

THE SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM.

VOL. I. CHICAGO, ILL., OCT., 1868. No. 5.

BIBLE DISCUSSION BETWEEN REV. GEORGE CLENDENAN AND MOSES HULL.

ELDER CLENDENAN'S FIFTH LETTER.

BROTHER HULL: Your letter dated Batavia, Ill., has just come to hand. Why is this, you ask. The following is the explanation, and also my apology: Since the 15th of August, if I mistake not, my family and self have been out upon the wide, wide world, without a home. The anxieties incident thereto,—even had opportunity offered—have wholly unfitted me for the discussion. But now, having located in this place for the purpose of educating my children, it is with pleasure that I resume the thread controversial. Sorry that the “little season” has not been richer in opportunities to study out responses to those “hard questions” propounded by my friend, the erudite and amiable Hull.

2. I am now to affirm the *plenary inspiration* of the Bible, and since in your discussion of the first term of the proposition, viz: that the Bible contains a *Revelation* from God, your reasonings were directed in the main against the latter term, that which affirms its *inspiration*, I deem it right before commencing a formal defence, to respond to some of the difficulties already presented. This course will mar somewhat the symmetry of the debate, but your course makes it necessary.

3. In the first letter you argue against the complete inspiration of the Bible from the premise contained in Gen. xviii: 21, “that God was compelled to come down in order to find out whether the cities of the plain were as wicked as he had heard they were.”

I answer in the first place, that while the omniscience of God is clearly taught in the Bible, it does not exclude the use of agencies in conducting the affairs of the universe. Three angels were sent on this mission.

But in the second place, the Bible don't say that God came down from heaven, but that he would go down from the dwelling of Abram. In the third place, the little word "see," when correctly defined, obviates all difficulty. Webster gives as one of its definitions "to try." God said I will give those wicked men a fair trial. And how did God try them? Listen, dear reader, just as he tries you and me a thousand times. Sends the poor, the weary, the sorrow-stricken *stranger* to test their beneficence and hospitality. Oh, if skeptics would but wipe the scoff-stains from their spectacles, they would see that each historic incident is richly fraught with instruction. Ye sons of wealth and pride, be careful to entertain strangers, for some have entertained angels unawares.—Heb. xiii: 1. Such is the voice of God speaking out of the lurid tempest; and because ten out of the thousands inhabiting this heaven-favored plain could not be found possessed of this virtue, the judgments of God fell upon it.

4. You object (second letter) that Moses killed the Egyptian, and therefore the Bible cannot be plenary inspired. I confess I cannot see the force of this. Moses did kill that cruel knight of the lash, and I glory in the fact. I think I would have done the same under like circumstances. *Bravo, Moses!* Infidels shriek for freedom—thou didst strike for it. Quite a difference! *But it has existed in all ages.* The command in Ex. xxii: 18, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," is used as an argument to disprove the inspiration of the Bible. That we may understand the intention of this law, I remark that among all the nations, commencing with Egypt, there has been a class who profess to control the celestial influences. These have been the systematic poisoners of the world, the Borgias, the Gridleys, the Bakers of mankind. Mr. Horne defines a witch to be one who pretends to bring down celestial influences to her aid by means of herbs, drugs, perfumes, etc. (Page 142 of Horne's *Introduct.*) So also affirms Watson in his *Institutes*. A witch, then, in the time of Moses was a *Scientific Poisoner*. But because they claimed to control the

celestial powers, and because women have ever possessed greater facilities of successfully practicing this terrible trade, it has come to mean "a woman, who by compact with the Devil, practices enchantment."—*Webster*. Now, sir, with this definition, will you object to the law? Was not Borgia worthy of death? and Gridley? (see "Astounding Facts from the Spirit World,") who being troubled nine years with a wife, whose only crime was insanity, was told by "celestial influences" that they were busily at work killing her by means of electricity thrown on the heart, so that he might be permitted to marry his housekeeper. Competent witnesses testified, however, that the lady exhibited symptoms such as are usually produced by the most subtle poisons. The Battle Creek tragedy is too recent to need comment. Ought such wretches to live? Moses saith no. What say you, reader?

5. You say, (second letter,) that the sun went back so as to throw the shadow back on the dial fifteen degrees, to convince a man that a pimple or boil on him would not kill him. How easy first to pervert, and then to ridicule *our own folly*. You allude, undoubtedly, to the case of Hezekiah. What are the simple facts, and what the lesson they inculcate? This king, in his life, had been blessed far beyond the lot of man. His reign was prosperous and happy. Rich and honored, he reached the end of his race. But the blessings so richly bestowed have but wedded him closer to this life; not an isolated instance of the perversion of heaven's blessings. He is unwilling to die, but clings with unmanly tenacity to life; looks with terror down into the darkness of the grave. His life is prolonged fifteen years. Those are years of misfortune and sorrow; his kingdom is invaded; he becomes proud and arrogant, a fine specimen of what is termed death-bed repentance. And now what is the lesson of high import taught by the history of this man? Nay, what is the lesson most needed, but the hardest for poor humanity to learn, if it is not this—*Resignation to death?* Mournfully true is the language of the poet:

"For who to dumb forgetfulness a prey,
This pleasing anxious being e'er resigned;
Left the warm precincts of the cheerful day,
Nor cast one longing, lingering look behind."

And the tenderly sad reflections of the young girl as she mused among the beautiful and fragrant flowers :

“To think of summers yet to come,
That I am not to see ;
To think a flower is yet to bloom,
From dust that I shall be.”

Is it unbecoming the Great Father to teach this lesson to his children to prepare them for the inevitable hour? Is a miracle out of place here? Brother Hull, open your Bible, read carefully the history, and then retract your unfair, undignified perversion of a most important truth.

6. You affirm that God moved David to number the children of Israel. This I presume is incorrect. Satan moved David to do this thing. “But why punish the innocent?” you ask. I answer: God is a God of nations; and terrible have been the Divine teachings upon this theme, and still the nations are not educated, but trust in their own numbers and material strength. If the history of the world demonstrates one fact more than all else, it is this: When a nation or people in their pride and arrogance ignore all religious and moral forces, and trust solely in the military arm, then the judgments of God descend in fearful weight upon them—the innocent as well as the guilty. Every objection and difficulty involved in the case of David bear equally against the dealings of God, against this nation and all others who refuse to retain God in their thoughts.

7. “The Bible commands theft and infanticide,” (third letter.) In proof of this you refer to Ex. iii: 21, 22 and Num. xxxi: 17. Touching the first charge, I brand it as a *falsehood, unqualified and absolute*. I know this may be deemed unkind. I candidly confess that *it is intentionally so*. Argument and persuasion are sometimes out of place—they would be just here. When a man of strong sense and good education deliberately writes that Ex. iii: 21, 22 teaches that it is right to steal, the only response that his opponent can in honor and truth make is the above. I have about made up my mind to meet impiety with rebuke. No man has the right to wickedly traduce *even the Bible*. Your second charge that the Bible justifies infanticide, I shall meet in a differ-

ent spirit and manner. It is true that Moses commanded little children to be put to death, whether this was infanticide was quite another matter. War in its mildest form is shocking. I am not disposed to appear as its advocate—still I believe that the Creator has a right to do with His universe as he pleases. I am not competent to sit in judgment upon his acts. But I can give a better reason for the death of those children than for the destruction of thousands of innocents by tempests, earthquakes, etc. Shall we turn atheists because some of God's ways are past finding out?

8. You admit that Jesus was a good man, pure and holy as any mortal, and in the next sentence charge him with the crime of *horse stealing*! Really, sir, your blasphemy is only excelled by your inconsistency. Proverbs iii: 6 prohibits the use of strong drink as a beverage, and only recommends it for medicinal purposes. There is no such precept as you refer to in the 14th chapter of Deuteronomy; on the contrary, there are regulations that effectually and intentionally accomplished the physical elevation of the degraded masses. Lord Macaulay, in his life of Somers, says: "That is the highest type of statesmanship that adapts its reform measures to the existing state of society." Judged by this standard, the regulations referred to were wise and beneficent. To the above you add the following: The Bible teaches that man is but dust and ashes—that mother Eve was formed from a rib—that the world was created in six days—that there were four days before the sun was created, etc., etc. (1.) Abraham's description of man physically is correct. (2.) As you are sure that the Bible record touching the origin of woman is incorrect, of course you know all about it; please enlighten our ignorance. (3.) The Bible don't say, however, that these were consecutive days. For aught we can prove, millions of ages may have elapsed between those days. Geology testifies that the introduction of the different epochs was instantaneous. (4.) The Bible does not say that there were four days without the sun.

9. I have now noticed the most important objections that lie scattered through your four letters, and will proceed to a formal defence of the proposition—that the Bible is plenary inspired—and I present as an argument the following: *A denial of the*

truth of the proposition involves an absurdity. Permit me to amplify this statement. There exists in the condition of mankind an absolute necessity for an infallible standard of right; without it there can be no such thing as virtue or vice. Modern infidelity does not reject the Bible as a whole. It is a species of *eclecticism*—says this is right and that is wrong, and results in individual infallibility—what I think is right is right for me. Now, what follows? First, it destroys society. Society is an organization of individuals, and can possess no more rights than belonged to each individual originally. But the right to impose law upon another is not a natural right of the individual, and hence he could not surrender it to society. Therefore society does not possess the right to impose law—hence all government is tyranny, and men have an infallible right to rebel! Individual infallibility destroys the family. If Roman children thought it was right to bury their old parents alive, *for them* it was right. Individual infallibility obliterates the distinction between vice and virtue, justifies the perpetration of every atrocity in the dark catalogue of crime, involves a monstrous and cruel absurdity and therefore cannot be true.

10. My second argument in the support of the complete inspiration of the Bible is furnished by yourself. In the first letter you say, “law lies behind everything—nothing exists but in harmony with the law that produced it.” Prophets and Apostles then, with all they wrote, exist in harmony with eternal law. The Bible exists in harmony with the law that produced it, *and is just as infallible as the eternal infallible law that produced it!* How do you like the conclusion? It legitimately flows from your own premises. The premises are not mine but yours—yours also the conclusion. Here is an end of the controversy. If Moses Hull is right, the Bible is absolutely infallible.

11. My third argument is derived from the assumption of individual infallibility. We have no right to question the sincerity of the Bible writers; they thought they were right. But what we believe to be right is infallibly right—therefore the Bible is infallible. Now, sir, you must place the standard of right somewhere else than in the individual, or else admit the plenary inspiration of the Bible. Where will you place it? Remember,

reader, these conclusions are from the skeptic's own premises. Have I not made good the statement that "any denial of the inspiration of the Bible involves an absurdity?" And here I close for the present.

Yours, etc.,

GEORGE CLENDENAN.

MR. HULL'S FIFTH REPLY.

BROTHER CLENDENAN: Supposing you to have passed from the land of the dying, to have entered the country where all disputes like ours are settled, I had given up hearing from you until as a spiritual being you came to tell me how you found it in that country where "faith is changed to glad fruition." But I am happily disappointed in finding that the discussion can be resumed. I only hope that no "breakers" in the future will prevent the regular amount of controversial matter in each number. Your "apology" is accepted. I heartily join with you in wishing that "the little season" had been "richer in opportunities," for you evidently will need more ammunition than you have before you get through with the "hard questions."¹

2. You at last come to the question of the "*plenary inspiration*" of the Bible. Here, my Brother, is where the work is for you. You have undoubtedly consulted Webster as to the meaning of that word *plenary*, if not, let me recommend that you examine him. You will find it your duty to prove the complete, perfect and entire inspiration of the sixty-six books of the Old and New Testaments. You will find it your duty to prove the Book of Ruth, the Song of Solomon and the Lord's Sermon on the Mount equally important. If you could have found it "necessary" to respond to my objections as I made them, the "symmetry of the debate" would not have been "marred," and now you would have been ready to grapple with the issue. As it is, I shall still hope for the best of the wine at the last of the feast. With one exception, our debate will be quite as pleasant as could be expected, and that is, I shall continue to "mar its symmetry" with hard questions.

3. "And the Lord said, because the cry of Sodom is very

great, and because their sin is very grievous; *I will go down now*, and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come unto me, and if not, *I will know.*"—Gen. xviii: 21. To this you make several answers, but not one of them touches the point. God said, "I will go," you say he sent a stranger. Which shall I believe, the *infallible* Bible or the infallible Clendenan? I do not care where God went *from*, when he went to find out whether matters were as the *report* had come to him, he went from where he was to where he was not. Again, he did it in order that he might *know*, "if not, *I will know.*" Now, what becomes of your *ad captandum vulgus* about God "testing the people." But suppose you are correct, what does he try them for? *That he may "know."* If he knew without trying them, why that false representation and work of supererogation? Your idea of poor, weary, sorrow-stricken angels, is ludicrous enough to look like an invention to escape a difficulty. The rhapsody at the close of your argument in the third paragraph is beautiful. Would that others had so happy a way of dressing their thoughts.

4. In the fourth paragraph you say, "You object that Moses killed the Egyptian and therefore the Bible cannot be plenary inspired." Dear Brother, I fear your exaltation among the Bethanyites has had a bad effect upon you. Has it beclouded your understanding? or, are you determined to persist in misrepresenting? I will be charitable, and therefore think you failed to comprehend me. Here is what I said: "From the time that Moses killed the Egyptian, down to the hanging of the Salem witches (which, by the way, was only the execution of a Bible command—see Ex. xxii: 18,) there has not been a day but that blood has flowed in direct obedience to the precepts which are now in that book." I do not say that Moses killed a man, therefore the Bible is not inspired; but I do say that from the time that Abraham attempted to slay his son until to-day, blood, *innocent blood*, has flowed in consequence of Biblical commands—that our late domestic war had its origin in a determination to uphold and carry out that *Biblical Institution, Slavery*. Please meet the issue, it would look so much better than the building up and demolishing of men of straw. The Bible represents God as sanctioning the

flow of blood, insomuch that he killed his own innocent Son, thus setting an example for all fathers—"We did esteem him stricken, smitten of God." The command, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," you regard as plenary inspired, and argue its justness, and then insinuate that mediums and Spiritualists, if not witches, are equally as guilty. My dear Brother, why do you "suffer them to live?" If it was ever a duty to kill them, it is now; and as you stand before the people to teach them by precept and example, why are you not hanging them on the elm trees? Ah! you are not so good a Bibliolator as Cotton Mather, and some others of the Puritan saints. In your reference to Dr. Gridley, Mr. Baker and others, you prove yourself quite equal to the task of picking up stale, highly colored reports, and construing them even to the greater disparagement of the parties concerning whom they were first circulated than their *manufacturers* intended. Had Judge Graves pronounced sentence on Jesus instead of Dr. Baker, you undoubtedly would have been an anti-Christian to-day. While talking of these things don't forget the poor children that have been *murdered* by their own parents within the last few months because they refused to pray. Also, please remember the orthodox minister, of the "Prairie State," who imprisoned his own wife for her infidel proclivities. The Battle Creek tragedy will be commented upon, and the judge who pronounced sentence upon the poor insane Mrs. Haviland and the innocent Dr. Baker will be consigned a place with others whose personal prejudices and vindictiveness cause them to condemn the innocent. Let me have the place of either of these condemned persons rather than that of the jury or judge who condemned them.

5. Your long prosy, poetical paragraph marked 5, has as much to do with the objection you undertake to meet as it has with Noah's ark, the cholera or potato rot. The objection is that the shadow went back on the dial of Ahaz, that therefore the order of nature was reversed, and the sun went backward fifteen degrees, then changed again and resumed its wonted course. Your answer briefly summed up, is: that Hezekiah lived a peaceful life up to that time, and a miserable one afterward. What if he did? Is it therefore true that the sun went backward? While writing poetry why did you not put in the following:

"The devil seized his stick in a rage,
And set these lines to fill the page."

They rhyme better than yours, and they are so much more appropriate to your purpose.

6. You say: "You affirm that God moved David to number the children of Israel. This I presume is incorrect. Satan moved David to do this thing." Well, my Brother, I leave you to settle this with your *plenarily* inspired Bible. The Bible says: "And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against the children of Israel, and *he* moved David against them, to say: Go, number Israel and Judah."—2 Sam. xxiv: 1. On this point again you misapprehend the issue. Now I will state it so that "a wayfaring man though a fool may not err therein." (1.) God moved David to number Israel. (2.) God got mad at David who numbered Israel after he had moved him thus to do. (3.) God spent his rage on the *innocent* Israelites who had been numbered, rather than on the guilty king who had obeyed the commandment or movement of God to number them. (4.) God afterward got ashamed of himself—as he should—and repented of the whole affair.—See 2 Sam. xxiv: 16; 1 Chron. xxi: 15. (5.) After the burning up of several hundred thousand dollars worth of property in the shape of the best cattle and sheep in the country, the plague was stayed. My Brother, if you can swallow all this as plenarily inspired, your *theological* throttle is larger than I had supposed.

7. Your seventh paragraph accusing me of "*falsehood absolute and unqualified*," is written in such a style that I will not meet it. You are entitled to the last words on every subject when they are *such* words as those. Our readers will please examine the text to which I referred.

8. Yes, Jesus was perhaps as good as any one, but who does not err? "No man liveth and sinneth not." His purity does not consist in his errors, but in the fact that he has so *few* of them. No one can deny but the passages to which I referred, contained errors in the life of Jesus. You have not denied it—you will not. How you can get the prohibition of the use of strong drinks as a beverage, into the passage which advises those "of heavy heart" to drink wine and forget their poverty, will

take at least, a theologian to tell. I have seen poor folks drink until they were *rich*—or in other words, *drunk*. How different the glasses through which *we* look! You say, “there is no such precept as you refer to, in Deut. xiv.” Well, let us see. “Ye shall not eat of anything that dieth of itself: Thou shalt *give it to the stranger that is within thy gates, that he may eat it, or thou mayest sell it unto an alien.*”—Deut. xiv : 21. The 26th verse of the same chapter contains language that we temperance people find as hard to meet as anything in the devil’s Koran. It reads as follows: “And thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul *lusteth* after—for oxen, or for sheep, or for *wine*, or for *strong drink*, or for whatsoever thy soul desireth.” As this text is a part of the *infallible word*, we must permit the drunkard to distress his wife and beggar his children. The statement that “man is but dust and ashes” you have misunderstood, you should read more carefully. I quoted that in reply to your assertion that “man was next in the chain of existence to God,” not to oppose it, yet I do not believe it. Man has within him the God-nature.—See Ps. lxxxii : 6. The other ludicrous stories to which you refer, you do not try to harmonize. It is well—you would only make the matter worse. You say, “the Bible don’t say that these days (the four before the sun was created,) were consecutive.” So much the worse for your theory if they were not, then we have *more* than four days without the sun, unless you have them *cotemporaneous*! Please inform me where you get your knowledge of geology, of what authors you studied? My textbooks all differ with your position. Even Hugh Miller, who blew his own brains out because he could not harmonize geology with the Bible, would differ with you.

9. In your ninth paragraph you proceed to a “formal defense of the proposition,” and start out with the astounding assertion that, “a denial of the truth of the proposition involves an absurdity.” However that may be, of one thing I am sure, *i. e.*, many have a faculty of making absurd arguments to sustain your position, this is the only “absurdity” I have as yet seen “involved” in its denial. Suppose it were true that “there exists in the condition of mankind an absolute necessity for an infallible standard of right,” how does that prove that the Bible is the “infallible

standard?" And when you have proved the Bible to be a standard, which parts will you take, the teachings of Moses or Christ, and Paul's contradictory teachings? Moses gave a law which was *perfect*.—Ps. xix: 7. The law, in all of its parts, even the Aaronic priesthood, was never to come to an end.—See Ex. xl:15. And if any one ever opposed it, or suggested that there might be a better way, he was to be put to death.—Deut. xiii: 1-9. When we open the New Testament we find it teaching that the law is *all* imperfect, only the "ministration of death" "gendering to bondage," and those who would obey it called "fools."—See 2 Cor. iii; Gal. iii and iv, whole chapters. Now, Brother, tell us which is perfect? I think I can see quite as many imperfections in the New Testament as its writers could see in the Old. Again: If the Bible is the only infallible guide, what will the myriads do for a guide who have never heard of that book? By what rule did the Prophets and Patriarchs live who had no Bible? If they could regulate their lives without it, cannot we do the same? If the Bible is infallible, it was made by an infallible rule. Let us take the rule by which it was made as an infallible guide instead of the book made by the rule. In reply to what you said about law, I will just say, "All laws derive their *just* power from the consent of the governed." Who has said a word about individual infallibility? I know of no infallibility. Yet you and I approach near enough to infallibility to write a better Bible than the one, the merits of which we are debating.

10. Your tenth paragraph is as clear as *mud*. Does it follow because an infallible law produced an egg, that an egg therefore must be infallible? I guess not. An infallible law produced my worthy opponent, but he is by no means infallible. (Excuse me, Brother, I only say it because it is true.) A perfect law often produces some imperfect things. An infallible law enables you and I to think, speak and write; yet I am sure that our writings are not infallible. There are infallible rules of logic, yet your logic is loose on the handle. Brother, did you ever hear of the dog that jumped the fence to whip the brazen lions on the door step?

11. I can but wish that space would permit me to quote your eleventh paragraph entire, but it will not. Who has assumed the

infallibility of humanity? Humanity is fallible, yet *human reason* is the best guide man has. Is it not your reason that tells you the Bible is infallible? but your reason is fallible, therefore you cannot arrive at infallible conclusions about the Bible. The fact that you *try* the Bible proves that there is in your estimation a *rule* by which you prove the Bible true. Which is the best, the rule or the Bible? The fact is, any argument made to prove the Bible infallible, proves the necessity for the argument, based on its inherent errors. With one question I close. Is it infallibly true that Christ said and did so many things that the world could not contain the books? Ah! my brother, "it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks."

Yours, etc.,

MOSES HULL.

THE WORLD WILL BE THE BETTER FOR IT.

BY B. M. LAWRENCE, M. D.

When man shall keep the great command,
 Loving the same himself and neighbor ;
 When each shall gain their rights to land,
 To live and learn, to love and labor ;
 When right shall rule, when purity
 Brings peace on earth, with naught to mar it ;
 When all shall be equal and free—
 The world will be the better for it.

When men care less for crowns of gold,
 Placing their treasures more in heaven ;
 When all the hungry, poor and cold,
 Are warmed and fed by heartfelt giving ;
 When men of wealth are more inclined
 To work for truth, and not ignore it ;
 When all mankind prize worth of mind—
 The world will be the better for it.

When men care less for what folks say,
 Taking more care to curb their passions ;
 When woman shall refuse to pay
 Allegiance unto foreign fashions ;

When stays and strings no more compress
 Her form divine, to cramp and mar it ;
 When all care less for show and dress—
 The world will be the better for it.

When men care less for gin and rum ;
 And less for wine, ale, beer and brandy,
 For nostrums which the nerves benumb,
 For doctor's drugs, with pills of candy ;
 When men shall eat the purest food,
 Refuse tobacco, and abhor it ;
 When reason's ken shall govern men—
 The world will be the better for it.

When men care less for forms and creeds,
 And less for proud priests and their preaching ;
 When men serve Christ by noble deeds,
 And hearken to the spirits' teaching ;
 When men shall own and love the truth,
 And never crucify and scar it ;
 When all shall know a heaven below—
 The world will be the better for it.

When Paradise on earth is gained,
 And converse held with seraph wardens ;
 When HOMES FOR ALL have been obtained,
 Where pure love dwells in peaceful gardens ;
 Where WORKING MEN shall dress the earth,
 'Till golden grains and fruits bend o'er it ;
 When all the poor, sweet homes secure—
 The world will be the better for it.

Laporte, Ind., July, 1866.

There are two classes of popular men—those pliant souls who yield gracefully to the force of circumstances ; who have a bow, a smile, or a pleasant word for every one, but are not deep in thought or single in purpose ; and those patient, plodding characters, who rise superior to surroundings, and by devotion to one idea win the confidence and respect of their fellows. He who has not the pliancy of the former, nor the executive ability of the latter, may be considered unfortunate.

R. P. LEWIS.

ASTROLOGY.—No. 1.

BY ALYTHIA.

“The use recently made of Astrology in the practical machinery of certain works of genius, (which are of the highest popularity, and above all praise,) seems to have excited in the world at large a desire to learn something of the mysteries of that science which has, in all former ages, if not in these days, more or less engaged reverence and usurped belief.”

The above language was used by Mr. J. M. Ashmand, in 1822, by way of apology for offering to the public an English translation of that ancient Astronomer and Geographer, Claudius Ptolemy on the influence of the stars. Presuming that these words are fully as applicable to the circumstances existing to-day, the writer proposes to offer a few reflections upon the ancient science of Astrology, in the progress of which it would seem meet to give a condensed history of its rise and progress, followed by a brief explanation of the general principles upon which the science is founded, and the supposed effects of the more simple positions and motions of the planetary orbs.

That the public will be interested in this subject, even though (as is generally the case,) they are disbelievers in its truthfulness, there is but little doubt, for as Mr. Ashmand remarks in another place, “Of all sciences which have at any time engaged the attention of the world, there is not one of which the real or assumed principles are less generally known in the present age than those of Astrology.”

The oldest work which has come down to our day upon Astrology is the *Tetrabiblos*, or *Quadripartite* of Claudius Ptolemy, and which was written about A. D. 133; indeed, this work, as an eminent writer remarks, “is the entire ground-work of those stupendous tomes in folio and quarto on the same subject, which were produced in myriads during the 16th and 17th centuries.” Ptolemy, however, does not claim to have invented, or rather discovered the principles of Astral influence, but to have completed, as he says, “the rules of the ancients, whose observations were founded in nature.” Indeed, Astrology can be clearly traced in Egypt, the ancient seat of learning, as far back as Hermes Tris-

megist, who lived anterior to Moses. He wrote *four* Astrological books, and the books of Ptolemy are *four* in number; and as the latter writer frequently alludes to the "rules of the ancients," "ancient writings," and of doctrines "handed down and recommended in the writings of the Egyptian authors," it has been supposed with a great deal of probability that Ptolemy's writings on this subject were actually founded on these very ancient works of Hermes himself. Be this as it may, that the belief in the doctrines of Astrology can be traced to a very early age cannot be denied, and that these doctrines were very universally diffused throughout the world long preceding the birth of Christ is equally well authenticated. It is quite probable, however, that the science took its rise in Egypt. Sir Isaac Newton says that Astrology was studied in Babylon 750 years B. C. The science flourished in Persia in the time of Zoroaster, who was himself a star-worshiper; and to this day it is held in great repute in that country, as high as six million livres being paid to Astrologers annually by the Persian kings. According to Pliny, who himself believed in stellar influences, Anaximander, the friend and disciple of Thales, by the rules of Astrology "foretold the earthquake which overthrew Lacedomon." This was in Greece, nearly 600 years before Christ. Anaxagoras, a famous philosopher of Greece, and preceptor of Socrates, is said to have devoted his whole life to Astrology. Pythagoras, Plato, Porphyry,¹ Aristotle, and the great Hippocrates, the Father of Medicine, were all supporters of the doctrines of this ancient science. The latter declares that a man who does not understand Astrology, is more deserving of being called a fool than a physician. In Rome, the science was equally as popular at an early day among the most cultivated and enlightened. Among others who speak in its favor may be mentioned Virgil, Cicero, and especially Horace. Macrobius wrote a poem on Astrology. The name of the most learned Proctor of Rome, Nigidius Figulus, should not be omitted, as he was a most gifted philosopher and astrologer. In Arabia, China, India, and among the Buddhists, Astrology was first established centuries before the Christian Era; and even in Mexico traces of this ancient science are found on the ruins of massive temples, and crumbling pyramids, built by a race long since extinct. Space will only per-

mit a mere allusion to the Astrological history of the ancients, which is indeed inexhaustable and deeply interesting; but enough has been said to show that the science is as old as history, and was widely diffused over the leading countries of the world at a very early period. We now come to the rise and progress of Astrology in England.

As we have heretofore remarked, the source of all Astrological knowledge among the moderns, is the Quadripartite of Ptolemy. This work was, however, but little known in England before the 15th century; and during the 16th and 17th centuries numerous systems made their appearance, founded upon the writings of Ptolemy, to be sure, but so tinctured with the superstitions of the Arabs, and crowded with errors resulting frequently from the ignorance of the authors themselves, that but little reliance could be placed upon these productions. Ptolemy's work was not translated into English until 1701, and that edition has been long removed from sale, owing to the gross misinterpretations of its author. Numerous professors of the Astral science sprang up in England soon after the appearance of this work, but of course as their foundation was in error, they proved stumbling blocks to the candid investigator. No reliable English translation of the Four Books of Ptolemy was made till 1822, when Mr. Ashmand's work appeared. This translation was made from Proclus' Greek Paraphrase of Ptolemy's original text, and is pronounced by critics as a very accurate rendering, and therefore reliable.

In 1647 Placidus de Titus, an Italian monk and celebrated mathematician, published a work entitled "The Primum Mobile," devoted to a demonstration of the principles of Astrology as taught by Ptolemy, and which is exemplified by thirty nativities of the most eminent men of Europe. This work has been pronounced the most successful attempt to reduce the teachings of Ptolemy's Four Books to practice ever made. It is certainly a work of deep research, and proves the author to have been a man of uncommon observation, and possessed of rare mental endowments. It was written in Latin. Several Astrologers wrote upon the science in England even after the production of this great work by Placidus, founding their doctrines thereon; but it is singular that no reliable translation of the entire treatise was made before

the present century. In 1816 a Mr. John Cooper rendered it into English. This work and Ptolemy's Quadripartite, translated by Ashmand, are now considered standard works upon Astrology.

It is remarkable that from the days of the conquest down to the time of Lord Bacon, almost every man of note as a mathematician was an Astrologer, and shows how universal was the belief in the science at that age. There was Oliver of Malmesbury, 1060, who is the oldest known writer on Mathematics; then comes Herbert of Lorraine, 1095, and Roger Bacon, born in 1214. In 1256 died the celebrated John of Halifax, whose true name was Holywood, and who, before Newton, was one of the ablest men of England—he, too, was a writer on Astrology. From the middle of the 13th century we will pass by a host of noted men who believed in the truth of planetary influence, and come down to King Richard I., 1392, who wrote "something on Astrology." The poet Geoffry Chaucer wrote a treatise on the Astrolahe, an instrument used at that period for making stellar observations for Astrological purposes. The Duke of Gloucester, in 1440, composed Astrological tables to aid in the computing of "directions." Robert Recorde, the founder of the school of English writers, the first man who wrote an Arithmetic in English, the first writer in English on Geometry, and who introduced Algebra into England, was also a believer in Astrology. Lastly should be mentioned the Viscount St. Alban's, Lord Vesulam, the noted Bacon. He was a firm believer in judicial Astrology, if we can believe the editors of *Chamber's Journal*. Bacon, it will be remembered, is called the founder of the new or inductive philosophy—a philosophy based wholly on observation and experiment; consequently it is natural to suppose, being himself such a close observer of nature's operations, he became a convert to the doctrines of Astrology only after a careful comparison of theory with facts; at least, so Astrologers would have us think. With Lord Bacon should be ranked the prince of mathematicians, Baron Napier, who invented logarithms. He speaks of Astrology as a true science. To another mathematician, the great Kepler, modern Astrologers are indebted for the discovery of several new Astrological "aspects."

Of the more modern professors of Astrology space will only allow the mention of a few of the most notorious. First of all is

William Lilly. He commenced the practice of Astrology in London in 1641, and soon became known all over the Kingdom and on the Continent. A universal belief in his powers soon pervaded all ranks, and during the civil wars which prevailed in his day he was consulted with the utmost confidence by both parties. On health, journeys, the gaining of wealth and honors, love, courtships, marriages—on any and all affairs of life—his decisions were sought for with avidity by high and low, rich and poor, and believed with the utmost credulity. Even Kings consulted him, *vide* King Charles I. He is said to have published some very remarkable prophecies, among them the great plague of 1651, and the great fire in 1666 which destroyed the greater part of London. He wrote several works on Astrology. He died on the 9th of June, 1681, at the age of 79.

A Mr. Partridge gained a considerable notoriety in England about the commencement of the 18th century as an Astrological writer. He published an almanac for many years, and several books, the most important of which are *The Opus Reformatum* and *The Defecio Geniturarum*—both made up from Placidus. They contain numerous examples. In 1795, in England, Mr. R. C. Smith was born. He began the study of Astrology at an early age, and commenced its practice while young in years, in 1822. Indeed he was soon considered quite a *rara avis*, as since the days of Lilly most professors of the science had been woefully illiterate. In 1824 he commenced the publication of the "Stragglng Astrologer," afterwards known as the "Astrologer of the 19th Century." This work gave him a great notoriety, "and he afterwards received the visits of nobles, and even of the greatest man in the realm." In 1826 he brought out his "Prophetic Messenger," "which met with a rapid sale." He was also the author of several minor works on his favorite study. We should add that Mr. Smith was almost universally known as "Raphael," a cognomen he assumed in all his Astrological writings. He died at the early age of 37.

During the last quarter of a century an English gentleman of no mean reputation as an Astronomer has devoted much of his time to the production of works on the ancient science of the stars, under the cognomen of "Zadkiel." Indeed, so carefully has he

disguised himself behind this assumed name, that but few even in England are aware who is the talented author of the many Astrological works which have from time to time made their appearance in that kingdom during the past twenty years. For several years Zadkiel edited a periodical entitled the "Horoscope: A Miscellany of Meteorology, the Celestial Science of Astrology and Literature." He has also published several treatises explanatory of the science, and in 1842 edited a new edition of Lilly's "Introduction to Astrology," written in 1647. Zadkiel was born the same year as "Raphael," and is therefore now over 70 years of age; nevertheless, he has recently published two extensive works on different branches of his favorite science, and still continues the annual publication of his Astrological Almanac, commenced in 1831, and has recently issued the thirty-first number of the Astronomical Ephemeris. This talented writer has done a great deal to call the attention of the intelligent to this long neglected science, so popular among the ancients, and seems perfectly sanguine that Astrology will at an early day take its place with the more popular sciences.

KINDNESS.

BY R. P. LEWIS.

No other trait can so adorn and dignify human nature as kindness. When we know a man to be kind we instinctively feel that he is noble. No matter how humble his circumstances, nor how rough his external appearance, if he has a warm and generous heart we value his good opinion, we seek his society, we secretly put him down on our list of friends. How often do we hear the expression concerning some one whose manners lack polish, who has been frowned on by fortune, or who has turned aside from the path of rectitude, "Well, after all, he is a *good-hearted man*;" and the tongue of the traducer is silenced, the mantle of charity falls on the child of misfortune, so instinctively do we recognize the worth and beauty of this heavenly virtue.

To be kind is to be God-like; for he is kind to the evil and to the unthankful, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. It is vain to call on God to draw near to us, while we ignore those works of practical goodness by which we can draw near to Him. He requires no loud lip-service, no tinsel glitter of priestly forms, but the silent incense of the heart, poured out in behalf of suffering, struggling, aspiring humanity. One of the sublimest sights that can engage the attention or gladden the hearts of mortals or immortals, is that of a good man, holding fast his integrity amidst corrupt and hardening influences, and never losing sight of the fact that we are all equally dear to the common Father. Such a man is the center of social and moral influences, around which cluster the affections of an entire community, and from whom rays of fraternal sympathy shoot far and wide into the surrounding darkness. When coupled with intelligence and administrative ability this trait sometimes gives to a single individual the power of drawing a whole nation within the sphere of kindly feeling and making of it one vast neighborhood. Of this character were Washington and Lincoln, the father and the savior of our Republic, who will ever live in the memory of a grateful people, and the luster of whose fame cannot be increased by the loftiest panegyric. On the choice of such men for the most responsible positions depend the life and happiness of a nation. No man should be called to fill the humblest office who has not a clear record for humanity. He who asks the suffrages of a great and free people should not hesitate to subscribe to the sentiment, "I am a man, and nothing that concerns humanity is a matter of indifference to me."

Spiritualists, Universalists, and other Liberals can afford to be kind; it is their nature to be so, and a logical sequence of their faith. And, be it said to the credit of human nature, which is stronger than creeds, there is a vein of good feeling, of active and kindly sympathies, among our "Orthodox" neighbors, notwithstanding their horrible caricatures of Deity and wicked depreciation of their poor, deceitful hearts!

Brethren! We know the more excellent way. Let us show it to others.

OUR TREATY WITH CHINA.

The great event which in the future history of our country will mark the year 1868, is the recent treaty between the United States and China.

It is the guide-board which will point the travelers of all nations to justice, friendship and wealth. Our Asiatic neighbors are worthy our esteem and confidence, for though they may possess attributes which our mantle of Christian charity is too narrow to cover, yet in the main, they are a good and peaceable people.

They are industrious, working early and late; temperate, seldom seen in a state of intoxication; frugal and economical, turning to gold articles thrown into the street by white people, and commendably apt to attend to their own affairs.

After the several articles of this treaty are digested by the Christians of America, a religious earthquake may be expected. According to Article 4, these worshippers of wooden gods, may build their heathen temples in any town of the United States, and worship their Joss unmolested. Idolatry may be established in puritanic New England, if they choose, a thing, however, they will be little inclined to do, while the Pacific States and Territories offer superior facilities for making money. The Christian world might reap advantages by stipulating with each other to worship whatever god their different imaginations might set up.

The Chinese have no faith in the Christians' God, but worship objects that manifest themselves to the senses. They exclude their women from heaven hereafter, and from social life here. They hold sacred the bones of their dead men, and those who die in foreign countries are packed and sent by ships to their native land. They believe in no Sabbath, but worship Joss, burn incense and Joss-sticks, colored papers, steal chickens and eat them, make obeisance and mutter prayers to a fierce looking idol in a niche of the temple, and perform many other ridiculous rites for two weeks in February and their worshipping is done for the year. They are slow to comprehend the doctrines of the church, as a little incident will illustrate. I was severely reprimanded by a pious Scotch woman just arrived for neglecting the soul of my Chinese Foo, who had been some years in my employ. I turned the missionary duty

over to her. She inquired of Foo if he knew Christ died for him. He opened his almond eyes to a wonderful width and asked, "what for he die?" "That you and all of us might live," replied she with anxious piety depicted in her features.

Foo paused a moment, to study the case, then replied, "too muchy lie, Kisle die, Chinaman die, Melican man die all the samey. No sarvy, no likey," he shook his head determinedly which put an end to further efforts to save his soul.

By our late treaty our yellow brethren are allowed seats in our street cars, which is a simple act of justice. It is petty thieving by rich companies to accept their money for an inside seat, and compel them to stand on the platform. There is preference in color, however, for while the yellow and white men are allowed to ride, the black have the privilege and exercise of walking.

Underlying this treaty with the celestial empire, is a strong motive aside from friendship and justice. As a nation, Americans have an eye to the loaves and fishes, why not to the teas and silks?

Our future trade with China and Japan is incalculable. The line of steamers running from San Francisco to Hongkong and Yokahama, is working out a problem of international friendliness with these old and long isolated nations. And if we by extending a few courtesies to these wonderful people secure the immense profits arising therefrom, who shall charge us with mercenary motives?

I say *we*, because senators, officials, and speech makers do, not grammatically, for we being the plural of I, I have no right to use it. Properly *they*, because kind nature has placed me in the category of humans who can break, but not make laws, who are not allowed to help form treaties, but are expected to applaud those framed by wise heads at Washington.

The most important article of this treaty is that of making citizens of Chinamen. It may be questioned whether this is the spirit of the treaty, but I do not see by what twisting and turning they can be denied the rights of citizenship when they ask for them. They have already the right to buy land, build house and temples, and do busines the same as "may be enjoyed by the citizens or subjects of the most favored nations."

Now the question arises, are *we*, and this time I mean we, to be subject to laws made by men who a few weeks since opened their eyes with undisguised dismay at seeing women mingle in social life with their husbands and brothers? These, too, the most intelligent and best of the empire. Are we to be governed by laws framed by men who do not believe in the morality of women or the immortality of their souls? Men who look upon women as beneath the vilest of their sex, who own as many wives as they choose to buy, or as many as they can pay for?

Gold is the chief corner stone, on which the beautiful structure of Chinese treaties rests. If *we* exercise the right of suffrage the currency of the nation is not increased.

The Republican party in its eagerness to secure the Negro vote, overlooked the utter ignorance of millions, born, raised and educated in the school of slavery. Their incompetence to vote, understandingly, could easily be remedied in a few lessons from these who had elevated them to the standard of free citizens.

The progressive wing of Democracy, observing the great gain likely to accrue to the opposite side, turned their attention to the female element, with faith that woman's gratitude would prompt her to deposit her vote for the party who had so suddenly discovered their fitness to govern themselves.

The Republicans are not to be outdone. Burlingame, Seward and Senate eagerly seize upon the idea that the peaceful, home-loving Chinamen would prove no mean acquisition to the popular party, there is money in it too; hence the treaty.

The handsomest men of the empire, clad in their gayest silks, their queues nearly sweeping the ground, are taken to Washington, petted and banqueted, until they begin to "sarvy" that Melican man has bella good country, and that John will make as much out of the treaty as Melicans will.

There are at present 50,000 Chinamen in the State of California, who, when they become naturalized, will by the laws of the State possess privileges denied her best educated married women. They may sit as jurors, vote and be voted for, do business without a process of law, administer the estate of deceased relatives and fill any position of political bestowing, though not one of the 50,000 may know a letter of the English alphabet!

Dr. Holland, who denies the right of suffrage to woman, describes her as being both more human and divine than man.

“True sister of the son of man
True sister of the son of God.”

Yet the men who are to make laws for her divine nature, are from the bogs of Ireland, the slave pens of the South and the idolatrous land of China!

F. M. K.

San Francisco, Cal.

“This world’s a howling wilderness,
This world is not my home.”

So sing the devotees of a gloomy theology. What is the tendency of such teaching? Evidently, to impress the plastic mind of youth with a low estimate of this beautiful earth, and dishonorable views of its great Architect. The “howling” is done by those who “paint the face of Omnipotence with an eternal frown;” not by the “world,” nor by those who regard this life as the incipient stage of an endless and better existence. R. P. LEWIS.

BE TRUE.

Thou must be true thyself,
If thou the truth would’st teach;
Thy soul must overflow if thou
Another soul would’st reach,
It needs the overflow of heart
To give the lips full speech.

Think truly, and thy thoughts
Shall the world’s famine feed;
Speak truly, and each word of thine
Shall be a fruitful seed;
Live truly, and thy life shall be
A great and noble creed.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

MOSES HULL & W. F. JAMIESON, EDITORS.

OFFICE, 90 WASHINGTON STREET, POST OFFICE DRAWER 5966, CHICAGO.

REV. ROBERT COLLYER.

Audi Aleram Partem.

The SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM is pledged to give all sides an impartial hearing. Truth never can be injured by bold investigation. Our readers will remember the editorial in the September number of the SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM, entitled "Robert Collyer and Horace Seaver *versus* Spiritualism." The following letters explain themselves :

CHICAGO, Sept. 9, 1868.

W. F. JAMIESON—*My Dear Sir* : I have received this morning a copy of a Magazine entitled the SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM, in which I find an article marked, and signed with your initials, referring to myself and to a sermon I preached last May. I presume from the use you make of this, that you have followed (as I believe some others did before you), the report of the newspapers. It is not a true report, if I remember it at all, but like most of those things, as you may perhaps be aware, if you have been much "reported," untrue, in quite essential particulars. At the time this report came out, some person I did not know, and do not care for, wrote to me demanding to know if it was true, in an imperious way, and also what was true, and to see my manuscript. I did not answer that note. The result was a hornet's nest. I did not mind this either, because I am somewhat used to that sort of thing. But I was sorry after that, to see that the *Banner of Light*, had caught up the thing and made it the text for a hasty curse. You have followed the common error, too. If you had taken the trouble to ask those that heard the discourse they would have set you right, and saved your time and type, for the spirit of your paper makes me feel sure you do not want to misrepresent either this or any other

matter. Now the sermon is still in existence, every word of it just as it was preached and you can see it if you care to come over. You can print it, also, if you want to, and reply to what I say ; for I do say things you will neither believe nor like, but do not go on the false scent for that can never bring you any game.

Respectfully yours, ROBERT COLLYER.

OFFICE OF THE SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM,
Chicago, Sept. 9, 1868.

REV. ROBERT COLLYER—*My Dear Sir* : Your note of to-day's date received. I did follow the reports of the Chicago papers, and predicated my editorial thereupon ; and never having seen the reports contradicted, supposed you did utter what the reporter or reporters said you did. I regret, exceedingly, that I have been led into a misrepresentation of your views, and will do whatever lies in my power to correct the report. I will publish your sermon in the ROSTRUM, with pleasure. Never mind what I do not like. It may be that which I do not like is truth, and that when I become better acquainted with it I will like it better. The earnest desire on the part of Mr. Hull and myself is to know the Truth, and to publish it, let what may befall us. We clearly, I think, recognize that there is as much danger of being blinded by an "ism," in our search for truth, as by a "sect." I mention this from the fact that there are Spiritualists who are under bondage to an ism, while commiserating their unfortunate fellow beings, who are enslaved by sect.

No, my friend, it is far from us to intentionally misrepresent any man.

Permit me, in closing, to thank you for your kind note of correction, trusting that the "false scent" and no "game" will teach me to look better to my footsteps. I am still young with a chance for improvement.

In accordance with your invitation, I will call to-morrow at 295 Chicago avenue, at two o'clock.

Yours, respectfully, W. F. JAMIESON.

We accordingly, called upon Mr. Collyer at his residence, and received from him the much talked-of sermon, which we will publish entire in our next number.

MARRIAGE.

Marriage is an important subject, and *must* be discussed. All that is *true* in the marriage relation will bear the test of the mighty revolution which is now, we believe, close at hand. The eternally mated will be found among the "unterrified." Blessed is the woman who has found her heart's idol, in the person of her husband. For her, there is peace, tranquillity, rest. Happy the man who can see in the person of his wife, what perhaps other eyes cannot see, beauty, grace, sweetness, all crowned by love. For such, the agitation of the social question will have no terrors. Secure in each other's affection they can bid defiance to the wild roar of the elements—the howling storm of social life which is about to break upon us in all its fury. But how many poor, crushed, bleeding hearts will appall the beholder. Woman, delicately, sensitively organized, will be as usual, the greater sufferer.

Moses Hull, in "A few Thoughts on Love and Marriage," says :
 "There is a remedy against false marriage. Educate yourselves ; know yourselves and what you want, then know the person you make your companion."

Ah! there's the rub. Here is a case, a sample of many: A young man, full of promise marries a blooming Miss. She is all the world to him. They live twenty years together, happily, each convinced that the other is the true soul-mate. They rear a family of noble sons, and charming, intelligent daughters. Suddenly there comes into view a mere cloud-speck athwart their matrimonial sky, in the form of some peculiarity of disposition, which had lain dormant all those years. The horizon is soon overcast, the light of love is shut out, the waters of hate and bitterness take the place of the sunshine of love; all is enveloped in darkness, and two once loving souls, "with but a single thought," become estranged, separate, and nothing is left but the smouldering embers of a once happy marriage. This is not an overdrawn picture, it is taken from life. Are there, then, no true soul-unions that shall survive the ravages of time and circumstances? We believe there are, but do not think that our author, or any one else, has discovered a rule, or a series of rules, by which man or woman can determine

with mathematical certainty, what one among a hundred thousand million is the soul's true mate. *Approximation* to true marriage does not constitute marriage. This Marriage question is fraught with interest. Remember, our pages are open for all well written articles on *any* question pertaining to the welfare of humanity.

W. F. J.

WHY SO MANY INDIAN SPIRITS?

It has been noticed by every observer of Phenomenal Spiritualism that a very large percentage of spirits that control media not only profess to have been of the aboriginal race, but manifest very many of their idiosyncrasies. Perhaps, at least six out of every ten of the manifestations through a majority of mediums are from Indians, while we know of no medium who is not occasionally influenced by Indian spirits. Why is this, we have been asked a thousand times? There is a solution to this problem, and we think we have it.

I. In the spirit world, on this continent, the Indian element is as yet, and will be for ages to come, the positive element. It is not yet four hundred years since the first white man passed to the spirit world from this continent, whereas the Indians of this country have been passing away for more than as many thousand years.

The Indians passing from this country, have not been emigrants from another country to this, but have passed from the country where they belonged. *Hence here is where they belong to-day*—where they ever will belong; but with others, a majority of them were only emigrants here—they really belonged to another country—their ties and social relations are in another country—they would at least be more given to travel in other countries, than would the Indians who have no business any where else except here. How natural then that there should be twenty or forty Indians in spirit-life, on this continent, to one white person. How natural also, that Caucasians should go to see their friends and relatives in other countries, and not tarry here all the time.

2. In this life, persons of our race are more apt than Indians, to have a regular occupation. How natural then, that in spirit-life they should have their legitimate business and follow it. That

being so, they would not be so apt to spend so much of their time in circles, as would the Indian, who, in that country as in this, has no regular pursuit or calling to take his whole attention.

3. Indians during this life live more in harmony with laws calculated to develop strong magnetic power, than do our pleasure seeking, fashion loving Caucasians. Why should they not have more of that power when they cross the river of death?

4. Why should the president of Yale or Harvard College leave his station to come to Chicago to teach a child its alphabet? He undoubtedly *could* do that, but while there are so many in Chicago who could not fill his office, that could, nevertheless, teach a child its alphabet as well as he, should not they do that and leave him to his work? So if an Indian can teach us of a hereafter as well as some one who could engage in a higher work, why not let him do it and have others engage in a work to which the Indian is not adapted. George Washington or Abraham Lincoln could cease to preside over a congress of immortals and come to circles, but while others could do it as well, will they do it? We regard them as doing a great work, and do not believe they will come down to participate in circles where a majority would be better gratified with the oddities of a *Jack Brown* than with Baconian logic or Websterian eloquence. Gen. Grant could leave the military to run itself and spend his time playing at marbles with the little boys of Chicago. Ben. Wade could retire from the Senate to teach little girls how to dress their doll babies, but we seriously doubt the propriety of their doing so. So, Socrates, Demosthenes, Jesus Christ and Ben. Franklin *may* occupy the editorial sanctum of the *News from the Spirit World* but we incline to think that their present work is in heaven more than upon earth.

Upon this subject, more when necessary.

M. H.

BEST BOOK FOR EVERY BODY.—The new illustrated edition of Webster's Dictionary, containing three thousand engravings, is the *best book for everybody* that the press has produced in the present century, and should be regarded as indispensable to the well regulated home, reading-room, library, and place of business.—*Golden Era.*

A HALF HOUR WITH THE SPIRITS.

A person never yet believed spiritualism so strongly that he could not be strengthened by a little *fresh* testimony. This strengthening we have recently enjoyed. We have in our publications heretofore often mentioned the manifestations of spirit power witnessed in the presence of Dr. Henry Slade, of Jackson, Mich. A few days since we called upon him in his Kalamazoo office, and expressed a desire to witness a few test manifestations. We went into the Doctor's private room and examined the table, bells, accordion, slate, etc., to be sure (for the sake of our readers, for *we* were sure before) that there was no machinery there. The Doctor then, to make assurance doubly sure sat down with his *side* to the table, so that his feet and hands were all the time in view. In about a minute a small piece of slate pencil, without any visible hand touching it, wrote, "God bless you, my son," and signed the name of our angel mother. A few other sentences were written out, after which the Doctor took the accordion by the bellows in his right hand, while we joined hands with his left, the accordion played "Gentle Annie," and "Sweet Home," at the same time two bells, one a large dinner bell and the other a small tea bell chimed, keeping time, most beautifully, no hand touching either of them. Our astonishment did not reach its culmination until we heard a noise at our right. We looked around, and there was a chair moving up and down, keeping perfect time to the music. After these things had continued several minutes the bells were, each of them, laid upon the table so adroitly as to preclude the possibility of it being done by any other than supermundane power.

All of these things occurred in broad day light. We know we were not hood-winked nor deceived.

How astonishing such manifestations! One such sitting as we had is worth more than a thousand sittings in the dark, where the chances for deception are so numerous that they weaken all the evidence which comes in such a manner.

Hundreds of scoundrels have proved themselves capable of taking advantage of the dark and deceiving, thus trifling with the

most sacred feelings of the human heart, until sensible men and women are beginning to look with suspicion on all dark circle manifestations. It is a pity that the innocent must suffer with the guilty, but they must. A person may now about as well post himself as a lying, treacherous deceiver as a dark circle medium. May the time soon come when we shall, as a body, be better able to detect the "wolves in sheep's clothing," and thus encourage and protect the genuine mediums, and purge our ranks from miserable mountebanks, whose only motive is to humbug the people and get their money.

M. H.



WHAT THE PEOPLE AND THE PRESS THINK OF THE SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM.

The people appreciate an independent journal. This is the secret of the favor with which our Magazine is received, and which will ultimately place it in the vanguard of popular Monthlies.

The many kind greetings which we are receiving from whole-souled men and women—noble-hearted reformers—prove that "such is the irresistible nature of truth that all it wants, and all it asks, is the liberty of appearing."

From H. T. Child, M. D.

"I am much pleased with your paper, hope it will live to bless the world and you too. Your *ROSTRUM* circulates well here—at least mine does—so I want you to send me another copy that I shall lock up as soon as it comes and keep to bind, and then lend it."

Yours truly,

HENRY T. CHILD, M. D.

Philadelphia, Pa., Aug. 5, 1868.

"The *ROSTRUM* circulates well here" is the gratifying news from various parts of the country. We promise our readers rich treats from the pen of Brother Child.

From J. T. Rouse.

"I am inclined to believe that Spiritualism, like the Gospel of Christ, may be a "savor of life unto life," or of "death unto death." Have we not through the social experiences which grow directly

out of this agitation, been caused to bury many bright hopes? O, for the dawn of truth's bright millennium! Would to God that some strong angel, charged with regenerating power, might move in majesty on the earth to bless and elevate her race.

We are weak brethren! too weak to find our way unaided by the light. Once we found consolation in the closet, but now if we kneel to pray, how the cold breath of intellectual philosophy freezes and chills us. Yet I know that we are on the road that leads to the sun-crowned summit of the delectable mountains."

Our gifted brother, though physically blind is spiritually clear-sighted. Many of earth's toiling ones have been gladdened by glowing words of truth, as they have fallen from the lips of this truly inspired and deep-thoughted orator. He is doing excellent service in the Spiritualistic field.

From Mrs. A. Wilhelm, M. D.

"Inclosed are the names of subscribers for the SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM.

"The Discussion proves an attractive feature, while the ready pen of Mrs. Brown is in keeping with clear thought, well and logically expressed, pleasant and practical.

"I saw Moses Hull in Providence. He is one of our earnest, working pioneers, whose labors must result in great good in leading Biblical thinkers to a higher plane of thought and action."

Sister Wilhelm has the thanks of the editors, for her efforts in behalf of the SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM. We hope our readers will soon have the pleasure of perusing a sketch biographical of this true woman.

From Andrew Jackson Davis.

"It is important that Spiritualists be educated to a higher standard in their search for Truth, and I have hopes that your Magazine will stimulate them to enter bravely upon this exalted labor.

"With cordial best wishes from Mrs. Davis and

"Yours, Fraternally, A. J. DAVIS."

Had A. J. Davis been actuated by a selfish ambition what a mighty leader he might have become. "To be a leader" is no part of the composition of the Great Thinker, A. J. Davis. He

lives above the petty influences that inaugurated kingdoms, priest-hoods and their attendant aristocracies. His writings have given tone to the character of American Spiritualists, and have probably done more to implant within the soul a supreme love of truth, for *its own sake*, than those of any other author who ever lived. A Spiritualist who is well versed in the writings of Brother Davis, is a philosopher, believes in the exercise of Reason, and unhesitatingly rejects error, whether taught by spirits in or out of human bodies.

We trust that our Magazine will fulfill Brother Davis' hopes, that its readers may be stimulated to improve society by elevating the standard of Manhood and Womanhood.

"THE SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM: A monthly Magazine, devoted to the Harmonial Philosophy. Published by Hull & Jamieson, No. 90 Washington st., (P. O. drawer 5966) Chicago, Illinois; \$2 per year; 20c. a number.

We are under obligations to the publishers for the July number of this new monthly. The ROSTRUM consists of 36 large pages, beautifully printed on white paper, and neatly stitched in appropriate covers. It is edited by Moses Hull and W. F. Jamieson. Mr. Hull, we believe, was for several years a star of the first magnitude in the constellation of Advent leaders, but finally succumbed to the winning doctrines of modern Spiritualism. Mr. Jamieson has long been known to the Spiritual fraternity as a talented and successful expounder of their peculiar ideas, while he has the meritorious reputation, in the reportorial world, of being one of the best Phonographic writers in the West. We notice in the list of regular contributors the names of several prominent reformatory lecturers and writers.

The ROSTRUM certainly reflects great credit upon its editorial management and typographical execution; and, being the only Magazine of the kind published in this country, we presume will meet with the hearty support of that class for which it is specially intended.—*Allegan Journal.*

W. F. J.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

THE SPIRITUAL HARP.—By J. M. Peebles, and J. O. Barrett. E. K. Bailey, Musical Editor.

This handsome volume now lies on our table, fresh from the press of William White & Co., publishers, 158 Washington street, Boston, Mass. It is bound in a durable form, neatly printed, and is just what Spiritualists all over the country need. The cost of the work is small when its size, and the amount of labor bestowed upon it, are taken into consideration.

The Harp is a most important addition to our literature. Its music is adapted to all occasions. How often we have felt the need of just such a book. Now we can have song free from the taint of theological absurdity; now we can sing sweet words expressive of the divine principles of our inspirational religion; now the heart can beat responsive to the intellect. Let all the people sing.

The Harp is adapted to the use of Children's Progressive Lyceums as well as Societies.

The title of the book is beautiful—"Spiritual Harp," it is significant of melody. The very first verse of the first piece entitled "Spiritual Harp," written by Mrs. C. J. Osborn, makes one feel cheerful.

"We come, we come with our harps of gold,
From the far-off Summer land,
The crystal river we've crossed again,
We've left an angel band,
To bring to you on our golden harps,
Sweet music from afar,
With cadence soft that the angels sing,
As they glide from star to star."

We notice several pieces composed by our gifted brother, A. B. Whiting, entitled, "Gloria! an Angel born To-day!" "Waiting, only Waiting," "Oh, Strike the Harp in Nature's Praise!"

Some of L. B. Brown's choicest poetic gems grace the pages of the Harp. "Build Him a Monument" is particularly fine.

The arrangement of the work is excellent. First, "Harmonies for various occasions." Second, "Congregational and Social."

Third, "Songs, Duets and Quartets." Fourth, "Anthems, Sentences, Choruses." Fifth, "Spirit Echoes." The "echoes" are sayings of gifted minds who have lived in different ages.

Price, single copy.....	\$2.00
" 12 copies.....	19.00
" 25 "	38.00
" 50 "	72.50

When sent by mail 20 cents additional for postage required on each copy. In our work of organizing Societies and Lyceums in Illinois, we will supply the people with the Harp at publishers' prices.

W. F. J.

Truth never suffers from being severely handled. It is like pure silver or gold, the more it is rubbed the brighter it will shine. The jeweler who refuses to have his wares touched betrays at once the spuriousness of their metal. In like manner, that system of religion which ignores all investigation shows itself to be unsound. This test applies to Spiritualism as well as all the other isms of the present day. The only true method is to *prove* all things, and hold fast that which is good. Therefore any ism that will seek to cloak itself under the shadows of midnight darkness, and refuse a single ray of light, proves its own falsehood. * *

STATE CONVENTION.

The Illinois Association of Spiritualists will assemble in Capitol Hall, Springfield, Friday, Saturday and Sunday, October 23, 24 and 25, 1868. The Convention will commence its sessions on Friday at 10 o'clock, A. M.

Each local Society is entitled to two delegates and an additional one for each fractional fifty members over the first fifty.

MILTON T. PETERS, *President.*

W. F. JAMIESON, *Secretary.*