perceive the colours of auras. Prayer, he thinks, is a means of putting ourselves into a spiritually receptive condition, or of arousing to action the power which is resident within ourselves : ‘We must seek deep within our own selves for that Presence and that Power which in our ignorance we have been allocating to the skies.’

In a closing chapter on vivisection, the uselessness of that practice is shown as clearly as its cruelty. The whole book will prove inspiring and encouraging to many, especially to those who may be inclined to distrust the old medical methods and have not yet made up their minds as to the efficacy of the ‘higher medicine.’

## EXPERIENCES WITH DR. MONCK.

Dr. Berks T. Hutchinson, late of Cape Town, sends us an account of some of his experiences with Dr. Monck, in 1877, the following summary of which may be of interest to our readers. At a séance at Burnley, Dr. Monck described to Dr. Hutchinson a spirit who, he said, was wearing the dress of an Anglican Sister of Mercy, and holding a small child by each hand. On her breast he saw the letter ‘G.’—intended for Georgina. He said one of the children held a white lily, and the other child had in her hand what looked like a May-flower. Dr. Hutchinson recognised the lady as a Miss Georgina Handley. She had known his children, May and Lily, before she, and they, passed on, and at a private séance in Cape Town had promised that she would communicate with him in England if she could do so. The next manifestation was one of slate-writing. Dr. Hutchinson purchased slates at a shop in Burnley, and having written his name on each one he placed a crumb of pencil between two, which he then tied and sealed and laid upon a table. He then placed his hand on the top of them, and the medium put his hands on those of the doctor. Very soon sounds as of writing were heard and, on cutting the string, a short message was found written on the inside surface of one of the slates. It was from ‘Lily,’ one of the two children who had been clairvoyantly seen. Another ‘direct’ slate-written message, under the same fraud-proof conditions, was received from a spirit named John Markham, who thus fulfilled a promise made in South Africa. On another occasion, at the urgent request of Dr. Hutchinson, a piano was played while the lid was closed. This occurred in full light and in the presence of two other witnesses. Dr. Hutchinson was allowed to open the lid and watch the movements of the keys and, in answer to his request, certain specified notes were sounded. At the close the piano was thoroughly examined by Dr. Hutchinson, but nothing out of the ordinary was discovered.

‘THE different conceptions,’ says the ‘Religio-Philosophical Journal,’ ‘of great thinkers and writers, in regard to the life and conditions beyond this, are an interesting study. Charlotte Brontë expressed her idea as follows : ‘Besides this earth, and besides this race of men, there is an invisible world and a kingdom of spirits. That world is round us, for it is everywhere ; and those spirits watch us, for they are commissioned to guard us ; and if we are dying under pain and shame, if scorn smites us on all sides, and hatred crushes us, angels see our tortures, recognise our innocence (if innocent we be), and God waits only the separation of spirit from flesh to crown us with a full reward. Why, then, should we ever sink overwhelmed with distress, when life is so soon over, and death is so certain an entrance to happiness—to glory?’

## JOTTINGS.

One of the gems from the Colley-Maskelyne lawsuit is the following utterance by Archdeacon Colley: 'Literary incapacity does not invalidate their honesty.' He was speaking of the laughable mistakes sometimes made by spirits when communicating, and he further explained that 'they forget their earthly language when they get on the other side.' Being taunted with having laughed at these mistakes, he further said 'it is not a matter for amusement, but for philosophical inquiry.' More eminent investigators than the Archdeacon have agreed on this, and we commend the point to the serious attention of the journalists who have seen in this trial only an opportunity for unlimited fun. But while some men laugh, others reflect.

The greatest merit and the most conspicuous truth in Mr. Maskelyne's performance at the St. George's Hall appears to us to be contained in its title, 'A Side Issue.' The pun is an atrocious one, and yet it is—a side issue, and nothing germane to the question involved. We need not dwell on the fact that the conditions of the original manifestation were such that any simulation must have been discovered by those who witnessed it, for it was evidently not a carefully arranged stage display, whereas at St. George's Hall those on the stage must be participants in the creation of the illusion.

But the 'side issues' do not end here. In the amazing and undignified proceedings at the Law Courts last week there was little else involved from beginning to end. The real questions were whether the Rev. Thomas Colley had the right to represent himself as an archdeacon, and whether Mr. Maskelyne's performance was a reproduction of the original phenomena, or any one of them. Comparatively little time or attention was devoted to these points; the time of the Court was frittered away on such questions as Monck's moral character, his alleged exposure, stories about Eglinton, the orthodoxy of Swedenborgians, the Mahedi as an apple eater, and the personal habits of members of the Inner Circle.

The case will be memorable because of the appearance of Dr. A. R. Wallace in the witness box and his unequivocal testimony to the fact of materialisation. It was really pathetic to see the venerable old man, with his silvery hair and kindly, benevolent face, and hear him bravely and simply telling the story of his remarkable experiences—experiences which, if true, are among the most marvellous happenings ever witnessed by man—and that Dr. Wallace believed them true no unprejudiced man who heard him could possibly doubt. Intense interest was manifested in court during his evidence. It was listened to in profound silence, and his calm, deliberate, concise and precise statements evidently carried much weight. Although so aged, his voice was clear and musical and his genial good temper was maintained throughout; even when, in the cross-examination, the clever counsel endeavoured to weaken the force of his testimony by sarcastic and ludicrous remarks and suggestions.

Mr. Maskelyne's statement that he had been informed that the Rev. R. Haweis changed his views with regard to Spiritualism on his deathbed is an extraordinary one. He must surely have been misinformed. The facts were stated in 'LIGHT' of February 2nd, 1901. The Rev. R. Haweis arose early to work in his study. He sent his man out on an errand, and he, on his return, found the rev. gentleman on the floor in a state of unconsciousness. He passed away shortly afterwards, and his last word was 'Collapsed!' There was, therefore, no 'deathbed' and no change of views, according to the authoritative information which we received.

As a sign of the times the following 'card' is interesting. It was issued to the residents in his parish by the vicar of St. Barnabas Church, East Park-road, Leicester. He says: 'It is sometimes objected to what is said at church, "Well, that doesn't concern me." I hope to speak at our next Men's Service, on Sunday, April 7th, at 3.30 p.m., on a subject that must concern everyone, "The Day after Death." Come and hear for your own sake. Come and hear for the sake of beloved ones now dead—or who will die some day. You know you are welcome, whoever and whatever you are.' There is a curious coincidence connected with this. Mr. E. W. Wallis was to give trance addresses at Leicester on Sunday, the 14th inst., and, writing on the 5th inst., he was 'impressed' to send, as one of the subjects to be spoken upon on that day, 'The Day after Death,' and it was not until after the delivery of his address that the coincidence was observed and commented on.

That Congregationalists, as a body, do not agree with Mr. R. J. Campbell's ideas is proved by the fact that a new book, entitled 'The Old Faith and the New Theology,' will be published shortly, in which a dozen or more of the leading Congregationalists will deal with 'The Divinity of Christ,' 'The Virgin Birth,' 'Immanence and Incarnation,' 'The Progressive Element in the Holy Scriptures,' &c. We are glad of it. The more thoroughly, honestly, and reverently these subjects are discussed the better. Truth never gets defeated in the strife when there is an open field and no favour.

The 'Morning Leader' recently said: 'Sir Oliver Lodge, in an interview on the psychological aspect of the Zancigs' performance, said that every hypothesis he had devised to explain it had broken down, and he was not prepared to deny the explanation of some people that there must be an admixture of telepathic powers in the process.' It looks as if the Zancigs will triumph yet. The careful, non-committal attitude of Sir Oliver Lodge is well maintained. He admits that all his theories have broken down, but, as yet, he is only prepared *not to deny* that there must be 'an admixture of telepathic powers'—as some people claim.

The Rev. W. Day, according to a report in the 'Otago Daily Times,' recently delivered a sermon at the annual meeting of the council of the New Zealand Congregational Union, in which he referred to Modern Spiritualism, and said that 'Its longing for assurance of the Unseen, and its desire for communion with the Unseen—these are its most significant and touching features. In print, it has another feature—a joyous and jubilant confidence that its ventures yield rich results. In a recent number of the "Hibbert Journal" a writer seriously proposes that the basis of a new and more satisfactory religion is to be found in the data gathered by the Society for Psychical Research. But the suggestion is after the event. The thing has already been done. Spiritualism is the religion of numbers of people.' This fact indicated, he thought, that there was something lacking in the faith and experience of the leaders in the churches. That lack is personal conviction based on knowledge. The note of *reality* is too often missing, and only actual intercourse with the living dead will supply it.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

*The Editor is not responsible for the opinions expressed by correspondents and sometimes publishes what he does not agree with for the purpose of presenting views which may elicit discussion.*

## 'Huxley on the Bible.'

SIR,—No doubt many at this time in the old country will be interested in being reminded of what Professor Huxley, the great Agnostic, thought of the Bible and Bible teaching.

Said to have been the greatest intellect of the nineteenth century, truly perhaps in a very limited sense and in his own line of study only, he was one who could take no interest in anything that could not be tested, and weighed, and measured, and scrutinised; to whom faith was an unknown quantity. A superb exponent of the scientific method, although forgetting that science is not the whole of life, and the great advocate of technical education, yet he had sufficient intuition to realise that no education amounted to anything, in fact was not education at all, which was not based upon a moral and religious foundation!

In an article in 'The Nineteenth Century' for April, 1889, he says: 'Greatly to the surprise of many of my friends, I have always advocated the reading of the Bible, and the diffusion of the study of that most remarkable collection of books among the people. Its teachings are so infinitely superior to those of the sects, who are just as busy now as the Pharisees were eighteen hundred years ago, in smothering them under "the precepts of men"; it is so certain, to my mind, that the Bible contains within itself the refutation of nine-tenths of the mixture of sophistical metaphysics and old-world superstition which has been piled round it by the so-called Christians of later times; it is so clear that the only immediate and ready antidote to the poison which has been mixed with Christianity, to the intoxication and delusion of mankind, lies in copious draughts from the undefiled spring, that I exercise the right and duty of free judgment on the part of every man, mainly for the purpose of inducing other laymen to follow my example.'

I have lately been reading with great interest and entertainment, and, I hope, profit (and Huxley could touch no subject that he did not make entertaining, luminous, and instructive; see his remarks about the Gadarene swine miracle,

'the bedevilled pigs,' as he called them), the celebrated controversy carried on in 'The Nineteenth Century' during 1885, 1886, 1888, and 1889 between Huxley and Gladstone, Dr. Wace, the Bishop of Peterborough, and others.

Huxley in 'Life and Letters' imagines, and his chief scientific friends agreed with him, that he had carried destruction into the ranks of his opponents; but to me, looking at the question from the spiritualist standpoint, he was out-matched, and had decidedly the worst of the argument all through. He seemed to be incapable of realising that there could be anything outside the physical senses, and was always dominated by the error so common among scientists, such as Haeckel, for instance, that man's logical reasoning power is his highest faculty—logical reasoning, reasoning from experience, being to intuition knowing on a par with a tallow dip in comparison with God's sunlight.

One cannot but regret, for their sakes, that so many clever people should have such a one-sided development. Far better to be less clever and have a more fully rounded-out nature! Will they not have a lot of hard work in the larger and sweeter life to rectify this warped condition? However deep these materialistic philosophers may go into the origin of things, the Spiritualist goes a step deeper and asks the cause of their cause.—Yours, &c.,

A. K. VENNING.

Los Angeles, Cal., U.S.A.

#### National Fund of Benevolence.

SIR,—Kindly permit me to acknowledge the following donations to the National Fund of Benevolence during April: Collected by Mrs. Kate Taylor Robinson (sale of lilies on Good Friday, 6s. 6d., Mr. J. Harwood, 1s., Mrs. Geyink, 1s. 6d., Mrs. Hartley, 1s., Mrs. S. P. Taylor, 5s., total 15s.); Mr. R. Padgham, £1; Mr. J. Frazer Hewes, £1 1s.; 'H. M. M.,' 4s. 6d.; total, £3 0s. 6d.

I beg to urge upon those who have not sent a donation the necessity for so doing, as I keep receiving fresh applications for assistance. 'He gives twice who gives quickly,' and any donation, no matter how small, will be gratefully received and acknowledged by—Yours, &c.,

9, High-street, Doncaster.

A. E. BUTTON.

#### 'Help for a Worthy Couple.'

SIR,—Kindly allow me to acknowledge with many thanks the following donations: From 'Emma,' 20s.; and, per Mr. W. T. Cooper (president), £3, collected at a séance for Members and Associates kindly held by the Marylebone Spiritualist Association on April 16th, in aid of Mr. and Mrs. Emms, at which Mr. George Spriggs generously gave his services as medium. Also 10s. from Miss M. Simpson.

The M.S.A. hope that Mr. and Mrs. Emms will receive practical help from many Spiritualists, and have a pleasant time during the years that they remain on this side of life, a wish in which, I think, all the friends of Mr. and Mrs. Emms will cordially join.

Further subscriptions and donations for this fund will be gladly received and acknowledged by—Yours, &c.,

(MRS.) M. H. WALLIS.

'Morveen,' Mountfield-road,  
Finchley, N.

AN interesting story, which is given as a fact, and is good enough to be true, comes from America. It is said that 'Mr. J. R. Wordeman, of Washington City, was driving in a light buggy. He was thrown from it and his head struck on a fence. It happened near the residence of Dr. H. W. Woodard. The horse stood for a moment by the prostrate driver and, as if possessed of human instincts, marched up to the physician's residence and rubbed his nose against the electric push button until the doctor came to the door.'

The trend of modern thought is well indicated by the utterances of thoughtful preachers. Thus the Rev. Dr. Bartholow, of the Janes-street Methodist Church in Brooklyn, U.S.A., in a recent sermon, said: 'To my mind there is nothing in Spiritualism that is in any way inconsistent with the doctrines of the Church. It may be that through Spiritualism will come the scientific demonstration of the immortality of the soul. And why should not this be scientifically demonstrated? If Spiritualism should become as settled a principle as telepathy it would wipe away every argument of the atheist. It will do no harm to give the study of Spiritualism the deepest thought, and it is worthy the best investigation on the part of scientists as well as of theologians.' This is the kind of truth that does good in our regular church services,

#### SOCIETY WORK.

Notices of future events which *do not exceed* twenty-five words may be added to reports *if accompanied by six penny stamps*, but all such notices which exceed twenty-five words must be inserted in our advertising columns.

OXFORD CIRCUS.—22, PRINCE'S-STREET, W.—On Sunday last Miss Violet Burton gave a good address upon 'The Spiritual Power of Spiritualism.' Sunday next, at 7 p.m., Mrs. Effie Bathe on 'Mediumship.'

PECKHAM.—CHEPSTOW HALL, 139, PECKHAM-ROAD.—On Sunday morning last Mrs. Webb held a successful circle, and in the evening gave an address and clairvoyant descriptions to an attentive audience.—L. D.

ACTON.—PEMBRIDGE HOUSE, HORN-LANE, W.—On Sunday last a reading by Mr. Barnikel was much appreciated. Sunday next, at 7 p.m., Mr. H. Ball on 'Andrew Jackson Davis, Philosopher and Seer.'

STRATFORD.—WORKMEN'S HALL, ROMFORD-ROAD, E.—On Sunday last Mr. G. Tayler Gwinn delivered a short address, and Mr. Roberts gave clairvoyant descriptions. On Sunday next, Mrs. Whimp, clairvoyante.—W.H.S.

BRIXTON.—8, MAYALL-ROAD.—On Sunday last Mrs. Wesley Adams' address on 'Human Responsibility' was much enjoyed. Sunday next, Mr. and Mrs. Wesley Adams and others, addresses and clairvoyant descriptions.—J. P.

FULHAM.—COLVEY HALL, 25, FERNHURST-ROAD, S.W.—On Sunday last Mr. Snowden Hall gave an interesting and instructive address on 'Mediumship.' Speaker on Sunday next, Mr. E. W. Wallis, on 'Death in the Light of Spiritualism.'—J. T.

BRIGHTON.—MANCHESTER-STREET (OPPOSITE AQUARIUM).—On Sunday last Mr. H. Boddington delivered excellent addresses. Sunday next, at 11.15 a.m., public circle; at 7 p.m., Mrs. Arthur Perryman will relate experiences and exhibit direct writings.—A. C.

CAVENDISH ROOMS, 51, MORTIMER-STREET, W.—On Sunday last Miss MacCreadie gave detailed clairvoyant descriptions of sixteen spirit friends, with full names. Mr. W. T. Cooper presided. Sunday next, Mr. J. W. Boulding, address. May 7th, members' séance; particulars from A. J. Watts, Hon. Sec.

CAMBERWELL NEW-ROAD.—SURREY MASONIC HALL.—On Sunday last, at the morning circle, clairvoyant descriptions and advice were given. In the evening Mr. W. E. Long's trance address on 'The Doctrine of Devils' interested a large audience. Sunday next, at 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m., Mrs. Imison, clairvoyant descriptions and spirit messages.—E. S.

CHISWICK.—110, HIGH-ROAD, W.—On Sunday last, at the morning circle, 'Spirit and Personal Experiences' were related. In the evening Mr. T. H. Pateman's instructive address on 'Harmony' was much enjoyed. On Sunday next, at 11.15 a.m., circle; at 7 p.m., Mr. W. H. Simpson on 'Was Paul a Christian?' No meeting on Monday.—H. S.

CLAPHAM INSTITUTE, GAUDEN-ROAD.—On Sunday last Mrs. Boddington made an earnest appeal for a 'Rational View of Spiritualism,' and gave successful clairvoyant descriptions. Sunday next, at 11.15 a.m., Lyceum and circle; at 7 p.m., Mrs. Boddington. Thursday next, at 8.15 p.m., psychometry and clairvoyance. Silver collection.—W. H. B.

THE UNION OF LONDON SPIRITUALISTS will hold meetings on Sunday, May 5th, at 3 p.m., in Battersea Park; speakers: Messrs. W. Wright, A. Rex, P. Smyth, W. Turner, and J. Adams. At 7 p.m., at Henley-street, Battersea Park-road; speakers: Messrs. J. Adams, A. Rex, H. Wright, and R. Boddington. Tea provided at hall at 5 p.m., 6d. each.

BALHAM.—19, RAMSDEN-ROAD (OPPOSITE THE PUBLIC LIBRARY).—On Sunday morning last Mr. H. Richards opened a discussion. In the evening Mr. G. Morley gave an address entitled 'The Faithist's Hope,' and clairvoyant descriptions. On Sundays, at 11.15 a.m. and 7 p.m., and on Wednesdays, at 8.15 p.m., public services are held for Faithist teachings and clairvoyant descriptions.—W. E.

HACKNEY.—SIGDON-ROAD SCHOOL, DALSTON-LANE, N.E.—On Sunday last Mr. D. J. Davis delivered an eloquent address on 'Spiritualism, the Gospel of Life,' and Mrs. Weedemeyer gave successful clairvoyant descriptions. Sunday next, at 7 p.m., Mr. Johnston, address; Mrs. Webb, clairvoyante. May 8th, at 8 p.m., Mrs. Webb will give clairvoyant descriptions at 50, Avenue-road, Hackney Downs.—N. R.

BARROW-IN-FURNESS.—On Sunday and Monday last Mr. John Lobb addressed three large audiences on 'The Return of the so-called Dead.'

NORTHAMPTON.—DUNSTER-STREET.—On Sunday last Mrs. Comerford delivered a good address and gave well-recognised clairvoyant descriptions.—J. W. B.