

Light:

A Journal devoted to the Highest Interests of Humanity, both Here and Hereafter.

"LIGHT! MORE LIGHT!"—Goethe.

No. 81.—VOL. II.

SATURDAY, JULY 22, 1882.

PRICE THREEPENCE.

CONTENTS.

Notes by the Way. By M. A. (Oxon.)	341	Society for Psychical Research:—	
Seance with Miss Wood	342	" Professors Balfour Stewart	
Spiritualism and Christianity	342	and Hopkinson	348
The Late Mr. Serjeant Cox	342	" Speech of Rev. A. M. Creery	349
Society for Psychical Research:—		" Report of Dr. Turner and	
" Prospectus	343	Mr. J. H. Orme	349
" First General Meeting	344	" Speech of Dr. Pardon	351
" Address of the President	344	Spiritualism in London and the	
" Committee's Report on		Provinces	351
Thought-Reading	345	Work for the Week	351

OFFICE OF "LIGHT,"

4, NEW BRIDGE STREET,
LUDGATE CIRCUS, E.C.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

Reports of the proceedings of Spiritualist Societies in as succinct a form as possible, and authenticated by the signature of a responsible officer, are solicited for insertion in "LIGHT." Members of private circles will also oblige by contributing brief records of noteworthy occurrences at their sêances.

The Editor cannot undertake the return of manuscripts unless the writers expressly request it at the time of forwarding, and enclose stamps for the return postage.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

The Annual Subscription for "LIGHT," post free to any address within the United Kingdom, or to places comprised within the Postal Union, including all parts of Europe, the United States, and British North America, is 15s. 2d. per annum, forwarded to our office in advance.

ADVERTISEMENT CHARGES.

Five lines and under, 3s. One inch, 4s. 6d. Half-column, £1. Whole Column, £2 2s. Page, £4. A reduction made for a series of insertions.

Cheques and Post Office Orders may be made payable to EDWARD T. BENNETT, at the Chief Office, London. Halfpenny Postage Stamps received for amounts under 10s.

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

"LIGHT" may be obtained direct from our Office, and also of E. W. ALLEN, 4, Ave Maria-lane, London, and all Booksellers.

NOTES BY THE WAY.

Contributed by "M.A. (Oxon.)"

The question as to what Serjeant Cox's exact views were, is apparently of perennial interest, and recurs with steady regularity. The letters printed in "LIGHT" last week give one phase of his somewhat erratic thoughts. This frame of mind did not, however, remain permanent. The psychical activity of some abnormal human beings failed to cover the facts, and was loosely held as a theory in his later days. The hypothesis of a race of inferior beings who dwell on this earth, and delight in mystifying its inhabitants by strutting about in the borrowed garb of our departed friends, did not content him either. Some more than usually convincing facts which he had opportunity of observing shortly before he solved the great problem in his own proper person, made a Spiritualist of him. But whether that phase would have been permanent is more than doubtful. The question as to his exact views will never be solved, because he never had any views that were sufficiently permanent for him to be able to satisfy his own mind of the exact scope and range of his beliefs.

The war still rages in America as to the methods of exposure of dishonest mediums. Dr. Crowell defends his case against Mr. Kiddle, and Mr. A. E. Newton. Dr. Crowell occupies a strong position; and, when the controversy is divested of some regrettable personalities, his proposals are sound and reasonable. He suggests the ancient method of bringing the question to proof by experiment. Mrs. Hull, the incriminated medium, is to be submitted to test by Dr. Crowell, and Mr. Kiddle, and five friends of each. These are to be judges in this novel psychic tournament, and so the question is to be decided. There is to be light enough for accurate observation, and the medium is to be so placed that her hands are in view. Without claiming prophetic power, I venture to predict that such a sêance would be a fiasco, and that by such means nothing would be proven, except, perhaps, that nothing takes place under certain otherwise satisfactory conditions. Yet test conditions in themselves are no bar. I hear of perfectly unimpeachable phenomena having been obtained at the rooms of the C.A.S., through the mediumship of Miss Wood, when scientifically perfect conditions were insisted on. Would it not be well that an exact

record of such sêances, with every minute fact specified, should be drawn up, attested, and published in "LIGHT."

Mrs. Watts' instructive letter takes note of the presence of an active principle of "Antagonism" in the spiritual development of those who are brought into relation with the world of Spirit. This is, I believe, an active law the presence of which may be traced in various ways. The Occultists tell of a dweller on the threshold who must be vanquished by the aspirant who would penetrate into new fields of knowledge. Mrs. Watts speaks of the "Antagonist" who tries the novice by various methods of temptation, even as Christ was "led up into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil" at the time when his great work was begun. My teachers have always spoken of the "Adversaries" who contend against their work, and strive to thwart and ruin it. Personally I have been more than once or twice, and for prolonged periods, brought face to face with Spirit foes with whom I have consciously striven for the mastery. I have recognised them as tempters, or, as I might better say, as those commissioned to try both courage and fixity of purpose before I could go farther. They were no phantoms of the imagination, no hideous dream, but powerful foes who persistently sought to terrify and destroy the mental balance, so that, reason being shaken, they might control and wreck the mind. This was their method with me, and I realised with awful clearness the inevitable result of relaxing my watchfulness even for a moment, and so fought on. With others I can readily understand that other methods might be attempted. It was not so with me. There was no suggested temptation, no crafty lure, no bribe even, but a conflict, an assault, a terror of which I do not even now like to think.

The Mystics, too, make much of this "wilderness-state"; this condition of vastation, and spiritual loneliness and desolation. The soul is unquestionably trained in such ways. Alone with itself, in its Gethsemane, it learns to pray and to draw spiritual strength by communion with its guardians. This is of quite another type from the assaults of the powers of evil of which I had experience. There are other methods of purgation and trial to some one or more of which the spiritual postulant will usually find himself subjected before he progresses in faith and knowledge, and is intronitted to profounder views of truth. Usually, but not always: for many who busy themselves with Spiritualism have no part or lot in things spiritual. These will run no risk of anything but obsession, and will not even understand what is meant by this *spiritual agony*, of which the great type is found in the wilderness-temptation which precluded the ministry of Christ, and in the Gethsemane-agony which marked its close. These are master truths.

And yet, fully as I realise all this, I do not believe that the problem of "J.P.T.'s" experience is greatly illuminated by such considerations. My speculative opinion is indeed of little value, but, following the method by which I have always tried to sift out truth, I see in "J.P.T.'s" case something that I cannot explain except on the hypothesis of action of "the Adversaries," with a malign purpose; that intent being, as I am inclined to believe, the thwarting of good work that had been accomplished. This would apply also to what Mrs. Watts says of her own experience. I have had none such, and she, therefore, is better able to estimate the exact applicability of her explanation than I can pretend to be. Still I am not logically satisfied. The explanation suggested of allegorical teaching is, I venture to think strongly, unreal and even repellent. It has all the vague unreality to my mind of an attempt to square certain selected facts with general theories, those that do not so square being left out of view. It is very necessary to remember, as "S." points out, that the lie was a constructive lie, cunningly planned to deceive, elaborately persisted in when the deception was successful, and only abandoned when detection was complete. This is not the machinery of spiritual trial, but the methods of a very

demon of conscienceless subtlety and craft. It is instructive, too, to remember that the organised deception supervened on a suggestion made by some of the circle. The unseen Intelligences did not originate but took up the half-spoken wish, and deliberately played upon it. How often does one find that this is the case in general circles! The sketchy and undeveloped Intelligence that is at work seems incapable of origination, but crafty and cunning in such action as it is capable of. This again is not the method of spiritual assaying, by which the purified Spirit may be elevated.

The matter is so full of deep import that I need hardly apologise for recurring to it. Mrs. Watts' suggestion of the influence of the ebb and flow of magnetism or psychic power is very important, and contains a deep truth. We shall all agree in thankfulness that she promises a more exhaustive treatment of the question. As there is undoubtedly ebb and flow of psychic power in the medium, so it may well be that there is the same flux and reflux to be traced in the great ocean of spiritual influence. Whether the ebb is identical with the dominant action of the Adversaries, I know not; but I am convinced that at times they do possess, as it were, this world of ours, and run riot in their congenial methods. And I believe, too, that we are now passing through one of those epochs which threatens to be fraught with unusual horrors, and to be of some severity and duration.

The *Pall Mall Gazette* (July 11th) has been devoting attention to West Indian ghosts. It is of opinion that the S.P.R., if in earnest, should send out its committee on haunted houses at once to investigate and report on duppies. These duppies are an obscure variety of "spook" with which, it seems, the negro mind is very familiar. These children of nature live in the midst of beings that "nineteenth century European thought" does not recognise.

"The two sets of people live in the same houses and join in the same external acts of life: but for all that they live in two utterly different worlds, seeing things and mixing with beings absolutely unknown to one another. The one knows all about duppies just as certainly and unhesitatingly as the other knows all about electricity. And the negro servant who polishes one's floor with a split cocoa-nut every morning passes her days and nights among grotesque supernatural beings of African origin who are just as real and unquestionable to her as the white master and mistress from that unknown England beyond the seas."

Quite so. But what then? "Nineteenth century European thought" is correct? I am by no means sure.

M.A. (Oxon.)

MISS WOOD'S MEDIUMSHIP.

Another very successful séance under stringent test conditions was held on Saturday evening last, 15th inst., with Miss Wood, of Newcastle, in the presence of a circle of members of the Central Association of Spiritualists at 38, Great Russell-street, Bloomsbury, W.C. The medium was, as on previous occasions, seated in a small ante-room, the entrance being screened by a curtain, and afterwards securely fastened by lattice-work formed of a single length of piping cord laced through brass screw-eyelets inserted around the framework, the two ends of the cord being brought out and secured in view of the sitters. As an additional precaution the brass screw-eyelets were protected by a cotton thread being passed through each one, the two ends in each case being sealed to the adjacent framework with wax and a private seal of one of the members present. The company sat in subdued gas-light sufficient to admit of fairly good observation, and, after some little conversation and singing, a white draped form, of about 5ft. 3in. in height, emerged from behind the curtain, receded, re-appeared, and finally withdrew without speaking. This was followed by the appearance of the familiar form of "Pocha," of diminutive proportions, not exceeding 4ft. in height, who spoke with her peculiar voice, and permitted several members of the company to approach close to her, and whom she kissed and caressed with her hands. On her withdrawing, another draped figure issued, which gradually extended itself until a height of about 5ft. 6in. was attained; then gradually subsiding until reduced to not more than about 4ft. in height, no vocal utterance accompanying this form. This was succeeded by a tall, white draped figure, which shortly retired, and no further manifestations of a similar character transpired. At the close of the séance the test conditions were carefully scrutinised and found perfectly secure.

SPIRITUALISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—There is a subject now occupying the thoughts of Spiritualists on which I should be glad to be allowed to say a few words in your paper. The subject is the attitude of Spiritualism to the Church.

I feel in some sort competent to speak upon the subject, because it was through difficulty in receiving certain Church doctrines that I reached Spiritualism, for in answer to prayer for solution of these difficulties I reached, by intuition, teaching which I subsequently discovered to be Spiritualistic. I am, therefore, in sympathy with all who see that the Church as it exists is imperfect; but though she has been a faulty exponent of truth, she has been its faithful repository, and the world would have been much worse off without her than with her during the past centuries. I do not, therefore, regard her as a battered old hulk only fit to be broken up for firewood, but as a stately building, full of cobwebs and out of repair, but which only needs cleansing and beautifying, and for this work I look to Spiritualism.

I have been taught lately that the Church lost her spiritual gifts, not so much by want of faith as by want of love. Whenever errors and corruptions became too bad to be borne, the reformers could not be content to remain where they were and work an internal reform; but they must needs break right away, and then divide among themselves, and split up again into other little fractions, persecuting each other right and left in the name of the God of Love, till, like the famous bundle of sticks, they became an easy prey to the enemy.

And it is because I see a tendency in Spiritualists to this same fatal course that I venture now to write. For Heaven's sake do not let us take up an antagonistic attitude. We are content to hold out the hands of fellowship to Mahomedans, Buddhists, and members of various schools of thought, because they are, like ourselves, seekers after truth; why, then, single out Christianity as the special object of animosity? Our strength is in our Catholicity, and our motto is, "Unity without Uniformity."

Truth is like a globe, of which no man, nor any body of men, can see the whole at one time; but because Europe is true, Asia need not be false, nor for the matter of that Australia, although it be the very Antipodes. In fact, our sympathies cannot be too wide, nor our charity too deep. If, both as individuals and communities, we would seek for points of contact, rather than of divergence, in those whom we encounter, we should not only be doing our duty better than we do, but should be greater gainers than we imagine; for I think it may be taken as a broad rule, though not of universal application, that where two men who outwardly differ, agree, they have come upon a fundamental truth; while the points on which they differ are likely to be individual fancies, and therefore more or less errors.

Therefore, I say to my brothers, as St. Catherine of Siena said to the Pope, "Pace, pace, dolci fratelli miei, pace, e non più guerra!" Our Lord came to preach a Gospel of Peace, and His followers turned it into a gospel of war, and so lost the gifts of the Spirit; do not let us follow their example and share their fate; but in mutual forbearance, patience, and love, let us do our work in the regeneration of the world.

Pax.

THE LATE MR. SERJEANT COX.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—In your impression of this date, I perceived that my old friend, Mr. Serjeant Cox, in writing to Professor Barrett speaks of me "as going to work in this way," which "way" is apparently represented as a wholesome and unscientific mode of attributing "every phenomena to the direct action of Spirits."

If any of your readers care to know anything about such an extremely unimportant affair as my opinion on Spiritualism, they will find it fully treated in my volume "Pith" (Trübner and Co.) To save them the trouble of referring to my book, perhaps you will permit me briefly to state in your columns that I never attributed to the direct action of disembodied Spirits any phenomena except those which were distinctly directed by "independent Intelligences."

I have never been able to conceive that non-intelligent "forces," such as "brain waves," and "psychic force," could, of themselves, generate intelligent manifestations. Even the electric telegraph can only exhibit itself intelligently when its "waves" are guided by intelligence.

If my friend had been as logical in reasoning as he was genial in conduct, his researches in Spiritualism would not have ended so unprofitably and hopelessly in barrenness, and, I may also say, in absurdity.—Yours, &c.,

NEWTON CROSLAND.

London, July 15th, 1882.

SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

PROSPECTUS.

It has been widely felt that the present is an opportune time for making an organised and systematic attempt to investigate that large group of debateable phenomena designated by such terms as mesmeric, psychical, and Spiritualistic.

From the recorded testimony of many competent witnesses, past and present, including observations recently made by scientific men of eminence in various countries, there appears to be, amidst much illusion and deception, an important body of remarkable phenomena, which are *prima facie* inexplicable on any generally recognised hypothesis, and which, if incontestably established, would be of the highest possible value.

The task of examining such residual phenomena has often been undertaken by individual effort, but never hitherto by a scientific society organised on a sufficiently broad basis. As a preliminary step towards this end, a Conference was held in London on January 6th, 1882, and a Society for Psychical Research was projected. The Society was definitely constituted on February 20th, 1882, and its Council, then appointed, have sketched out a programme for future work. The following subjects have been entrusted to special Committees:—

1. An examination of the nature and extent of any influence which may be exerted by one mind upon another, apart from any generally recognised mode of perception.
2. The study of hypnotism, and the forms of so-called mesmeric trance, with its alleged insensibility to pain; clairvoyance, and other allied phenomena.
3. A critical revision of Reichenbach's researches with certain organisations called "sensitive," and an inquiry whether such organisations possess any power of perception beyond a highly exalted sensibility of the recognised sensory organs.
4. A careful investigation of any reports, resting on strong testimony, regarding apparitions at the moment of death, or otherwise, or regarding disturbances in houses reputed to be haunted.
5. An inquiry into the various physical phenomena commonly called Spiritualistic; with an attempt to discover their causes and general laws.
6. The collection and collation of existing materials bearing on the history of these subjects.

The aim of the Society will be to approach these various problems without prejudice or prepossession of any kind, and in the same spirit of exact and unimpassioned inquiry which has enabled Science to solve so many problems once not less obscure or less hotly debated. The founders of this Society fully recognise the exceptional difficulties which surround this branch of research; but they nevertheless hope that by patient and systematic effort some results of permanent value may be attained.

The Society for Psychical Research is now in a position to invite the adhesion of Members. It is desirable to quote here a preliminary Note, which appears on the first page of the Society's Constitution.

"NOTE.—To prevent misconception, it is here expressly stated that Membership of this Society does not imply the acceptance of any particular explanation of the phenomena investigated, nor any belief as to the operation, in the physical world, of forces other than those recognised by Physical Science."

The privileges and conditions of Membership are defined by Rules IV. and V. as follows:—

Rule IV. The Society shall consist of:—

(a) *Members*, who shall contribute not less than two guineas annually, and who shall be entitled to hold any of the offices of the Society; to vote in the election of the Governing Council, and at all meetings of the Society; to use its Reading-rooms and Libraries; to borrow books from its Libraries; and to the free receipt of any journal, transactions, or periodical publication which may be issued by the Council.

(b) *Associates*, who shall contribute not less than one guinea annually, and who shall be entitled to attend all meetings of the Society, except such as are convened for business purposes only; and shall have free access to its Reading Rooms and Libraries.

Rule V. All Members and Associates of the Society shall be elected by the Council. Every candidate for admission shall be proposed in writing by two or more Members or Associates, who, on his behalf, and by his authority, shall assent to the Constitution and Rules of the Society, and consent to abide and be governed by them. One of them shall also certify in writing, from personal knowledge of him, that he is a fit person for admission.

Every such certificate having been read and approved at a meeting of the Council, the election shall be proceeded with. The election to be by ballot, and one black ball in six to exclude. The Council shall cause the result to be made known to the candidates, who, if elected, shall be furnished with a certificate of election, and a copy of the constitution and rules.

Ladies are eligible either as Members or Associates.

Meetings of the Society will be held from time to time; and the proceedings of the Meetings, or other papers, will be published when occasion requires. Rooms will be taken and a Library opened so soon as the funds of the Society may justify this step.

A list of the President, Vice-Presidents, and Council of the Society, as at present constituted, is subjoined:—

PRESIDENT.

Henry Sidgwick, Esq., Trinity College, Cambridge.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

Arthur J. Balfour, Esq., M.P., 4, Carlton-gardens, S.W.

W. F. Barrett, Esq., F.R.S.E., 18, Belgrave-square, Monkstown, Dublin.

John R. Holland, Esq., M.P., 57, Lancaster-gate, London, W.

Richard H. Hutton, Esq., Englefield-green, Staines.

Rev. W. Stainton-Moses, M.A., 21, Birchington-road, London, N.W.

Hon. Roden Noel, 57, Anerley Park, London, S.E.

Professor Balfour Stewart, F.R.S., Owen's College, Manchester.

Hensleigh Wedgwood, Esq., 31, Queen Anne-street, London, W.

COUNCIL:

W. F. Barrett, 18, Belgrave-square, Monkstown, Dublin.

Edward T. Bennett, 8, The Green, Richmond, near London.

Mrs. Boole, 103, Seymour-place, Bryanston-square, London, W.

Walter R. Browne, 38, Belgrave-road, London, S.W.

Alexander Calder, 1, Hereford-square, South Kensington, London, S.W.

Walter H. Coffin, Junior Athenæum Club, London, W.

Desmond G. FitzGerald, 6, Akerman-road, Brixton, S.W.

Edmund Gurney, 26, Montpelier-square, London, S.W.

Charles C. Massey, 1, Albert Mansions, Victoria-street London, S.W.

Frederic W. H. Myers, Leckhampton, Cambridge.

Francis W. Percival, 28, Savile-row, London, W.

Frank Podmore, 16, Southampton-street, Fitzroy-square, London, W.

C. Lockhart Robertson, M.D., Hamam Chambers, 76, Jermyn-street, S.W.

E. Dawson Rogers, Rose Villa, Church-end, Finchley, N.

Rev. W. Stainton-Moses, 21, Birchington-road, London, N.W.

Morell Theobald, 62, Granville-park, Blackheath, S.E.

Hensleigh Wedgwood, 31, Queen Anne-street, London, W.

G. Wyld, M.D., 12, Great Cumberland-place, London, W.

The Council desire to conduct their investigations as far as possible through private channels; and they invite communications from any person, whether intending to join the Society or not, who may be disposed to favour them with a record of experiences or with suggestions for inquiry or experiment. Such communications will be treated, if desired, as private and confidential.

Letters relating to particular classes of phenomena should be addressed to the Hon. Secs. of the respective Committees, as follows:—

(1) Committee on Thought-reading; Hon. Sec., Professor W. F. Barrett, 18, Belgrave-square, Monkstown, Dublin.

(2) Committee on Mesmerism; Hon. Sec., Dr. Wyld, 12, Great Cumberland-place, London, W.

(3) Committee on Reichenbach's Experiments; Hon. Sec., Walter H. Coffin, Esq., Junior Athenæum Club, London, W.

(4) Committee on Apparitions, Haunted Houses, &c.; Hon. Sec., Hensleigh Wedgwood, Esq., 31, Queen Anne-street, London, W.

(5) Committee on Physical Phenomena; Hon. Sec., Dr. C. Lockhart Robertson, Hamam Chambers, 76, Jermyn-street, S.W.

(6) Literary Committee; Hon. Secs., Edmund Gurney, Esq., 26, Montpelier-square, S.W.; Frederic W. H. Myers, Esq., Leckhampton, Cambridge.

Letters of inquiry or application for Membership may be addressed to the Hon. Secretary, Edward T. Bennett, 8, The Green, Richmond, near London.

[We are glad to hear that Rule V. quoted above requiring personal knowledge on the part of the proposer, as an essential qualification for membership in the S.P.R., is about to be relaxed, and that the Council will, at its discretion, accept any responsible introduction. This will make it much easier for those desirous of joining the Society who may not be acquainted with any of its present members.—Ed. of "LIGHT."]

SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

General Meeting of Members.

The first general meeting of members of the recently-established Society for Psychical Research was held at Willis's Rooms, King-street, St. James's, on Monday afternoon last, to receive a report from Professor Barrett, Mr. F. W. H. Myers, and Mr. E. Gurney, the committee appointed to investigate the phenomenon of thought-reading.

Mr. Henry Sidgwick, President of the Association, occupied the chair, supported on the platform by Professor Balfour Stewart, Professor W. F. Barrett, Mr. Frederic W. H. Myers, Mr. E. Gurney, and the Rev. A. M. Creery. The company also included:—Rev. W. Done Bushell, Mr. and Mrs. Walter R. Browne, Mr. P. G. Bidder, junr., Mrs. Bidder, Mr. T. O. Bonser, Mr. Geo. Barlow, Mr. J. J. Bodmer, Mrs. Boole, Mr. and Mrs. E. T. Bennett, Rev. and Mrs. Astley Cock, Mr. Walter F. Coffin, Mr. Alex. Calder, Miss H. Isabel Cooper, Miss Viola Cramp, Miss Beatrice Cramp, Mr. F. Collingwood, Mr. J. S. Crisp, Mr. E. W. Firth, Mr. Ernest B. Florence, Miss Greenfield, Miss Houghton, Sir Stuart Hogg, Lieutenant-Colonel J. Hartley, Mr. George Lance, Rev. W. Stainton-Moses, Mr. C. C. Massey, Mr. T. Douglas Murray, Mr. J. J. Morse, Mr. T. L. Nichols, M.D., Mr. F. Podmore, Mr. Paice, Mr. Edw. R. Pease, Mr. F. W. Percival, Mr. J. E. Purdon, M.D., the Misses Ridley, Mr. E. Dawson Rogers, Mr. J. Howard Spalding, Mr. H. Stock, Miss Stables, Mr. M. Theobald, Mr. J. W. Warre Tyndale, Mr. and Mrs. Tindall, Mr. and Mrs. Tebb, Mr. Geo. Wyld, M.D., Rev. Canon Basil Wilberforce and Mrs. Wilberforce, Mr. Matthew W. Webb, Mr. F. B. Ward, &c., &c.

The President, in opening the proceedings, said: Ladies and gentlemen,—Before we proceed to what has been marked out as the business of this meeting, as it is the first general meeting of our new Society since the time it was definitely constituted, it has been thought that I should make a few brief remarks on the aims and methods of the Society, which will form a kind of explanation in supplement to the prospectus defining those aims and methods,—which, I suppose, has been seen by all the members, and perhaps by some who are not as yet members. This prospectus has not been subjected to much instructive criticism. It has been received, either with entire credulity, or with guarded neutrality, or with uninformative contempt. Still, several private criticisms on that prospectus and questions suggested by it have come to my notice; and it seems to me that I might perhaps employ the few minutes of your time that I wish to take up in no better way than in replying to these criticisms and objections. The first question I have heard is, Why form a Society for Psychical Research at all at this time, including in its scope, not merely the phenomena of thought-reading (to which your attention will be directed chiefly this afternoon), but also those of clairvoyance and mesmerism, and the mass of obscure phenomena commonly known as Spiritualistic? Well, in answering this, the first question, I shall be able to say something on which I hope we shall all agree; meaning by "we," not merely we who are in this room, but we and the scientific world outside; and as, unfortunately, I have but few observations to make on which so much agreement can be hoped for, it may be as well to bring this into prominence, namely, that we are all agreed that the present state of things is a scandal to the enlightened age in which we live. (Applause.) That the dispute as to the reality of these marvellous phenomena,—of which it is quite impossible to exaggerate the scientific importance, if only a tenth part of what has been alleged by generally credible witnesses could be shown to be true,—I say it is a scandal that the dispute as to the reality of these phenomena should still be going on, that so many competent witnesses should have declared their belief in them, that so many others should be profoundly interested in having the question determined, and yet that the educated world, as a body, should still be simply in the attitude of incredulity. While the primary aim of our Society, the thing which we all unite to promote, whether as believers or non-believers, is to make a sustained and systematic attempt to remove this scandal in one way or another, some of those whom I address feel, no doubt, that this attempt can only lead to the proof of most of the alleged phenomena; some, again, think it probable that most, if not all, will be disproved. But regarded as a Society, we are quite unpledged, and as individuals, we are all agreed that any particular investigation that we may make should be carried

on with a single-minded desire to ascertain the facts, and without any foregone conclusion as to their nature. But then here comes the second question, which I have had put by many who are by no means unfriendly to our efforts,—that is, Why should this attempt succeed more than so many others that have been made during the last thirty years? To this question there are several answers. The first is, that the work has to go on. The matter is far too important to be left where it now is, and, indeed, if we compare the importance of the questions still in dispute, which we hope to try to solve, with the importance of other scientific problems on which years of patient and unbroken investigation have been employed, we may say that nothing like sufficient evidence has yet been devoted to our problems; that even if we were to grant that previous efforts had completely failed, that would still be no adequate reason for not renewing them. But, again, I should say that previous efforts have not failed; it is only true that they have not completely succeeded. Important evidence has been accumulated, important experience has been gained, and important effects have been produced upon the public mind. I say that important evidence has been accumulated; and here I should like to answer a criticism that I have privately heard which tends to place the work of our Society in a rather invidious aspect. It is supposed that we throw aside *en bloc* the results of previous inquiries as untrustworthy, and arrogate to ourselves a superior knowledge of scientific method or intrinsically greater trustworthiness—that we hope to be believed, whatever conclusions we may come to, by the scientific world, though previous inquirers had not found that to be the case. Certainly I am conscious of making no assumption of this kind. I do not presume to suppose that I could produce evidence better in quality than much that has been laid before the world by writers of indubitable scientific repute—men like the late Professor De Morgan, Mr. Crookes, and Mr. Wallace. But it is clear that from what I have defined as the aim of the Society, however good some of its evidence may be in quality, we require a great deal more of it. I do not mean to dispute,—it is not now the time to dispute,—with any individual who holds that reasonable persons, who have looked carefully into the evidence that has been so far obtained, ought to be convinced by that evidence; but the educated world, including many who have given much time and thought to this subject, are not yet convinced, and therefore we want more evidence. If anyone asks me what I mean by, or how I define, sufficient scientific proof of thought-reading, clairvoyance, or the phenomena called Spiritualistic, I should ask to be allowed to evade the difficulties of determining in the abstract what constitutes adequate evidence. What I mean by *sufficient evidence* is evidence that will convince the scientific world, and for that we obviously require a good deal more than we have so far obtained. Again, I do not mean that some effect on the world outside has not been produced. If that were so we could not hope to do much. The advocates of obstinate incredulity—I mean the incredulity that waves the whole affair aside without further inspection—I think, feel that now their case is not, even in their own eyes, *primâ facie* so strong as it was. I mean evidence that will win a deaf ear. Thirty years ago it was thought that want of scientific culture was an adequate explanation of the vulgar belief in mesmerism and table-turning. Then, as one man of scientific repute after another came forward with the results of individual investigation, there was a quite ludicrous ingenuity exercised in finding reasons for discrediting this scientific culture. He was said to be an amateur, not a professional; or a specialist without adequate generality of view and training; or a mere discoverer not acquainted with the strict methods of experimental research; or he was not a Fellow of the Royal Society, or if he was it was by an unfortunate accident;—(laughter)—or again, natural distrust came in, it was chiefly in America that these things went on; or as I was told myself, some years ago, in Germany, it was only in England, or America, or France, or Italy, or Russia, or some half-educated country, but not in the land of *Geist*. Well, these things are changed now, and though I do not think this kind of argument has quite gone out of use yet it has on the whole been found more difficult to work; and our obstinately incredulous friends, I think, are now generally content to regard the interest that men of undisputed scientific culture take in these phenomena as an unexplained mystery, like the phenomena themselves. Then again, to turn to a different class of objectors, I think, though I do not wish to overrate the change, that the attitude of the clergy has sensibly altered. A generation ago the investigator of the pheno-

mena of Spiritualism was in danger of a formidable alliance of scientific orthodoxy and religious orthodoxy; but I think that this alliance is now harder to bring about; the danger is less. Several most enlightened clergy and laity who attend to the state of religious evidences have come to feel that the general principles on which incredulous science explains off-hand the evidence for these modern marvels are at least equally cogent against the records of ancient miracles, that the two bodies of evidence *primâ facie* must stand or fall together, or at least must be dealt with by the same methods. Then, again, a generation ago we were directed to go to the conjurers, and told that we should see that the whole thing was conjuring, and I quite think that the direction was to a great extent just and important. It is highly desirable that the investigation of these matters should be carried on by men who have tried to acquaint themselves with the performances of conjurers. But we can no longer be told off-hand that all the marvels recorded by Mr. Crookes, Mr. Wallace, and others, are easy conjuring tricks, because we have the incontrovertible testimony of conjurers to the contrary. They may be conjuring tricks, but they are at any rate tricks that conjurers cannot find out. For these various reasons I think we may say that on the whole matters are now more favourable for an important reception of the results of our investigation, so far as we can succeed in obtaining any positive results, than they were twenty years ago. In saying this I do not in the least wish to ignore or make light of the evidence that has been accumulated in the recent years to show that at least a great part of the extraordinary phenomena referred to Spiritual agency by Spiritualists in England and America are really due to trickery and fraud of some kind. I had this in view when I said just now that important experience had been gained by preceding investigations. This is certainly part of the experience, and I believe that no Spiritualist denies its importance. It would, however, be a mistake to suppose that investigators, or even believers in mesmerism or Spiritualistic phenomena twenty years ago, had not their eyes open to the part played in these phenomena by fraud. My interest in this subject dates back for nearly twenty years, and I quite remember that when I began to look into the matter, nearly every educated Spiritualist that I came across, however firmly convinced, warned me against fraud, and emphasised his warning by impressive anecdotes. It is merely a question of degree, and I think it would be untrue not to admit that recent experiences have changed the view of many with regard to the degree. I think that Spiritualists in general—I mean educated, scientific, cultivated ones—were not prepared for the amount of fraud which has recently come to light, nor for the obstinacy with which the mediums against whom fraud has been proved have been afterwards defended, and have in fact been able to go on with what I may, without offence, call their trade, after exposure no less than before. And this leads me to the point which is chiefly characteristic of the method of investigation which our Society will, I hope, in the main use. Though it would be a mistake to lay down a hard and fast rule that we may not avail ourselves of the services of paid performers or paid mediums, still we shall, as much as possible, direct our investigation to phenomena where no ordinary motives to fraud, at any rate I may say no pecuniary motives, can come in. There, of course, has always been a mass of evidence of this kind. In fact, I think everyone who has become convinced of the reality of the phenomena, or has become strongly and persistently convinced that there is a *primâ facie* case for investigation, has had his attention first attracted by narratives of what has gone on in private families or private circles where none but relatives or intimate friends have been concerned. Now, the great gain that I hope may accrue from the formation of this Society is that the occurrence of phenomena—under circumstances *primâ facie* inexplicable by any ordinary natural laws—may be more rapidly and more extensively communicated to us who desire to give our time to the investigation, so that in the first instance we may carefully sift the evidence, guard against dangers and deceptions, or illusions which even here may come in, and then, when the evidence has been sifted by accumulation of personal experiments, make it more available for the purpose of producing general conviction. As I said before, I do not mean to claim for myself or my colleagues either any special aptitude for investigation, or any special claim to the credence of mankind, as compared with the members of private households or circles of

friends where the phenomena may in the first instance occur. But in a matter so strange to ordinary experience I think we may say that it is only gradually that a man learns the complicated precautions that have to be taken in order to exclude all conceivable possibility of illusion or deception. Certainly my own experience is that I only learnt what had to be done in this way, and had to be guarded against, in a gradual way by experience; and as regards the credibility, the important point to bear in mind is that every additional witness who, as De Morgan said, has a fair stock of credit to draw upon, is an important gain. Though his credit alone will not do for the demand that is made on it, his draft will help. For we must not expect any decisive effect in the direction at which we primarily aim, on the common sense of mankind, from any single piece of evidence, however complete it has been made. Scientific incredulity has been so long in growing, and has so many and so strong roots, that we shall only kill it, if we are able to kill it at all, as regards any of those questions, by burying it alive under a heap of facts. We must keep “pegging away,” as Lincoln said; we must accumulate fact upon fact, and add experiment upon experiment, and, I should say, not wrangle too much with incredulous outsiders about the conclusiveness of any one, but trust to the mass of evidence for conviction. The highest point of demonstrative force that we can obtain out of any single record of investigation is, of course, limited by the trustworthiness of the investigator. We have done all that we can when the critic has nothing left to allege except that the investigator is in the trick. But when he has nothing else left to allege he will allege that. We shall, I hope, make a point of bringing no evidence before the public until we have got it to this point of cogency. I think it is desirable on various grounds, but one ground is, I think, this: It is due to the private families or private circles of friends whom we hope to persuade to allow us to take part in their experiments, not to leave the subject or the medium of the phenomena—when we have convinced ourselves, by our own methods, of the genuineness of the phenomena—to bear alone the injurious statement of any incredulous materialist who may find it needful to attack our experiments. We must drive the objector into the position of being forced either to admit the phenomena as inexplicable, at least by him, or to accuse the investigators either of lying or cheating or of a blindness or forgetfulness incompatible with any intellectual condition except absolute idiocy. I am glad to say that this result, in my opinion, has been satisfactorily attained in the investigation of thought-reading. Professor Barrett will now bring before you a report which I hope will be only the first of a long series of similar reports which may have reached the same point of conclusiveness.

Professor Barrett then read the Committee's Report on Thought-reading. It was a lengthy document, and some parts of it have already appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* and in a recent number of “LIGHT.” The following, however, will be new to our readers.

For several years past the members of this Sub-Committee have been gathering evidence on the obscure but important question of what may be termed *supersensuous perception*. Stray facts met with from time to time in the course of our own observations, or related to us by competent witnesses, led us to doubt the sufficiency of the popular physiological explanations to account for all cases, and encouraged us to persevere in an inquiry which may be stated in the form of the following proposition:—

Is there or is there not any existing or attainable evidence that can stand fair physiological criticism, to support a belief that a vivid impression or a distinct idea in one mind can be communicated to another mind without the intervening help of the recognised organs of sensation? And if such evidence be found, is the impression derived from a rare or partially developed and hitherto unrecognised sensory organ, or has the mental-percept been evoked directly without any antecedent sense-percept? The nature and the laws of this direct action of mind on mind would of course form the subject of prolonged subsequent discussion and inquiry whenever the evidence in its favour had accumulated sufficiently. The object of the present report is to place on record the first instalment of the evidence which we have been collecting bearing on this subject, so that when the facts have sufficiently accumulated an intelligent conclusion may be formed.

The present state of scientific opinion throughout the world is not only hostile to any belief in the possibility of transmitting the simplest mental concept, except through the ordinary channels of sensation, but, generally speaking, it is hostile even to any inquiry upon the matter. Every leading physiologist and psychologist down to the present time has relegated what, for want of a better term, has been called “Thought-reading” to the limbo of exploded fallacies. In the July number of the *Nineteenth Century* the senior assistant physician at Westminster Hospital expresses his amazement at the hardihood of

any one having the slightest pretence to scientific knowledge daring to put forth evidence in favour of thought-reading; and a recent writer in the *Saturday Review* gives utterance to the general scientific attitude of the present day on this subject, when he remarks that "we thought we had heard the last of thought-reading." Dr. W. B. Carpenter, whose name and distinguished contributions to the science and literature of physiology command universal recognition and respect, finds in the so-called thought-reading a striking confirmation of views he has long advocated, that the "communications are made by unconscious muscular action on the part of one person and automatically interpreted by the other." Where collusion does not come into play all that Dr. Carpenter has ever seen or heard rests upon the "intermediation of those expressional signs which are made and interpreted alike unconsciously.* Dr. H. Maudsley in his "Pathology of Mind" takes the same view as Dr. Carpenter, treating the subject as hardly worthy of serious refutation. Others might be quoted in the same sense; collusion, hallucination, unconscious interpretation of unconsciously imparted signs, one or all of these causes furnish, according to the physiologists of to-day, abundant explanation of the phenomena under investigation.

Twelve months ago, the performances of Mr. Irving Bishop having attracted considerable attention, a small committee of distinguished men investigated the matter, and after a few and rather hastily conducted experiments, a report, approved of by the other members of the committee, was drawn up by Mr. G. J. Romanes, and published in *Nature* for June 23rd, 1881. The report indicates that one member of the committee, Professor Ray Lankester, absolutely refused to countenance the idea of thought-reading, and objected to the other members—Professor Croom Robertson, Mr. F. Galton, and Mr. Romanes—giving even a fair trial to "so puerile a hypothesis." The trial was, however, made, and the result is thus stated: "From these experiments it is needless to say we did not anticipate any results, but, with the exception of Professor Lankester, we thought it worth while to make them, not only because Mr. Bishop seemed to desire it, but also to satisfy the general public that we had given the hypothesis of 'thought-reading' as well as that of 'muscle-reading' a fair trial."

Since then Mr. Stuart Cumberland has been rivalling Mr. Bishop in certain pseudo-scientific exhibitions of so-called mind-reading that have reached considerable notoriety throughout the country. Two members of our committee, Mr. Myers and Mr. Gurney, have tested Mr. Bishop's and Mr. Cumberland's powers, with, however, no decisive results, so far as the experiments went and under the conditions imposed.

Mr. Bishop's and Mr. Stuart Cumberland's performances are in some respects identical with those exhibited some years past, by a Mr. Corey and others, in America. In a paper read before a scientific body in Detroit, and published in the *Detroit Review of Medicine* for August, 1875, Dr. T. A. McGraw describes as follows the method followed by Mr. Corey in his experiments: "Bringing himself," says Dr. McGraw, "into direct physical contact with some person, Mr. Corey was enabled to discover objects which that person had secreted, and to select from a multitude of objects the one upon which the willer was intent. All his performances were but variations upon these two strings. A hidden object was found, or a person, letter, or figure was picked out from a crowd of others. He usually brought himself into contact with his subject by grasping the subject's hand, and applying it to his own forehead, but sometimes placed his own hand also on the brow of his companion." The writer proceeds to shew that most of Mr. Corey's tests (like those of Mr. Bishop and Mr. Cumberland) are only ideas which can be expressed by the simplest kind of action. "He cannot detect any kind of an idea in such a way as to express it first by speech. Thus he cannot tell directly the date of a coin, nor can he discover it in any other manner than by choosing out the figures which represent it from among others on a table." It is obvious, as the writer goes on to say, that most of the actions "could be explained by the perception by a trained operator of involuntary and unconscious muscular movements."

Notwithstanding this, Dr. McGraw disbelieves in the explanation he has just given covering all the phenomena he witnessed, for he adds, "It seemed to me that there were features in these exhibitions which could not be satisfactorily explained on the hypothesis of involuntary muscular action, for . . . we are required to believe a man could unwillingly, and in spite of himself, give information by unconscious and involuntary signs that he could not give under the same circumstances by voluntary and conscious action. . . . It seems to me there is a hint towards the possibility of the nervous system of one individual being used by the active will of another to accomplish certain simple motions. There would be nothing inherently impossible in this when we recollect the strong similarities that exist between nervous and electrical forces; and as we know, it is possible to generate induced currents of electricity in coils of wire that are near to a primary electric coil; so we can imagine the nervous current to be continued into [induced in?] another body and act there upon the automatic centres of action. . . . The whole matter, however, needs as yet the most careful investigation before the phenomena can even be accepted as genuine."

* "Mesmerism, Spiritualism," &c., by Dr. W. B. Carpenter, pp. 53 and 55.

Dr. Beard, of New York, professes to have supplied this need, and in various papers—on "Trance," on the "Scientific Basis of Delusion," on "The Physiology of Mind Reading," &c.—published in the American "Popular Science Monthly" for 1876, 1877, and 1879, has, according to the high authority of Professor Croom Robertson (*Nature*, July 14th, 1881), "given a varied record of facts, and a series of carefully drawn conclusions." We have carefully read what Dr. Beard has written, and failed to find more than an amusing exhibition of self-assertiveness and magnificent waving aside of some of the most eminent names in the past and present records of scientific inquiry. Dr. Beard tells us that after incredible labour he has discovered six sources of error open to all who experiment with living human beings. "All of these errors are to be recognised, and systematically, and, if possible, simultaneously guarded against, if our results are to command the confidence and homage of science." These six sources of error are as follows:—

1. The phenomena of the involuntary life in both the experimenter and the subject,—embracing under this head trance as well as all actions below the plane of consciousness.

2. Unconscious deception on the part of the subject experimented on; which appears to be a particular instance of the general statement given in the first error.

3. Intentional deception on the part of the subject; experiments must be made without any regard to the moral character of the subject.

4. Unintentional collusion of third parties, meaning by this bystanders or assistants, seen or unseen; to avoid this the experiments must be made privately, or the audience kept absolutely silent.

5. Intentional collusion of third parties, i.e., assistance designedly given; difficult to guard against, for, as Dr. Beard remarks, intentional and deliberate deception is more common among the better classes than is generally imagined.

6. Chance and coincidences.

Concerning this last Dr. Beard remarks the only way to eliminate this error is by making comparative experiments with all the sources of error removed except chance. "In this way," he continues, "it was shewn that mind-reading, so-called, was really muscle-reading. In the researches I made on muscle-reading, it was shewn over and over that by pure chance only the blindfold subject would under certain conditions find the object looked for in one case, and sometimes in two cases out of twelve." The first two sources of error are, however, considered the most frequent and fatal, and to guard effectively against them "two, and only two, things are considered needful; one is a general knowledge of the phenomena of the involuntary life, and the other is so to deceive the subject experimented on that this involuntary action of his mind or body cannot come in and destroy the experiment."

But may not the experimenter himself be deceived by his foregone conclusions? In fact, we venture to think Dr. Beard and others have omitted one source of error more fatal to accuracy in interpreting the results obtained than perhaps any other. We allude to the strong prepossessions with which the subject is approached, a prejudice which concludes against their possibility, and which, if it does not preclude inquiry, destroys all calmness and impartiality in viewing the facts. It is undeniable that a strong mental bias in one direction is as objectionable on the side of scepticism as on the side of credulity. In either case it tends (1) to explain the facts in accordance with the mental bias, which may be erroneous; (2) to produce an actual mental disturbance, either perceptible or imperceptible, which in delicate mental operations may really be as fatal to their success as slight air disturbances in the indications of a galvanometer, or the introduction of a trace of a magnetic metal in the reading of a magnetometer. An amusing instance of the existence of mental prejudice among eminent scientific men is given by Miss Fox, in her recently published journals; she relates that the late Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, said to her, "When in Dublin Sir W. Hamilton mentioned to Airey some striking mathematical fact. He paused a moment, when Airey interposed with 'No, it cannot be.' Sir William mildly remarked, 'I have been investigating it closely for the last five months, and cannot doubt its truth.' 'But,' said Airey, 'I've been at it for the last five minutes, and cannot see it at all!'" Similar interlocutory remarks, and even published replies, are not unknown to the members of this Sub-Committee.

Hesitation in accepting any facts so novel, and, in many ways suspicious, as mind-reading is of course perfectly justifiable; and we are quite prepared for the need of intelligent criticism and prolonged experiment, before any generalisation from the facts can meet with wide acceptance. Of the value of this research our President has spoken, and to this we may add the testimony of a distinguished man of science, Dr. Angus Smith, who writes: "If we could prove the action of mind at a distance, by constant experiment, it would be a discovery that would make all other discoveries seem trifles."

[The report then goes on to describe the origin of this investigation and the means taken since 1876 to obtain information from various private sources. It proceeds.]

The cases that have come under our notice may be divided into four groups:—

I. Where some action is performed, the hands of the operator being in gentle contact with the subject of the experiment.

II. Where a similar result is obtained with the hands *not* in contact.

III. Where a number, name, word, or card has been guessed and expressed in speech or writing, *not* as before indicated, by a series of actions.

IV. Where similar ideas have simultaneously occurred, or impressions been formed, in minds far apart.

I. Whenever the hands are in contact or even communicate by a tense cord with the subject of the experiment, it is almost impossible to exclude giving faint indications to the guesser, which with a sensitive subject are interpreted into a sense of rightness or wrongness that ultimately may lead them to the hidden object.

[A series of experiments are here detailed which stretch this hypothesis to its utmost limits.]

Besides these cases we have received evidence of similar performances in private families in different parts of England—at Southampton, Southport, Colchester, Yarmouth, Cork, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Norwich, &c.; in all these cases we are greatly indebted to our informants, to whom we have given considerable trouble in correspondence; but none of these cases were so remarkable as to justify a personal visit, for the hypothesis of muscle-reading might, *prima facie*, be taken to account for all of them. Two cases however, one in London and one on the south coast, seemed deserving of more careful inquiry.

[Details of these cases are given, and though it was almost incredible that muscle-reading could account for what was done, yet, if these cases rested alone, the authors felt that they should not be justified in rejecting the received hypothesis, the limits of muscular sensibility being unknown.]

II. [The report then proceeds to give illustrations of cases where actions were performed *without* contact with the person willing, and then proceeds to]

III. Here there was no contact nor other known means of communication, between the subject and those who knew what was "willed." [Cases received on the testimony of trustworthy witnesses are narrated, and the report then goes on to detail the experiments made at Buxton with the children of the Rev. A. M. Creery.]

The results obtained when the family were present gain enormously in value if similar results can be shewn when none but strangers to the family know the word or card selected, or when the child who is the subject of the experiment is completely isolated from those who know the thing chosen. We will therefore first describe two series of experiments of this character, which appear to us to be absolutely unexceptionable and conclusive, so far as they go.

Easter, 1881. Present: Mr. and Mrs. Creery and family, and W. F. Barrett, the narrator. One of the children sent into an adjoining room, the door of which I saw was closed. On returning to the sitting-room and closing its door also, I thought of some object in the house, fixed upon at random; writing the name down, I showed it to the family present, the strictest silence being preserved throughout. We then all silently repeated the name of the thing selected. In a few seconds the door of the adjoining room was heard to open and after a very short interval the child would return to the sitting-room, generally speaking with the object selected. No one was allowed to leave the sitting-room after the object had been fixed upon; no communication with the child was conceivable as her place was often changed. Further, the only instructions given to the child were to fetch some object in the house that I would fix upon, and, together with the family, silently keep in mind to the exclusion, as far as possible, of all other ideas. In this way I wrote down, among other things, a *hair-brush*; it was brought; an *orange*; it was brought; a *wine glass*; it was brought; an *apple*; it was brought; a *toasting-fork*; failed on the first attempt, a pair of tongs being brought, but on a second trial it was brought. With another child [among other trials not here mentioned] a *cup* was written down by me; it was brought; a *saucer*; this was a failure, a plate being brought; no second trial allowed. The child being told it was a saucer, replied, "That came into my head but I hesitated as I thought it unlikely you would name saucer after cup as being too easy." This, some would think, shews pure guesswork, and invalidates the other results; but I prefer to let it stand, as taken in conjunction with our experience obtained in other ways, it indicates one source of failure, namely, that in delicate experiments of the kind here recorded (assuming them to be cases of thought transmission) the slightest effort of reason, or of will, on the part of the subject is sufficient to vitiate the success of the experiment. No doubt the chief source of failure is to be found in the difficulty of suppressing the more vivid impressions made on the mind by the ordinary channels of sensation. We may compare this to the action of a die in stamping; light pressure of the die will yield a delicate and faithful impression, or a blurred and imperfect one, or none at all, according to the nature of the material that is stamped, or the prior existence of any deeply cut impression.

Returning to our experiments, the result of two or three

evenings' protracted trials convinced me that we had here something that could not be explained by any recognised theory.

The second series of experiments, which we venture to think are unexceptionable, were made by my colleagues in this inquiry—Mr. Myers and Mr. Gurney—together with two ladies who were entire strangers to the family. None of the family knew what was chosen; the type of thing selected was told only to the child. The experimenters took every precaution that experience could suggest against any faint indications from them reaching the child on her return to the room, who stood near the door with downcast eyes. In this way the following results were obtained:—

April 13th, 1882. A white pen-knife was fixed on, and rightly named with the colour on the first trial; the four of spades was then selected but was a failure; the four of hearts was rightly named on the first trial; as were also the king of hearts, the two of diamonds, and the ace of hearts. Another child having been selected, the nine of spades was rightly named on the first trial; the five of diamonds having been selected, the four of diamonds, the four of hearts, the five of diamonds were successively guessed; the two of spades was rightly named at once. In five more trials with all the children, two were right and three were wrong. In these fourteen trials ten were right and four wrong.

Now if we apply to these trials the sources of error enumerated by Dr. Beard, we find that the conditions under which the experiments were made render it a most remote possibility that any one of these errors could have crept in. *Involuntary whispering or gesture* was eliminated in the first series by the child being out of ear and eye shot; *collusion*, by the fact that none were allowed to leave their seats after we had selected at random the word or card; *illusion*, by the fact that the object wished for was silently written down by me, and the object itself brought into the room by the child; *chance and coincidences* by the number of successful trials, e.g., in the second series there were ten right to four wrong, the chances being one right to fifty-one wrong in any single trial.

The experiments were continued over several days, a total of 382 trials being made; of these 127 were right on the first attempt, 56 on the second attempt, and 19 on the third attempt—though a third trial was seldom allowed. This gives a total of 202 successes to 180 failures. In many trials, such as the guessing of fictitious names, made up by us on the spur of the moment, the chances against success were, of course, incalculable; yet, as will be seen by the following record taken from our last day's experimenting, these names were guessed with as much ease as cards, where the chances were far less. In the following experiments the thing selected was known to the family, who, however, never left their places after we had written down the word and silently handed it round, the child being then recalled by one of us. There were present Mr. Gurney and Mr. Myers (Professor Barrett having left the day before) and the family.

Morning of April 17th, 1882. [After a series of rather less successful trials with the other children, which there is not room here to record, the eldest daughter became the subject, who, upon returning to the room, guessed as follows, no word being spoken, the guesser standing nearer to the authors than the family, and in the first half-dozen trials with her back to her father. *The guesses are printed in italics*; many will be seen to be right on the first attempt.]

Miss Mary Creery. Cards first chosen: Six spades, eight clubs, eight spades. Ace of diamonds, ace of diamonds. Queen of hearts, queen of hearts. Two of clubs, two of clubs. Ten of spades, ten of spades. Ten of diamonds, ten of diamonds. Five of spades, five of spades. Two of spades, two of spades. Five of diamonds, five of diamonds. Three of clubs, four of clubs, five of clubs, three of clubs. King of clubs, ace of diamonds, knave of clubs, king of clubs. Five of spades, four of spades, five of spades. Seven of diamonds, five of diamonds, five of clubs, seven of diamonds. Queen of spades, queen of spades. Six of spades, six of spades. Three of spades, four of spades, three of spades. Knave of diamonds, ace of diamonds, knave of diamonds. Eight of hearts, nine of hearts, nine of diamonds, nine of diamonds. Knave of clubs, king of clubs, knave of clubs. Four of clubs, four of clubs. Nine of hearts, five of hearts, nine of hearts. Two of clubs, two of clubs. Six of clubs, six of clubs. King of clubs, knave of clubs, king of clubs. Nine of hearts, nine of diamonds, nine of hearts. Ten of clubs, ten of clubs. Ace of clubs, ace of clubs. Five of clubs, five of clubs. Seven of clubs, five of diamonds, seven of clubs. Knave of hearts, knave of clubs, knave of diamonds, knave of hearts.

Fictitious words were now chosen; during some of these trials Mr. Creery was absent. Miss Mary was the guesser in the first five trials, then Maud was selected; the guesses are again indicated by italics:—William Stubbs, William Stubbs. Eliza Holmes, Eliza H.—. Isaac Harding, Isaac Harding. Sophia Shaw, Sophia Shaw. Hester Willis, Cassandra Wilson. John Jones, John Jones. Timothy Taylor, Tom Taylor. Esther Ogle, Esther Ogle. Arthur Higgins, Arthur Higgins. Alfred Henderson, Alfred Henderson. Amy Frogmore, Amy Freeman, Amy Frogmore. Albert Snelgrove, Albert Singrove, Albert Grover.

The above results were obtained in the order they are given

EVERY trial made on the last day being recorded, and we need hardly say no unfavourable results omitted and no question and answer allowed.

[The report then passes on to discuss the fourth group of cases, where ideas have apparently been communicated to persons far apart, without any known mode of communication. We hope to give particulars of these in a subsequent number.]

Professor Balfour Stewart : Mr Chairman,—After the exhaustive report that we have had from Professor Barrett upon thought-reading, I shall only trouble you with a very few remarks. As one who has been engaged more in physical science than in anything else, I may perhaps be allowed to give an illustration from physical science that has reference to the best method of obtaining evidence of infrequent phenomena. It so happens that there is in science a phenomenon that has been frequently observed by trustworthy observers, but that until very recently has hardly been accepted at all as anything that could possibly have occurred. I allude to the case of globular lightning. It was said in objection to all the evidence with reference to globular lightning, that is to say, a thunder-bolt travelling at a slow rate, and afterwards exploding and giving rise to lightnings of the ordinary kind, that what occurs is an electric discharge and that all electric discharges must necessarily take place in a moment of time inappreciably small. Of late years, however, some physicists have suggested that this globular lightning, instead of being an ordinary electric discharge, is really a sort of travelling Leyden jar, and I believe one foreign observer has shewn in some experiments that something analogous to that on a small scale may be artificially produced. I think I am entitled to say that a change of tone has consequently taken place among physicists with regard to the evidence for globular lightning. The evidence of course remains as before. A little additional evidence accumulates now and then, but the great bulk remains as it was. The fact that we are able to explain this phenomenon without overthrowing entirely our received views on electricity, has certainly enabled people to accept that evidence that they would not have accepted before. Thus we see that the reason why this evidence was not accepted before, was because the hypothesis with regard to electric discharges was insufficient. We imagined that there could not be anything but an ordinary electric discharge: we did not imagine the possibility of what may be called a travelling Leyden jar. Now there is no question, I think, that the ordinary way in which we have communications from one human being to another, is by means of what may be called the five senses. No one, of course, disputes that, but I do not know that this fact, any more than any other scientific fact, or any scientific law, should be taken as absolutely final and complete. Scientific experience has always shewn that we go from one generalisation to another. First of all we bind together a number of facts by what may be called a working hypothesis, which we may call a generalisation of the first order. Afterwards we find that there are slight departures from this working hypothesis, and then we are led to reflect on these departures, and are ultimately led to a higher law. Now if we were to treat this first generalisation or working hypothesis as something absolutely final, we should be able to gain no more information upon the subject. Surely it would not be the right way for any one who has come to a first generalisation to set his face against all extensions of it, neither making extensions himself nor trusting to the evidence of any others who may profess to have done so. But this is exactly the position taken up by physiologists with regard to the possibility of thought-reading. It has been recognised throughout the world,—and all of us who are here recognise it as completely as any,—that the five senses are the ordinary and established means by which communications are made; but that physiologists should regard this as an absolutely final and complete statement is decidedly against all scientific analogy, and that they should decline, as some have done, to see experiments themselves or refuse credit to those who have done so, is to pursue a very objectionable method. I quite think that the mode in which our Chairman has put it is the best possible mode. We have, as he said, to bring evidence in such a way before the public that they must either believe the phenomena or be compelled to say “We do not trust those who brought them forward;” and I think that in this respect the report that has been read by Professor Barrett, and the observations made by him and Mr. Myers and Mr. Gurney, have certainly succeeded wonderfully well. The only possible way of disputing the evidence is by hinting at the untrustworthiness of those gentlemen who have given it, and consequently I think

their efforts must be regarded as successful. Professor Barrett, Mr. Gurney, and Mr. Myers have, as you are aware, put things in such a way that if they are to be denied you must dispute the trustworthiness of those gentlemen. Professor Hopkinson and myself have not been equally successful; in fact we did not try to be so: we had not the same time to devote to the inquiry. The experiments were made in the same house and with the same host, and they are valuable, I think, at any rate, in confirming the conclusions arrived at by those gentlemen from their experiments. If they are to be disputed on account of untrustworthiness, it is clear *a priori* that the charge of untrustworthiness must be extended so as to embrace Professor Hopkinson and myself, and perhaps also the gentleman who was kind enough to give us the opportunity of seeing the experiments performed—perhaps to include us all—but I do not think that any of us will mind that very much. I should like to say a word with regard to the last series of phenomena or the extension of thought-reading at a distance, which Professor Barrett brought before the meeting. I devoted a great deal of attention to reading evidence on this particular point, and I certainly think that if we can rely upon evidence we have here a very strong body of evidence for some kind of action at a distance, particularly for the appearance of one individual to another at a distant point at the time of death. The reason for my bringing up this case is that while there is very strong evidence for something of the kind, I have been much surprised that it has not been put upon such a footing as would certainly commend itself to all men of science from without. Of course, it is a matter of delicacy for an individual who has received a communication of this kind to make it public, but it would be a great boon and an addition to our knowledge if he would do so either by an ordinary letter to a newspaper or by giving the communication in some kind of cypher. In such a case if, before the intelligence of the death can have arrived, a communication of this kind is published, either openly or in cypher, there will be unimpeachable evidence of a character to satisfy any candid inquirer, that something peculiar has taken place. You must bear in mind that coincidence will not certainly explain a thing of that kind. Suppose, for instance, that an appearance presented itself to an individual at a distance, and that death happened within twenty minutes of this appearance. First of all, such an appearance is uncommon; then the probability of any person dying in a particular ten minutes is very small; and when the two things happen together you have to multiply the one probability by the other, and you will find that the probability of the united event is something which is inappreciably small, and consequently if a thing of that kind happens, it cannot be accounted for by any such hypothesis as coincidence. The few experiments which I took part in performing were performed at Buxton, at the house of a clergyman, who, I am glad to see, is present with us to-night. We paid two visits to his house. In the first instance, the thought-reader was behind a door. The object or thing thought of was written on paper and silently handed round to the company in the room. The thought-reader was then called in, and in the course, perhaps, of a minute, the answer was given. Definite objects in the room, for instance, were first thought of, and generally the answer was right. Then cards were thought of, and in the majority of cases the answer was correct. Then numbers were thought of, and the answers were generally right; but, of course, there were some cases of error. Then names of towns were thought of, and a good many of these were right. Then fancy names were thought of. When my colleague, Professor Hopkinson, had gone away, I was asked to think of certain fancy names, and mark them down and hand them round to the company. I then thought of, and wrote on paper “Blue Beard,” “Tom Thumb,” “Cinderella,” and the answers were all correct. I think it was the servant who answered Cinderella. There was some hesitation in getting her to pronounce the name, as she seemed to think she did not know it. On the occasion of the second visit, one of my colleagues at Owen’s College remarked that it would be more conclusive if the thought-reader, instead of turning her face to the company, turned her face to the wall; and that was accordingly done. The percentage of success was about as large as in the first instance. In one case, while the thought-reader remained behind the door, a card was chosen. I chose the “ace of hearts,” and the paper on which it was written down was handed round to the company. The child in a few moments called out “Ace of hearts!” These are all the experiments that I have to bring before you. While they cannot stand upon the same footing as those of Professor

Barrett and his colleagues, they may be considered, I think, as corroborative of the experiments of these gentlemen. At any rate, if they are objected to, it will be necessary for our opponents to extend somewhat the area of untrustworthiness. I have no doubt when this operation is done again and again the objectors will get tired of it, and the laugh will then be turned against themselves.

The following is Professor Balfour Stewart's detailed report of the experiments alluded to in his speech :—

On Saturday, November 12th, 1881, Professor Alfred Hopkinson and I went to the house of the Rev. A. M. Creery, at Buxton, whose children claim to have the power of thought-reading.

There were present, besides Mr. Creery, Miss Mary Creery, also Alice, Emily, Maud, Kathleen, children : and the servant Jane.

After a few preliminary trials, the following guesses were made, the guesser going out of the room until some object was thought of by the company, when she came in and tried to guess what object was in the thoughts of all. No questions asked nor observations made by the company.

First.—DEFINITE OBJECTS THOUGHT OF.

1. Pipe : Alice guessed plate, paper, then pipe.
2. Fork : Maud guessed it at once.
3. Cup : Emily guessed it at once.
4. Corkscrew : Jane guessed it at once.
5. Tongs : Miss Mary guessed fire-irons and then poker.

Second.—CARDS THOUGHT OF.

6. Three of Clubs : Jane guessed three of Spades, then three of Clubs.
7. Queen of Clubs : Miss Mary guessed three of Diamonds.
8. Four of Clubs : Maud guessed five of Clubs, then four of Clubs.
9. Ace of Diamonds : Jane guessed Ace of Clubs, then Ace of Diamonds.
10. King of Spades : Jane guessed four of Diamonds, then six of Diamonds.
11. King of Hearts : Maud guessed Knave of Hearts, then King of Hearts.
12. Ace of Spades : Maud guessed right at once.
13. King of Diamonds : Professor Stewart tried and guessed ten of Diamonds.
14. Three of Diamonds : Miss Mary guessed right at once.
15. Ace of Hearts : Alice guessed right at once.
16. King of Clubs : Professor Hopkinson tried and guessed Knave of Spades, then four of Hearts.
17. Mr. Creery and Professor Balfour Stewart tried but could not guess.

Third.—NUMBERS THOUGHT OF.

18. Forty-eight thought of : Jane guessed 34, 44, 84.
19. Sixty-seven thought of : Miss Mary guessed 66, then 67.
20. Fifty-five thought of : Maud guessed 54, 56, then 55.
21. Eighty-one thought of : Alice guessed 71, then 81.
22. Thirty-one thought of : Emily did not guess it.
23. Eleven thought of : Kathleen did not guess it.

Fourth.—OBJECTS THOUGHT OF.

The following objects were by previous agreement thought of by Professor Hopkinson and myself, the others being ignorant, and Mr. Creery being out of the room.

24. Falling Snow : None guessed it.
25. The Crescent, Buxton : (a place in Buxton given for a hint) : after either two or three wrong guesses given by others, Alice guessed the Crescent.
26. Mr. Creery thought of : (a person in Buxton given for a hint) : Alice guessed at once.
27. A flash of forked lightning thought of : Not guessed.

Fifth.—NAMES OF TOWNS THOUGHT OF.

28. Macclesfield : Jane did not guess rightly, then sat down, and shortly afterwards guessed rightly.
 29. York : Maud guessed Ashford, then York.
 30. Paris : Miss Mary did not guess rightly.
 31. Chester : Jane guessed Manchester, then Chester.
- (N.B.—During this series Mr. Creery was out of the room, seeing Professor Hopkinson off.)

Sixth.—FANCY NAMES.

32. Peter Piper : Alice guessed at once.
33. Bluebeard : Jane guessed at once.
34. Tom Thumb : Jane guessed at once.
35. Cinderella : Jane guessed at once.

BALFOUR STEWART.

I ought to state that the object thought of was marked on paper by one of the company, and handed round silently, so that all present might be aware of it.

I ought also to mention that the thought-reader was aware of the general character of the things thought of ; for instance, that it was definite objects in the first place ; cards in the second, and so on.—B.S.

Professor Hopkinson agrees with the above memorandum, except that after No. 29, Derby was put down as the name of a town, and Maud guessed right the first time.

In all the above cases—except two or three—the guesser's back was turned to the company.

While Mr. Creery and ourselves were downstairs, Miss Alice guessed the object held by Dr. Turner to be a gold ring without a stone, and with a kind of buckle on—all correct.

The President : The members of the Investigation Com-

mittee will be glad to hear and to reply to any objections that may be urged against the methods they have pursued. I may be permitted to say that though I have not been able to obtain results so satisfactory as those that the Committee have referred to, yet having paid two or three visits to Buxton I have obtained similar results to those which Professor Balfour Stewart has described, and have entirely satisfied myself as to the genuineness of the phenomena.

Dr. Nichols : As I have paid a good deal of attention during a large part of my life to these matters, I wish to say in the first place, with reference to Professor Stewart's introductory remarks, that when I was thirteen years old I once distinctly saw a thunderbolt, that is to say, a mass of light falling from a cloud. I compared it, in point of size, to a hog's head. It was a globular body, and it struck a large stump of a tree, the upper portion having been blown off, and then exploded as a cask of gunpowder might explode, making a loud reverberation, and throwing a mass of light all around. I suppose it shattered the stump of the tree, but I did not examine it. I do not know how the phenomenon occurs, and I simply give my testimony in regard to the fact. In carrying out your investigations, which appear to me to be extremely interesting, even to us who think we have gone a great deal further, I think success will depend upon two or three things, on the quietness, clearness, and a certain mental strength—or force, if you please—on the part of those who make the experiments, who try to impress ; and then a certain kind of impressibility on the part of those who are so impressed. Perhaps not one in twenty will be a good subject for the experiments. I think the Committee has been exceedingly fortunate in that respect. Perhaps several members of the same family are likely to possess by heredity or other influences the same constitution. I would say also that the literature of mesmerism or animal magnetism contains a great body of similar facts, and I would suggest to the Committee, if they see their way to it, that some use might be made of them in their investigation. In America the phenomenon has been called clairvoyance, and sometimes psychometry. The fact that strikes me particularly is that a letter written by a person, or even a piece of paper which has been in the hand of a person, may convey at a great distance to another who never saw or had any knowledge of him or her, a perfect idea of the character, the mind, and even the particular thoughts of the individual, not such as are written upon the paper, but which seem to be communicated through it or by means of it. It appears to me that there is a great range for experiments in all these directions.

The President : Perhaps the best answer that could be given to the question that has been raised with regard to the character of the persons best adapted to these experiments might be given by Mr. Creery, the father of the children whom he has kindly allowed to be seen by the investigators, and perhaps he will also tell us how these phenomena began.

The Rev. A. M. Creery : The phenomena began in this way. I happened to be a year and a-half ago at a dinner party of gentlemen who were talking about the "willing game," and asked me if I had ever seen it. I replied, "No, I don't believe a word of it ; it is all nonsense." A gentleman then said, "You should not condemn it." I replied, "But I do ; it is all bosh." He then said, "Have you any children ? if you have, when you go home try the experiment for yourself, and then if it does not succeed you may say it is bosh." On the next evening I said to the children, "I have a new game for you, the willing game." They went out of the room as directed, and we settled upon something that they were to do. I found at once that the successes so far preponderated over the failures that there must be something in it. Instead of going through the usual process, we thought of something, and then asked the children, "What object have we thought of ?" They generally guessed the right object, and the failures were very few. There were more failures on the first evening than there were afterwards. We persevered evening after evening. We first thought of objects in the room and out of the room. We then went to cards, then to names of towns, to dates upon coins, verses out of the Bible, lines from different poems, and so on—in fact, anything that we could think about and that those present could keep in their minds. After three or four evenings I was perfectly convinced that there was really something in it. When the children are in a good humour, and when those who are willing and taking part in the experiment devote themselves to it with energy, there is no difficulty at all in passing ideas from the mind of the willer to the mind of the thought-reader. The thought-reader

must, as I have said, be in a good humour, and must have confidence in himself or herself, and those who are willing must be determined that they will transfer their ideas, otherwise the success is highly problematical. I have seen some ladies and gentlemen at our house who, after choosing a card, did not seem to be thinking about it at all, but sat perfectly cool and quiet and unconcerned. When I am doing it I say to myself, "I am determined to send this five of hearts or ace of hearts upon your brain;" and then the child hardly ever makes a mistake. When a mistake is made it is generally the fault of those who are round about and not the fault of the thought-reader. I may say that this faculty is not by any means confined to our family. If it were it would be of no value, as it would be looked upon simply as an abnormal occurrence. It is far more general than any of us have any idea of. In order to test this we asked on many occasions the children of neighbours round about us, the same age as our own, to come and join us, and we generally found that these visitors, after one or two evenings, succeeded nearly as well as our own children. On the first evening they were perhaps rather diffident, and did not succeed, but on the second they improved, and on the third they were still better. I feel certain that if we had gone on for a sufficient length of time they would have been quite equal to our own children in thought-reading. Those who are desirous to ascertain the truth of the matter can do so in their own families or the families of friends about them. It is a very simple thing. The children are sent out of the room, and then the thought is fixed first upon some simple object in the room; afterwards, perhaps, on something not in the room; then a town or a person is named; and going on from one step to another, it will be found that there is hardly one failure in ten. I have myself known seventeen cards in succession rightly named the first time. On the last evening that Professor Stewart was with us I asked a friend of mine—a medical man in Buxton—to join us and to bring with him another friend, a solicitor. Professor Stewart was obliged to leave, but my friend the medical man, Dr. Turner, remained. During my short absence with Professor Stewart, Dr. Turner and his friend continued experiments, and this morning I have received from them this report of what was done on that evening.

With a friend (Mr. Orme), who appends his signature to these notes, which are copied from those taken on the moment, I visited the Rev. A. Creery on February 18th, 1882, for the purpose of witnessing the power of thought-reading possessed by his children. Arriving late, I saw little before those assembled for the purpose had left. However, in the absence of the Rev. A. Creery, I made an attempt to test the children's power, and with the following results, roughly chronicled I know, and imperfect as a searching test, but accurate as to the results obtained.

Miss Alice Creery.—

What do I hold in my hand? *Answer*—Spectacles. (Describe them.) Eye-glasses. (I had Mr. Orme's eye-glasses in my hand.)

What do I hold in my hand? *Answer*—Piece of paper. (No.) A knife. (Describe it.) It is white. (Describe further.) It has a toothpick and button-hook. (Correct; it had other implements useful to a smoker.)

What do I hold in my hand? *Answer*—A ring. (Describe it.) Has a buckle on it. (Correct.)

Miss Maud Creery.—

What town have we thought of? *Answer*—Buxton. (Correct.)

What town have we thought of? *Answer*—Derby. (What part did you first think of?) Railway station. (So did I.) Next, the market-place. (So did I.)

What town have we thought of? *Answer*—Something commencing with L. (Pause of a minute.) Lincoln. (Correct.)

What town have we thought of? *Answer*—Stockport. (Correct.)

What town have we thought of? *Answer*—Fairfield. (What part did you think of first?) The road to it. (So did I. What part next?) The triangular green behind the Bull's Head Inn. (So did I.)

Jane Dean, the maid servant.—

What do I take hold of in my pocket? *Answer*—Spectacle case. (Contain anything?) Empty. (Correct.)

What have I placed under the piano? *Answer*—A key. (What is it the key of?) A club. (One and a-half minute's pause.) No. The key of the Asylum. (It was the key of the Asylum grounds. No-one knew that I had a private key; I am not officially connected with the Asylum.)

What have we agreed to think of? *Answer*—A flower. (What is the name of the flower? Slight hesitation, then answered.) Lily of the valley. (No.) Immediately pointed to some flowers in Mr. Orme's coat. Snowdrop.

What have I in my hand? *Answer*—A Pin. (What colour?) Black. (What shape?) Bending her index finger and thumb into the shape of the letter C, she said, "That shape." (Unknown to anyone I had bent it to that shape.)

What card have I selected? *Answer*—Seven of hearts. (No.) Eight of hearts. (Which way is the point of the heart directed?) Upwards. (Correct.)

What card have I selected? *Answer*—Nine of spades. (Correct.) (Which way is the point of the spade directed?) Downwards. (Correct.)

No-one knew of the first card except Mr. Orme. No-one knew of the second card except myself.

FREDK. TURNER, M.R.C.S., Grafton House, Buxton.
JOHN H. ORME, Solicitor, Buxton.

July 14th, 1882.

So much has been said by Professor Barrett, Mr. Gurney, and Mr. Myers in the *Nineteenth Century* that any further statement may seem superfluous. Professor Barrett is no doubt right in saying that we are not yet in a position to theorise; still, we cannot help it. For myself, I am perfectly satisfied that an idea can be passed from one mind to another without any apparent external means of communication; and I cannot help asking myself what is the method by which it is accomplished. It may be said that it is the action at a distance of one mind upon another without an intervening medium. That is an idea that I can hardly conceive. Then it may be said that there is a medium between brain and brain, so that the motions of my brain cause waves to be produced in that medium, which set up similar motions in the brain of the thought-reader. That medium is thought by some persons to be the luminiferous ether or the vehicle that conveys heat and light to us. On the other hand, it may be a nerve atmosphere or aura, that extends only a certain distance from the mind of the willer, and as it were connects itself with the brain of the thought-reader. If we suppose that there is a nerve atmosphere extending only to a certain distance, one can understand how distance will materially interfere with success, as it does. But, of course, whether it is a nerve atmosphere or the luminiferous ether or simply a direct action at a distance, I for one am not in a position to say, and it must be a subject of further investigation.

Professor Balfour Stewart: Mr. Creery has told us that this thing is much more common than we imagine. I have no doubt that the Committee on Thought-reading will be shortly in communication with many persons upon this subject, and perhaps it would be an advantage if they prepared a kind of form in which the results could be recorded in the best way.

Mr. W. R. Browne: There is one point in Professor Barrett's report—the only one so far as I know—that is not quite clear; that is, the way in which the thought-reader was called into the room to answer the question, whether by one of the experimenters or by a member of the family, or whether it was done by spoken words or simply by some preconcerted signals. It might be alleged that there was some kind of communication opened at that moment.

Mr. Myers: The way in which the child was called was simply this. One or other of us—Mr. Gurney, Mr. Barrett, or myself—would sit on a chair close to the door, holding the door and seeing that the child went to the other end of the passage. When the time came for the child to come in we would suddenly open the door and say "Come along, Maud" (or whatever the name was), always using the same words and never allowing any stranger or any member of the family to call the child in.

Mr. W. R. Browne: I have tried some experiments myself, and they appeared at first to give a promise of success, but they were afterwards a failure. Assuming the theory advanced to be correct, I should be glad to know how a thought-reader distinguishes the promptings of other minds from the ideas occurring to his own mind. If the thing thought of is a card, however much of a blank you try to keep your mind, it is impossible but that the number of some particular card will suggest itself. How am I to tell whether that is a suggestion of my own mind or whether I am to regard it as a suggestion thrown into my mind from that of the experimenter? Have thought-readers any test to enable them to distinguish between the two?

Mr. Gurney: There is no doubt that foreign ideas do suggest themselves to the minds of these children, otherwise we should have more successes. What they say is that different cards keep

dodging in and out, but that the one which turns out eventually to be right keeps persisting. It comes and then vanishes, but it comes back again. Often the child is in doubt between two and three, but more often between two, and frequently when that is the case the wrong card is selected; then the child has a second shot and gives a right answer. I think Mr. Creery will say that that is correct.

Mr. Creery: Quite so.

Dr. Wyld: Does the power of the children increase with practice?

Mr. Creery: I can hardly answer that question. Sometimes we have not tried the experiments for perhaps two or three months, and then when some friends have happened to drop in, the experiments have been renewed, and the children have done as well as ever they did before. I have no doubt, however, that improvement comes by practice, because on the first or second nights that we tried the results were very inferior to what they are now.

Dr. Wyld: Are the children who practise this occult method in any way interfered with in their attention to the ordinary affairs of life?

Mr. Creery: Not in the slightest degree. It is taken up simply as an amusement to pass away half-an-hour in an evening; it does not interfere with them in the least.

A gentleman present asked: What are the ages of the children?

Mr. Creery: The eldest is seventeen and the youngest ten or eleven.

Mr. Bidder: Have any successful experiments been made with older persons?

Professor Barrett: The cases which I have described in the earlier part of the report were cases of older persons, but possibly they come under the head of unconscious muscular action. I should have thought that young people would be better subjects than others because their minds are rather more blank than those of other people, and they seem to have the power of abstracting their minds more easily.

A gentleman present said: I should like to ask whether there is any physical sensation that can be recognised by the subject accompanying the mental sensation.

Mr. Creery: I have never heard them say anything about a physical sensation accompanying the mental impression. They say that the card, or the name, or the number, or whatever it may be, seems to flash into the mind. Occasionally they seem to see two cards, or think of two numbers or objects, and they choose the one that comes most distinctly before the mind.

Dr. Purdon: I should like to say one word upon what appeared to be a serious objection urged in the July number of the *Nineteenth Century*. I refer to the fragmentary images that seem to have been conveyed from one person to another. These were regarded as objections, instead of confirmations of the genuineness of the phenomena. Incomplete images appear to have been conveyed—I will not attempt to say how—but I think that that which is offered as an objection is in reality as strong an indirect confirmation of the reality of transference from one mind to another through some hypothetical medium as anything I have heard. I think it is possible to differentiate aural from visual images, and I have a case in point which I think will not be easily overcome. One night I was experimenting, when a lady, a member of my own family, who was very strongly opposed to psychological investigation, left the room. At that time my little daughter was sleeping with her. She knew that the child was precious to me, and that I was afraid of certain influences affecting her. She came to me the next morning and said, "I have something to tell you; I had a warning about your child. A certain personage" (mentioning him) "came into the room, took your child's hand, kissed it, and wrote a sentence of three alliterative words." The next morning the child came and said the same thing—that she saw somebody come into the room, kiss her hand, and write a sentence. "I know," she said, "that he wrote three big P's." There was no aural transfer there, but only a visual impression. I take it that something flowed from one brain to the other, and that that is the solution of the question. I think I never saw a greater physiological or psychological blunder than to regard it as evidence against the genuineness of these phenomena that in a case of this kind there should be occasionally an imperfect image transferred from one brain to another, especially when it is considered how difficult it is to make a perfect image pass through the ordinary channels of thought. Great efforts have

been already made to overcome prejudices, and in the end they will succeed. It is only a question of time. Physicists and mathematicians will take the matter into their hands. I have been in a feeble way endeavouring to adapt general geometrical reasonings to these things, and I know it is only a question of time for the heavy guns to take the matter up. It is a matter of physiology, and the sooner physiologists set to work about it the better. They should endeavour to settle the diathesis of the mediums; that is an all-important matter, because the senses and the inner meaning of the senses are bound up in this question.

The President: We have now exhausted, not perhaps the subject, but the interest in the investigations so far as they have been conducted. I am sure we all feel that the Society is greatly indebted to Mr. Creery for the experiments which have led to what I hope we all feel to be completely satisfactory results. I think it will be important to shew that these phenomena can be reproduced, I will not say at will, but in various families and circles; and I hope, after what has fallen from Mr. Creery as to his experience, that the Committee will have other opportunities afforded them of conducting similar experiments, and that before long we may have some further reports of this kind, on this or other subjects, brought before the Society.

The proceedings then terminated.

SPIRITUALISM IN LONDON & THE PROVINCES.

GOSWELL HALL.

On Sunday last the members and friends attending this hall had an excursion to Epping Forest. The day being fine a goodly number were present. In the afternoon a meeting was held in the glades when an admirable address, suited to the occasion, was delivered by the guides of Mr. J. J. Morse. A second meeting was held in the evening, at which Mr. Swinden presided, and several members and friends took part in the proceedings. Among the visitors we noticed W. Paynter, Esq., Cardiff; Miss Kate Wood, Newcastle; Mrs. Durrant, Mr. and Mrs. J. J. Morse, and Miss Morse; Miss Clapham, Keighley; Mr. and Mrs. C. P. Allan and Miss Allan, and numerous others. Altogether the friends spent a very pleasant day.—RES-FACTA.

QUEBEC HALL.

An interesting lecture and debate on "St. Peter," entertained the frequenters of this hall, on Sunday evening last. Mr. MacDonnell presented the "Saint" as a fellow countryman, possessing all the ardour and enthusiasm of an Irishman, and eulogised him for his courage and faithfulness. His explanation of the "denial" was original, and he defended St. Peter from the heinous charge on that point. The physiognomical and phrenological portraiture of St. Peter was very interesting. A gentleman from Melbourne gave an encouraging report of the progress of Spiritualism in his city, and of the success of children's lyceums, which he regretted that he did not find in London.

BELPER.

On Sunday, July 9th, Mrs. L. Thompson Nosworthy (daughter of the late Geo. Thompson, Esq., the famous Anti-Slavery lecturer), delivered two lectures in the Lecture Room, Brookside, Belper, in the morning and evening, to large and appreciative audiences. The subjects were, morning: "Spiritualism: What is it?" and in the evening: "Spiritualism: its Uses and Advantages." The fair lecturer handled the subjects in a clear and precise manner, evidently giving great satisfaction to those who listened to her. On Monday evening there was an entertainment at which Mrs. Nosworthy gave recitals from Shakespeare, Tennyson, Lord Lytton, E. A. Poe, Butler, and Lizzie Doten, interspersed with songs by several ladies and gentlemen, who kindly gave their services on this occasion. Altogether we may say Mrs. Nosworthy's visit to Belper was a great success.—COR.

WORK OF THE COMING WEEK.

LONDON.

Sunday, July 23.—Goswell Hall. See advertisement.
 " July 23.—Quebec Hall. Lecture, Mr. Iver MacDonnell.
 Tuesday, July 25.—Quebec Hall. Lecture, Mr. Wilson.
 Friday, July 28.—Central Association of Spiritualists, 38, Great Russell-street. Members' Weekly Free Séance, at 8 p.m.

PROVINCES.

Public meetings are held every Sunday in Liverpool, Manchester, Oldham, Leeds, Bradford, Gateshead, Newcastle, Glasgow, Leicester, Nottingham, Belper, &c., &c. See our list of Societies on p. 2.

MR. J. J. MORSE'S APPOINTMENTS.—STAMFORD: July 23rd; GOSWELL HALL: July 30th; CARDIFF: August 6th and 7th; WALSALL: August 13th; PLYMOUTH: August 20th; FALMOUTH: August 27th; CORNWALL district: end of August; GATESHEAD: September 3rd and 4th.—For terms and dates, direct Mr. Morse, at 53, Sigdon-road, Dalston, London, E.—[Advt.]

TESTIMONY TO PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA.

The following is a list of eminent persons who, after personal investigation, have satisfied themselves of the reality of some of the phenomena generally known as Psychical or Spiritualistic.

N.B.—An asterisk is prefixed to those who have exchanged belief for knowledge.

SCIENCE.—The Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, F.R.S., President R.A.S.; W. Crookes, Fellow and Gold Medallist of the Royal Society; C. Varley, F.R.S., C.E.; A. R. Wallace, the eminent Naturalist; W. F. Barrett, F.R.S.E., Professor of Physics in the Royal College of Science, Dublin; Dr. Lockhart Robertson; *Dr. J. Elliotson, F.R.S., sometime President of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society of London; *Professor de Morgan, sometime President of the Mathematical Society of London; *Dr. Wm. Gregory, F.R.S.E., sometime Professor of Chemistry in the University of Edinburgh; *Dr. Ashburner, *Mr. Rutter, *Dr. Herbert Mayo, F.R.S., &c., &c.

*Professor F. Zöllner, of Leipzig, author of "Transcendental Physics," &c.; Professors G. T. Fechner, Scheibner, and J. H. Fichte, of Leipzig; Professor W. E. Weber, of Göttingen; Professor Hoffman, of Würzburg; Professor Perty, of Berne; Professors Wagner and Butleroff, of Petersburg; Professors Hare and Mapes, of U.S.A.; Dr. Robert Friese, of Breslau; Mons. Camille Flammarion, Astronomer, &c., &c.

LITERATURE.—The Earl of Dunraven; T. A. Trollope; S. C. Hall; Gerald Massey; Captain R. Burton; Professor Cassal, LL.D.; *Lord Brougham; *Lord Lytton; *Lord Lyndhurst; *Archbishop Whately; *Dr. Robert Chambers, F.R.S.E.; *W. M. Thackeray; *Nassau Senior; *George Thompson; *W. Howitt; *Serjeant Cox; *Mrs. Browning, &c., &c.

Bishop Clarke, Rhode Island, U.S.A.; Darius Lyman, U.S.A.; Professor W. Denton; Professor Alex. Wilder; Professor Hiram Corson; Professor George Bush; and twenty-four Judges and ex-Judges of the U.S. Courts; Victor Hugo; Baron and Baroness von Vay; *W. Lloyd Garrison, U.S.A.; *Hon. R. Dale Owen, U.S.A.; *Hon. J. W. Edmonds, U.S.A.; *Epes Sargent; *Baron du Potet; *Count A. de Gasparin; *Baron L. de Guldenstübbe, &c., &c.

SOCIAL POSITION.—H. I. H. Nicholas, Duke of Leuchtenberg; H. S. H. the Prince of Solms; H. S. H. Prince Albrecht of Solms; *H. S. H. Prince Emile of Sayn Wittgenstein; Hon. Alexander Aksakof, Imperial Councillor of Russia; the Hon. J. L. O'Sullivan, sometime Minister of U.S.A. at the Court of Lisbon; M. Favre-Clavairoz, late Consul-General of France at Trieste; the late Emperors of *Russia and *France; Presidents *Thiers and *Lincoln, &c., &c.

Is it Conjuring?

It is sometimes confidently alleged that mediums are only clever conjurers, who easily deceive the simple-minded and unwary. But how, then, about the conjurers themselves, some of the most accomplished of whom have declared that the "manifestations" are utterly beyond the resources of their art?—

ROBERT HOUDIN, the great French conjurer, investigated the subject of clairvoyance with the sensitive, Alexis Didier. In the result he unreservedly admitted that what he had observed was wholly beyond the resources of his art to explain. See "Psychische Studien" for January, 1878, p. 43.

PROFESSOR JACOBS, writing to the editor of *Licht, Mehr Licht*, April 10th, 1881, in reference to phenomena which occurred in Paris through the Brothers Davenport, said:—"As a Prestidigitator of repute, and a sincere Spiritualist, I affirm that the medianimic facts demonstrated by the two brothers were absolutely true, and belonged to the Spiritualistic order of things in every respect. Messrs. Robin and Robert Houdin, when attempting to imitate these said facts, never presented to the public anything beyond an infantine and almost grotesque parody of the said phenomena, and it would be only ignorant and obstinate persons who could regard the questions seriously as set forth by these gentlemen. . . . Following the data of the learned chemist and natural philosopher, Mr. W. Crookes, of London, I am now in a position to prove plainly, and by purely scientific methods, the existence of a 'psychic force' in mesmerism and also 'the individuality of the spirit' in Spiritual manifestation."

SAMUEL BELLACHINI, COURT CONJURER, AT BERLIN.—I hereby declare it to be a rash action to give decisive judgment upon the objective medial performance of the American medium, Mr. Henry Slade, after only one sitting and the observations so made. After I had, at the wish of several highly esteemed gentlemen of rank and position, and also for my own interest, tested the physical mediumship of Mr. Slade, in a series of sittings by full daylight, as well as in the evening in his bedroom, I must, for the sake of truth, hereby certify that the phenomenal occurrences with Mr. Slade have been thoroughly examined by me with the minutest observation and investigation of his surroundings, including the table, and that I have not in the smallest degree found anything to be produced by means of prestidigitative manifestations, or by mechanical apparatus; and that any explanation of the experiments which took place under the circumstances and conditions then obtaining by any reference to prestidigitation is a *absolutely* impossible. It must rest with such men of science as Crookes and Wallace, in London; Perty, in Berne; Butleroff, in St. Petersburg; to search for the explanation of this phenomenal power, and to prove its reality. I declare, moreover, the published opinions of laymen as to the "How" of this subject to be premature, and, according to my view and experience, false and one-sided. This, my declaration, is signed and executed before a Notary and witnesses.—(Signed) SAMUEL BELLACHINI, Berlin, December 6th, 1877.

ADVICE TO INQUIRERS.

The Conduct of Circles.—By M.A. (Oxon.)

If you wish to see whether Spiritualism is really only jugglery and imposture, try it by personal experiment.

If you can get an introduction to some experienced Spiritualist, on whose good faith you can rely, ask him for advice; and, if he is holding private circles, seek permission to attend one to see how to conduct séances, and what to expect.

There is, however, difficulty in obtaining access to private circles, and, in any case, you must rely chiefly on experiences in your own family circle, or amongst your own friends, all strangers being excluded. The bulk of Spiritualists have gained conviction thus.

Form a circle of from four to eight persons, half, or at least two, of negative, passive temperament, and preferably of the female sex; the rest of a more positive type.

Sit, positive and negative alternately, secure against disturbance, in subdued light, and in comfortable and unconstrained positions, round an uncovered table of convenient size. Place the palms of the hands flat upon its upper surface. The hands of each sitter need not touch those of his neighbour, though the practice is frequently adopted.

Do not concentrate attention too fixedly on the expected manifestations. Engage in cheerful but not frivolous conversation. Avoid dispute or argument. Scepticism has no deterrent effect, but a bitter spirit of opposition in a person of determined will may totally stop or decidedly impede manifestations. If conversation flags, music is a great help, if it be agreeable to all, and not of a kind to irritate the sensitive ear. Patience is essential; and it may be necessary to meet ten or twelve times, at short intervals, before anything occurs. If after such trial you still fail, form a fresh circle. Guess at the reason of your failure, eliminate the inharmonious elements, and introduce others. An hour should be the limit of an unsuccessful séance.

The first indications of success usually are a cool breeze passing over the hands, with involuntary twitching of the hands and arms of some of the sitters, and a sensation of throbbing in the table. These indications, at first so slight as to cause doubt as to their reality, will usually develop with more or less rapidity.

If the table moves, let your pressure be so gentle on its surface that you are sure you are not aiding its motions. After some time you will probably find that the movement will continue if your hands are held *over* but not in contact with it. Do not, however, try this until the movement is assured, and be in no hurry to get messages.

When you think that the time has come, let some one take command of the circle and act as spokesman. Explain to the unseen Intelligence that an agreed code of signals is desirable, and ask that a tilt may be given as the alphabet is slowly repeated at the several letters which form the word that the Intelligence wishes to spell. It is convenient to use a single tilt for No, three for Yes, and two to express doubt or uncertainty.

When a satisfactory communication has been established, ask if you are rightly placed, and if not, what order you should take. After this, ask who the Intelligence purports to be, which of the company is the medium, and such relevant questions. If confusion occurs, ascribe it to the difficulty that exists in directing the movements at first with exactitude. Patience will remedy this, if there be a real desire on the part of the Intelligence to speak with you. If you only satisfy yourself at first that it is possible to speak with an Intelligence separate from that of any person present, you will have gained much.

The signals may take the form of raps. If so, use the same code of signals, and ask as the raps become clear that they may be made on the table, or in a part of the room where they are demonstrably not produced by any natural means, but avoid any vexatious imposition of restrictions on free communication. Let the Intelligence use its own means: if the attempt to communicate deserves your attention, it probably has something to say to you, and will resent being hampered by useless interference. It rests greatly with the sitters to make the manifestations elevating or frivolous, and even tricky.

Should an attempt be made to entrance the medium, or to manifest by any violent methods, or by means of form-manifestations, ask that the attempt may be deferred till you can secure the presence of some experienced Spiritualist. If this request is not heeded, discontinue the sitting. The process of developing a trance-medium is one that might disconcert an inexperienced inquirer. Increased light will check noisy manifestations.

Lastly—Try the results you get by the light of Reason. Maintain a level head and a clear judgment. Do not believe everything you are told, for though the great unseen world contains many a wise and discerning Spirit, it also has in it the accumulation of human folly, vanity, and error; and this lies nearer to the surface than that which is wise and good. Distrust the free use of great names. Never for a moment abandon the use of your Reason. Do not enter into a very solemn investigation in a spirit of idle curiosity or frivolity. Cultivate a reverent desire for what is pure, good, and true. You will be repaid if you gain only a well-grounded conviction that there is a life after death, for which a pure and good life before death is the best and wisest preparation.