

THE ROSTRUM.

VOL. II. CHICAGO, ILL., AUG., 1869. No. 2.

DISCUSSION BETWEEN W. F. JAMIESON AND REV. SELAH WHEADON.

QUESTION: Modern Spiritualism is the same system of Religion which the New Testament represents was taught by Jesus Christ and his Apostles.

AFFIRMATIVE BY W. F. JAMIESON.

I admire the spirit of my esteemed opponent. His views of discussion—eschewing personalities, giving doctrines believed to be errors “no quarter,” “truth, not victory”—is after my own heart. What a merry time we will have of it!

My friend promises to show that modern Spiritualism is a “monstrous absurdity.” If he can prove that, he will make one convert, if not more than one; do not think it can be done. Many attempts have been made since the advent of modern Spiritualism to prove it a “monstrous absurdity,” but they were miserable failures; do not deny, however, that the opponents of Spiritualism have succeeded in erecting monstrous absurdities which they have been pleased to label Spiritualism. In short, they had their labor for their pains, because they built men of straw for the pleasure of knocking them down. In order to truly define Spiritualism it is necessary to correctly state its principles, as endorsed by the great body of its believers. Unanimity of opinion upon minor points of Spiritualism cannot be expected among Spiritualists; but on fundamental principles they are a unit. These principles are the same as those taught by Jesus Christ and his Apostles. It cannot be decided that two systems that are fundamentally the same are not alike *as systems*. Minor

differences are allowable in their comparison; were it otherwise, it would be impossible for any two systems to be alike. I grant the correctness of my friend's statement, that it is not enough for me to show that "Spiritualism holds *some* of the doctrines of Christ's religion." The "some" will be found to be a pretty large *sum* before our discussion closes. I acknowledge that it devolves upon me to prove that the central idea of both systems of religion is the same; because if I should prove the religions alike in everything except the central idea, I would fail to sustain the proposition. So it is necessary, in order to prove that they are alike, to show that their fundamental, or essential principles are the same. This I have done thus far.

In my first article I laid down *ten* propositions for my friend's consideration. He admitted one—concerning the distinction between religion and its rites, forms, ceremonies. It was refreshing, too, to read his criticisms on the "glitter and pomp of the Romish church," and the "*monstrous* errors" of either the Romish or Protestant churches. My friend has denied two of the ten propositions, one concerning Death; the other, the Mediumship of Jesus. He has questioned the correctness of my quotation of one passage of Scripture—about the fishes; and also, that human "spirits were Christ's constant companions and guardians." The following positions have not been noticed:

1. The Eclecticism of the religion of Jesus and his apostles, and modern Spiritualism. After Bro. Wheadon will have successfully denied that Jesus taught a system of eclecticism, then his texts about the mere opinions of Peter, James, John, and others, will have some weight; but if, as I maintain, Jesus and his apostles did teach an eclectic religion—the acceptance of truth from any source—and nothing on the mere *ipse dixit* of men—then the opinion of Peter, or Paul, is of just as much authority as that of my friend Wheadon, and no more.
2. The final happiness of all mankind, unnoticed. My friend, of course, will not deny that this is a teaching of Jesus and his apostles.
3. The kind of God that Jesus worshiped, the God of nature, unnoticed.
4. Religion and Morality inseparable, unnoticed.

5. Condition of spirits in the next world, unnoticed.

6. Jesus communicating with the spirits that once lived in earthly bodies, unnoticed.

Will my friend either admit or deny any one, or all, of the foregoing propositions as being a portion of the religious system taught by Jesus Christ and his apostles? When this is done I will give the chapters and verses called for; and also notice texts brought forward, either singly or in classes. You are on the negative, Brother Wheadon: "Follow thou me," and I will become responsible for your "crooked paths." In the meantime, my brother, I will act the part of the "good Samaritan," and point out a few of the errors into which you have already fallen. It is the duty of the affirmative to either defend or abandon his own propositions, when denied by the negative. I have two denials to meet, one of them emphatic.

1. You emphatically deny that Jesus taught that "there is no death." If he did not teach it, I confess I have fallen into a great error, and cannot hope to prove that the religion of Jesus and the apostles is the same as modern Spiritualism in this fundamental doctrine, believed in by Spiritualists as a body. Now, did Jesus believe it?—that there is no death. Let us see: From the fact that he conversed with the spirits of "dead folks"—as you are pleased to term them—he *positively knew* that what is erroneously called death is but the "flower-encircled gateway to show us those we love"—a glorious, beautiful change. Physical death *seems* like a total extinction of being; and so strong a hold has this "seeming" upon thousands of minds that they believe that to "die" means to *perish!* Judgment founded upon mere appearances is deceptive, yet this is the only way that thousands have to judge of death; but I ask, Do those who believe in the immortality of the soul—Catholics, Pagans, Protestants, Spiritualists, and others, do they believe that any man is *really dead?* No! They believe that the *real* man—his spirit—is alive, always, before and after its departure from the earthly tabernacle. The science of chemistry proves that even the body does not die; in fact, that death, in the strict sense, does not exist anywhere! The universe teems with life! If the spirit *could die* it would not be *immortal!* Jesus Christ is represented as having "*abolished*

death and hath brought life and immortality to light." He recognized immortality as a sublime triumph over death when he declared to a woman, "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall *never die*." Yet, who will pretend to say that when he uttered this language that he believed that those who believed in him would escape the physical change called death? He must have known as well as any Spiritualist now knows, that believers and unbelievers would experience a change from this world to the next, leaving their old earthly bodies to moulder in the ground. The term "death" has been used in much the same sense that we say, "The sun rises." Science has proved that the sun does not rise. Primitive Spiritualism, taught by Jesus and his apostles, proved that man does not die!

Such was the repugnance that Jesus entertained against the idea of death that he frequently used the word "sleep" instead, as contra-distinguished from death. I am well aware, however, that Christians, of all denominations, claim that Jesus raised people from the dead. Take, for instance, the case of the raising of Jairus' daughter. Never knew one who believing in a literal resurrection, did not claim this as a *bona fide* case of raising from the dead; for she was reported to Jesus by her father's servant as being dead. When Jesus went to see her, there was a tumult—"great weeping and wailing," (which is now nearly out of fashion.) Jesus said, (Mark v : 39,) "The damsel *is not dead*, but sleepeth." Luke reports him as saying the same thing, and adds, "They laughed him to scorn, *knowing that she was dead*." Of course, like my friend Wheadon, they believed in "dead folks." Jesus did not; hence, he was a Spiritualist. Luke says that when Jesus told the damsel to arise, "her spirit came again." Seems it had been away; it could not have been dead. The spirit is the *real* person, so Jesus was justified, as any modern Spiritualist is, in saying, "She is not dead."

The case of Lazarus, as related in the eleventh chapter of John, may be considered an exception to the rule, by some; but I candidly admit that if there is an exception to this rule, such is its nature, that it would be the death of the rule. It can be shown that whenever Jesus expressed an opinion of the state of the person supposed to be dead, he always said he, or she, *slept*. He

said the same thing of Lazarus. When John represents him as saying, plainly, "Lazarus is dead," he makes him utter a sentiment contrary to his universal practice; and not only that, but involves him in a self-contradiction. It is easier for me to think that John made a mistake in his report, than to believe that Jesus contradicted himself. I do not mean to say that Jesus never used the word "death," but he did not believe in the *idea* that it was used to represent. We Spiritualists employ the word sometimes, (though seldom as possible consistent with being understood,) but do not believe in the meaning generally attached to it. Further evidence to show that "Jesus taught there is no death," appears almost supererogatory; but I will call attention to Matt. xxii : 32. "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is *not* the God of the *dead*, but of the *living*!" Matthew informs us that "when the multitude heard this, they were *astonished* at his doctrine." It was new to them. Even now-a-days many, who have not outgrown the Jewish superstition concerning death, are astonished at the same doctrine. But the question may arise, Is not God the God of all things? I answer, Yes. Orthodox Christians believe so too. And as there is really no death, God cannot be the God of what is not. Luke represents Jesus as saying, "He is not the God of the dead," and then explains why, "for *all live* unto him." Our Universalist friends have always been successful in proving that "a-l-l" does not spell "part." That there is no death is a cardinal teaching of Spiritualism, and a glorious truth, from which there is no escape.

2. Denial of the mediumship of Jesus. My friend argues that because Jesus did not *claim* to be a clairvoyant, clairaudient, or any other kind of a medium, therefore he was not such a medium. The logic of that is, if a man performs an act, but does not claim to perform it, therefore he does not perform it! I do not know that Jesus claimed to be a man, therefore he was not a man! He did not, in so many words, claim to be immortal; was he not, therefore, immortal? And, now, will Mr. Wheadon be kind enough to tell us the chapter and verse where "*he claimed* to be a 'mediator between God and men.'" I deny that he ever

claimed it; therefore, according to Wheadon logic, he was not a "mediator between God and men."

"Will Mr. Jamieson tell us the chapter and verse where Christ told his disciples where to catch one hundred and fifty-three fishes? Did you see that clairvoyantly? Don't remember to have seen it."

My friend wants "light, more light." That is good. Well, I humbly confess that I did see that clairvoyantly. The word *literally* means *clear-sightedness*. Brother Wheadon, you may become a clairvoyant in the same sense in which I have the gift, by turning to John xxi : 3, 6, 11. My brother, "Search the Scriptures."

Yours, in behalf of human brotherhood,

W. F. JAMIESON.



THE TRIUMPH OF PRIDE.

BY FREDERIC R. MARVIN.

We seem not all we are—we are not all we seem,
For wayward Pride, with colors bright, paints life's short dream;
And where the days are dark, and where the skies are black,
She leaves upon the fading hours her golden track.

On youth her subtle fingers trace, with skill complete,
An hour when ardent love with regal fame shall meet;
And age she bids upon a future day rely—
Regardless of the silent moments as they fly.

And lo! she gives to mortal man immortal name;—
Upon the venal altar of his frozen heart,
She strews her jewels rare, and lights her baleful flame;
With more than human skill she hides all trace of shame:
Beneath her glass our vice and virtue are the same.

She scorns all human life—she spurns the fear of death—
She mocks, with gems and jewels rare, the failing breath:
She triumphs over time, and sits upon the throne
Of human mind—with power supreme she reigns alone.

A SERMON, *NOT* PATENTED.

BY JOHN F. HOLLISTER.

TEXT: "The Prophets prophecy falsely, the Priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so; and what will ye do in the end thereof?"

The first two clauses of this text tell a very bulky truth, a truth (not flattering to popular orthodoxy) worthy the notice of the greatest God, whether *in* man or out of him, both for its historic import and its current influence for weal or woe upon human kind.

The Prophetic and Priestly propensity has constantly pressed itself into the van of all tribes and nations at all times. The parent of all religions, all devotion has given it homage, all talent has paid it tribute. It has propagated its dogmas in all lands, placing its sectarian icebergs and Saharas in all climes, among all peoples, freezing and scorching the fresher, sweeter plants and flowers of the human soul with their frosts and fires.

Ecclesiastical sectarian names, too, are delusory. Thus, Baptist (as immersionists), Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Methodist, Universalist, Campbellite, is not found in the Christian Shaster. They are modern innovations of misdirections, with each its priest to "run the machine."

The priest polity requires the priest policy, and thus are introduced proxy sins, proxy atonements, proxy justice, proxy mercy, proxy death, proxy life, proxy —— everything the enlightened soul does *not* want, together with the dearth and privation of all that the better unfoldment desires and needs.

In their preaching, these extravagant interpreters of the Divine economies, have so long decried and debased the humanities, and glorified and exalted the Divinities; so long urged "total depravity" and alienation on the one part, and unapproachable Majesty on the other, that no rational relationship and likeness can now be recognized; they have flung man floundering into the bottom of the "bottomless pit," baptized (immersed is the later gloss) in the slush and slime of "imputed sin" and shame, and set their God on a throne so "high and lifted up" that their people cannot

approach him, and even if they could, they would be scared away. Thus situated, without the aid of some theological Lord Ross' telescope—which by implication these conservators perhaps assume to be—neither party can see the other. The normal and intimate relationship which must necessarily be, and be realized between the Good Father and all His children, is hopelessly obliterated; the Christ principle in the individual is only speculated upon as a chimera, or discarded as a myth; and man is left to wander in the wilderness of ignorance and unsatisfied longing, hearing the voice Divine only in the faint, distorting echoes of the impertinent, mediatorial priests, while his feeble cries for wisdom and light are swallowed up in the reverberations of the pit.

A sheep falls into the slough: nobody is silly enough to attempt to cleanse the creature while lying in that predicament; no! but he first lifts it out of the ditch, places it on ground high and dry, and in pure air, and then washes and brushes it clean. And why would any one be so foolish as to attempt to reform and refine a human creature without first lifting him up to a position and relation more suitable to the saving work?

It was said of one prophet of truth, "He shall save his people from their sins"—not *in* them! It is a difficult task to save people from the sin of drunkenness in a liquor saloon; or from the sin of cheating in a gambling house—be that at the Board of Trade or bank, or any other place of either contraband or legalized scheming; or from bigotry in a church. But lift up the victims out of the scenes of their degradation, where their besetting sins hold riot, and there is hope of their salvation.

This brings us to the third clause of our text: "And my people love to have it so." This, instead of being a general truth, is true only of "*my* people"—debased followers of apostate priests; true of the *priest-ridden* everywhere and at all times, whether of Mohammed, or Moses, or Bramah. But it is a very great lie and slander of the people, as such; for the human mind came of truth and inclines to truth, relishing her sweets wherever it finds them. Otherwise, it would be a very great libel on the character of its creative source.

And here we arrive at the fourth and last clause of our text:

“And what will ye do in the end thereof?” Do! Why, revolutionize this whole programme! re-graduate the prophets, reform the priests, re-discipline the people; set to work with a will on the “back action,” preach Divinity downwards to its reasonable status, within possible reach; then preach humanity *up* till it can realize its relationship with the Divine, where the Spiritual may sway the passional and not the passional the Spiritual; where the soul’s devotions shall be spontaneous, and not as,

“Where men display to congregations wide,
Devotion’s every grace except the heart.”

We will do this by such a storm of agitation, such a tempest of thought and discussion, as will sweep away the musty mountains of rubbish of prophet and priest; all their refuges of lies, and the places they have so long encumbered, shall be made pure and light with the truth and love of a kingdom of heaven on earth, where Spiritual sunshine will be free to all the needy, and warm and enliven them into growth and refinement.

The wealth and worth of humanity can never be realized in leading-strings; its self-reliance, attained on scaffolding; its symmetries unfolded in strait-jackets, nor its perfections of hues and tints in shade and darkness. Break off the leading-strings, demolish the scaffolding, tear away the strait-jackets, disperse the awnings, unroof the grottoes, and let the rains, and dews, and sunshine of the generous skies find their affinities in the soul soils, and let them blend their sweets where the interference of meddling priests shall not disturb their harmonies and stifle humanity’s growth. Then, in wisdom and love, will each individual own himself a child of the Good Father, a true “immaculate conception,” begotten of a Holy Ghost and the true God in man. All souls will then mingle in the millennial felicities, and justice, mercy, truth, and all the beauties of holiness, will chime their melodies in their song of hailing to the blissful consummation.

THE FUTURE ASPECT OF SPIRITUALISM.

BY E. F. BOYD.

The *Banner of Light*, of June 19th, speaking of the dying out of so many Progressive Lyceums asks, "What ails them? Something is the matter. Certain Lyceums in the West that once lived, breathed and promised well, are *dead*. Others drag; others still have in them *wrangling, disintegrating elements*." Naming half a dozen around Boston, it says, "They are *dead*. What ailed them? This is an important question for Spiritualists to answer. Children are in the world, and will be educated somehow and by somebody. What are these arithmetical millions of Spiritualists about? * * * These and other questions of import are destined, and that very soon, to pass the ordeal of severe criticism."

Of the same import is the declaration made by Andrew Jackson Davis, a few months since, at the twenty-first anniversary of Spiritualism, when he said that "Spiritualism is not organizable." There had been several disastrous attempts during the past twenty-one years to get it into an organized form, and these had failed, because Spiritualism as yet was only an *announcement*, and it does not yet appear fully what it shall be." These statements, coming as they do from the leading *author* and the leading *organ* of Spiritualism in the country, or the world, must strike many thousands of readers with surprise and some even with consternation. They seem to belie facts which are being constantly put upon record, by the Spiritualistic press in relation to the organization of Lyceums and Spiritualist Associations everywhere.

But who is more competent to announce the status of Spiritualism and the Lyceum cause than A. J. Davis, the author of the *Harmonial Philosophy* and the *Lyceum System*? or the *Banner of Light*, which has been the *Day-Book* and *Journal* of Spiritualism so many years?

Spiritualists are numbered by *millions*—they are variously set down at from six to thirteen millions in the United States alone. Organizations, so-called, are constantly recurring; constitutions, platforms of principles, etc., are adopted, and officers elected.

1869

These proceedings are pompously paraded before the readers of Spiritualistic papers. The idea is conveyed that something like unity and solidity prevail in the ranks of these "millions," than which nothing is more unreal. There cannot be found in any other "ism" so great a variety of differences, such a heterogeneous conglomeration of opinions, religious faiths and philosophies as these millions represent. There are Christians of every degree of belief, and Infidels of every shade of belief and unbelief; Theists, Deists and Atheists; philanthropists and misanthropists; saviors and destroyers, church-builders and church-haters, idolaters and iconoclasts—the most opposite, antagonistic and incompatible elements in human form, come under this comprehensive appellation, "Spiritualist." Would it not be a *miracle* if such a spiritual chaos *could* become organized, harmonized and agreed upon a specific polity and definite line of duties and actions?

Well, then, What is to be done? We cannot do anything *without* organization, and if Spiritualism is unorganizable what is the use of trying? The only practical and philosophical answer is this: Spiritualists must honestly and frankly *avow* themselves to be just what they in fact *are*, namely: of different sects.

What! would you have Spiritualists divide into sects and contend with each other like the Christian world, which is now beginning to exhibit universal signs of decay? I answer that it is irrational to talk about, or deprecate and lament the "dividing" of that which has *never yet been united*, and which, in the nature of things, *never can be*. It is just as reasonable to expect that all denominations of Christians, together with the Jews and Infidels, should become organized, as to look for such an event among the Spiritualistic millions.

By classing Spiritualists into sects, parties, schools, or orders, there is nothing lost, but everything to be gained. Each party, or sect, would then have its own distinctive ideas, doctrines, purposes and field of labor, and would attract to itself those of congenial natures and of parallel planes of thought and development. The devotional Christian Spiritualist, who reverences the authority of his Bible, would not then constantly realize and accuse himself that he was co-operating with Infidels or Atheists. The conscientious defenders of the institution of legal marriage would

not be tormented with the fear and suspicion that he or she was conspiring with "free lovers" for the overthrow of marriage. It certainly needs no argument to show that Christian *theology* is incompatible with Atheism, or that the conventional opinions of society regarding marriage are at war with the doctrine of free-love.

The fact cannot be denied nor disguised that at this day Spiritualism is implicated in the charge of free-love, or disloyalty to the institution of legal marriage, and rendered thereby obnoxious. There are some who discriminate between such disloyalty and that which is vulgarly denominated free-love. Others, again, hold that all malfeasance to the sacredness of legal marriage virtually means, and ultimates in, free-love. But the fact remains that such disaffection to the institution of legal marriage *does exist* both in the sentiments of thousands of Spiritualists, and in the teachings of its leading authors and lecturers. In proof of this it is only necessary to cite the inquirer to the works of Andrew Jackson Davis, Warren Chase, A. B. Child, Henry C. Wright, Austin Kent, Thomas L. Nichols, the *ROSTRUM*, the *Universe*, (late *Chicagoan*,) etc., etc., and also many contributors to the Spiritualistic periodical literature, as J. Madison Allen, J. M. Peebles, E. V. Wilson, Moses Hull, and a long list of others.

What is the result? It is this: With all their boasted *millions* of believers, Spiritualists—as such—can hardly anywhere get up a respectable society. Why? Because "respectability" in the social sense of the word means *loyalty to the marriage institution*, and as Spiritualism is *disloyal* to the legal marriage institution it is, therefore, not "respectable." Now, friends of the *Banner of Light*, "THAT'S WHAT'S THE MATTER!" The whole secret is, *Spiritualism is not respectable!*

The ruling passion that, in society, everywhere forces itself upon the general observation of the world is the desire to be thought and reputed to be "respectable." In the popular estimation what is truth, what is goodness, or nobleness of soul, or industry, or attainments, or perfection, or beauty, or charity, or love, or amiability, or any high and noble attribute, when compared with "respectability"? What is human happiness, or even life itself, when contrasted with that modern Almighty God "repect-

ability"? Everything pales into utter insignificance and nothingness by the side of the ineffable glories of an evanescent and ideal "respectability"! What superlative folly, then, to think and expect that millions of Spiritualists are going to sacrifice and utterly ruin their reputation for "respectability" merely for the sake of being *organized*, and of disseminating doctrines that half of them do not believe in, uprooting institutions that they do believe in? The theory is preposterous and may as well be abandoned at once—that is, the promiscuous and indiscriminate organization, or co-operation, of Spiritualists.

Yet there is a plan of organization, and one which can be carried out in an efficient and harmonious manner, as before intimated, *i. e.*, by classification. Already there are several well marked classes among Spiritualists, and their inability to affiliate is not less marked. For example, there is a class that might be called Bible Spiritualists, who hold the Bible to be altogether superior to, and of higher authority than any subsequent revelation. There may be several *sects* of this class. It is painfully horrifying to this class to hear *infidel* Spiritualists speak of modern revelations as being far superior to the Bible. Such antagonistic sentiments *cannot* be amalgamated by the simple machinery of external organization, for they inwardly *hate* each other's sentiments.

There are also two classes of Spiritualistic *Free Thinkers*. *First*—Those who accept the HARMONIAL PHILOSOPHY of Andrew Jackson Davis as the highest and purest system yet given to the world. *Second*—Those who accept no particular system or philosophy, and rank the author of the Harmonial Philosophy as no more inspired or reliable than scores of other Spiritual mediums. The former class, or HARMONIALISTS, probably comprise a minority of the free-thinking Spiritualists, and are the most radical, advanced and unswerving reformers.

The Harmonialists should constitute a sect, or organic body. All the foregoing classes are again divisible into two parties diametrically opposed to each other on the marriage question; one wing arraying itself against the *legal marriage institution* as a relic of barbarism, an imposition and assumption by the state of the natural rights of individuals. The other strenuously opposing any

change, and defending the marriage institution at all hazards as the great bulwark of social order and of the sacredness of the family circle. These two classes can never be organized as one party, sect or fraternity. The sooner they organize in distinct parties the better for all concerned.

It is preposterous to expect that people who are ambitious to be thought "respectable" will associate and co-operate with, or even countenance their adversaries, whom they stigmatize with the odious name of "free lovers." Does any one suppose that "*free lovers*" and *free haters* can be organized into one common fraternity merely because of the fact that each believes that departed spirits communicate with the living? No, no! These are opposing elements, as unlike as fire and water, and can no more harmoniously blend than oil and water can unite.

Belief in a mere *fact* is not sufficient ground for people to organize, fraternize and harmonize upon, however grand and inspiring that fact may be. There must be some moral and ethical principles of action and behavior as a foundation for organization, otherwise nothing can reasonably be expected in the way of advancement and progress. Parallel attractions, desires and aspirations, coincident objects and purposes, companionship of ideas and convictions of the principles of righteousness—these are the things that people may organize upon as co-laborers for the general good.

1869
I have said that Spiritualism is not respectable because (principally) it is amenable to the imputation of *free love*; not in the vulgar sense of unrestrained sensualism, but in the sense that it—Spiritualism—advocates and teaches obedience to the laws of nature as paramount to the laws of man, or a contempt for, and repudiation of *legal marriage* wherever a true allegiance to nature's laws demands it. There is nothing more palpable in the literature and religion of Spiritualism than the doctrine that man's first and highest allegiance is due to God as revealed in nature and her laws. This doctrine is consistently carried out by the class of authors and lecturers above alluded to in their manner of treating the question of conjugal love and of marriage.

This class of Spiritualists, through the influence of their peculiar teachings and philosophy on the marriage question, now oc-

cupy an anomalous and important position before the world. The "peculiar institution," of marriage stands solidly and stubbornly in the way of the further advancement of Spiritualism. Spiritualism acknowledges no highest allegiance to that institution. That institution virtually says, "thus far shalt thou go, but no further." One or the other must succumb.

Now here is the battle of the age to be fought. It is the cause of man, of nature, of human rights, against a "human institution." Ye millions of Spiritualists, do you see the field before you? Are ye masters of the situation? Do you not all know and feel that Spiritualism is "unpopular" and that as social and religious reformers you are not "respectable"? And that this lack of caste and "respectability" is because of your disloyalty to the marriage institution?

This is evidently the world's estimate and opinion of Spiritualism. It is either true, or false. If false let the evidence of its falseness be forthcoming. The world demands it. The cause of Spiritualism and the cause of Truth demand it.



REPLY TO LITA BARNEY SAYLES ON THE MARRIAGE QUESTION.

BY J. C. GILL.

Sister Sayles assails my position on Love and Marriage with great vehemence, for which I am thankful to her, for nothing pleases me more than to see people independent and fearless in the advocacy of what they feel to be right. I entertain nothing but the very best feelings toward her for the bold, outspoken manner in which she has reviewed my article. But what pleases me most is to see the gentle manner in which she has conceded the whole ground at issue in the closing up of her article.

She says, "Charity is love, and covers sins by helping us to have patience with each other's infirmities, by teaching us humility, for we may be wrong as well as others, and need their charity to be exercised toward us; it leaves us to allow freely, every one,

the right of private judgment, in matters of conscience, as we wish it for ourselves."

Oh, what a beautiful thought! This is *all* we have been contending for on this subject. Our sister has struck the key-note at last, and its vibrations will extend from heart to heart until every human soul will become imbued with that pure spirit of love which will entirely hide from our view all the weaknesses and impurities of our nature.

She further says, "Who would not desire, in place of that 'total blindness' to have the beautiful mantle of charity rest upon their shoulders?"

If charity is love, love is charity, and if charity covereth a multitude of sins, love must also cover a multitude of sins; and that "beautiful mantle of charity" is made of love, both warp and woof, and where the material is pure and genuine, it is so opaque that it completely hides all the so-called deformities of the soul from view and renders the object perfect in our sight.

Where the defects or irregularities of an object are completely hidden from our view the effect is the same to us as blindness;—it is blindness in reality. So we still believe that love has no eyes, and the purer and stronger that love becomes the less fault we see with the object of affection.

One writer in that old book called the Bible says, "God is of purer eyes than to behold evil." So when the God-principle of love becomes developed in us we shall see no evil in our fellow-beings. The faculty of fault-seeing arises from the evil, or undeveloped condition of ourselves, and not from wrong in others. And nowhere should this pure principle of love be more fully developed and called into action than in the conjugal relation. Many err on this subject by supposing that love is of the head, and therefore subject to the reasoning faculties. Love is not of the head, but of the heart, and consequently is not subject to the control of cold reason. We can neither love nor refrain from loving a fellow-being by the action of the head. Love is spontaneous with the heart and comes from within, and therefore is not subject to the reasoning faculties of the head; the purer and more fully developed that passion becomes, the less faults and errors we see in the object of that love. "Love is charity and

covereth a multitude of sins," and when that pure and holy affection of our nature matures to the degree that it should attain between the sexes in the marriage relation, it will cover so great a multitude of what we call sins, which as we have before stated are nothing but the reflections of the evil in our own being, that *none* will remain visible. Then, and not till then, can man and woman live in that state of harmony and true enjoyment that naturally belongs to them.

LAW.

BY W. THIRDS.

Law is a rule or method of action through which the elements of nature are wrought into forms and expressions of being by the forces which pervade the universe. Law presupposes a lawgiver. To a Supreme Being or Intelligence, we attribute, primarily, the authorship of all the laws which govern the universe, and the author we call God. There is a limit to our comprehension of this abstruse problem. We have abundant and conclusive evidence that all the forces and elements of nature are held in strict submission to inexorable law. From primordial conditions up to the most attenuated and refined substances there are no exceptions. As we ascend the scale of being the more perfect seems the law which subjects all matter to silent and everlasting transmutations. There is not a mote that floats in the atmosphere, nor a particle hid in the granite rock, but has its history reaching back into the eternal Past. Through the operations of the laws of nature those atoms have been elaborated from primal conditions through millions of changes. Their destiny is onward through myriads of transformations.

It may be asked, What does all this portend? Simply this: Scientific exploration and discovery demonstrate one great truth in connection with natural law. It is this: Forces and elaborations of nature acting in strict subordination to law, have ever been and are continually refining matter, and evolving higher and

nobler expressions of utility and beauty. The indications are unmistakable, that everything is tending to ultimate results in the distant and impenetrable future, the completeness and grandeur of which the human mind in its present state may not fathom. All the laws of nature are perfect, and so adjusted as to accomplish ultimate designs. If we were to discover one failure in the law to accomplish the final end sought, then our confidence is destroyed, and we would have no solid foundation upon which to rest, besides it would virtually impeach the perfection of the law-giver.

Theologians will perhaps admit that our premises are correct. But when we ascend the scale of being from crude matter up to man, the crowning work of the Infinite, so far at least as we are able to comprehend, then we are told there is a total failure, a disaster. We are informed that God is surpassed by a subordinate. Theology does not stop here; it undertakes to repair damages; to bridge the awful chasm by a concocted scheme involving the necessity of killing an innocent man, or a being part man and part God.

The plan devised by Infinite Wisdom proves to be a second failure. The whole theory as expounded by the popular theology of the day is a monstrous absurdity, a pitiable caricature of the Divine Being; and so we dismiss it.

Law is the medium through which the Divine Mind works out the varied problems of nature, from nebulous matter up to the mightiest Seraph. Law is as immutable and as potent as its eternal author; it is the visible expression of the Eternal. It will hold every being, and every thing, in its eternal embrace, until through the crucible of an all-embracing and irresistible destiny all things are brought into harmonial relations with one another; until all the varied problems of mind and matter are finally solved, and the ultimatum of our creation is reached.

What, then, is the life-work of finite intelligences? The acquisition of as perfect a knowledge of the laws of nature as possible. This can only be attained by thorough investigation of the varied phenomena of mind and matter within our reach, and strict conformity to the laws of our being. These are the only agencies for progress, the only means of a full and complete sal-

vation. No scape-goat, no bloody sacrifice, no substitution, can individualize, purify or save the soul. It must pass through the alembic, and be made perfect, if need be, through suffering, and so learn to work out its own salvation, by conformity to the laws that must eventually govern human life and human destiny.

Many Spiritualists are prone to depend too much upon external influences, upon "the spirits." We must learn self-reliance, self-discipline, self-culture. Diligence and active labor are indispensable agencies by which the soul may ascend to higher conditions, and finally reach the sunny heights of a pure spiritual life, the fruits of which are harmony, love and happiness evermore.



"THE TRUTH AS IT IS IN JESUS."

BY D. W. HULL.

Among the various stereotyped theological phrases none are more common (I had almost said *meaningless*) than the one at the head of this article—"The truth as it is in Jesus."

I would not be captious; but I should really be glad to know the meaning of the sentence. Are we to understand that there are other truths, antagonistic to those he taught? It would seem so. But this cannot be. All truth is consistent with itself, and exists independently of its propagator, whether taught by Plato, Socrates, Confucius, or Jesus. All truths are sacred, whether taught by Arnold or Paul. Jesus nor Emerson ever made a single truth; for truths always existed independently of them. Hence, a truth is none the better for coming through their organism than if it had been expressed by the veriest clown. Yet the discovery and enunciation of truth has made Jesus, Confucius, and Thales what they are. But had those truths never been developed by, or through the mediumship of these persons, they would not have been any the less truths. Had it been reserved for Andrew Jackson Davis, or Fourier, or Joseph Smith, to have developed them, they would have been none the less sacred.

The world has been prone to deify the promulgator, and after-

ward to sanctify the truths on account of such deification. To illustrate, take the axiomatic truth known as the Golden Rule. To the orthodox world, so-called, this is esteemed a splendid aphorism because it was spoken by Jesus, while it is not less esteemed by the Chinaman because his demi-God, Confucius, uttered it five hundred years before Jesus was born. It is not a truth to either *because* it is axiomatic; but because their great leaders expressed it.

The theological world only nominally assents to the doctrine of this and other truths taught by Jesus—for not among those who pretend to be the worshipers of Jesus do you find this idea incorporated as a rule of action. While with their lips they will laud to the skies the Golden Rule, and proclaim themselves as believers in “the truth as it is in Jesus,” they practice a very different rule—the *lex talionis* principle, “*Do unto others as, or a little worse, (if any difference,) than they do unto you.*” Thus they swallow Jesus as a man with all his clothes on, and reject his teachings. To them his flesh, blood and bones are necessities in the plan of their salvation, while his principles are ignored as impracticable dry husks. Men speak of “the truth as it is in Jesus,” as if there are other truths besides those he uttered, and as if an irreconcilable warfare is being waged between them. A. has a pet theory which he calls “truth,” B. has another, and C. still another. Each thinks his truth will succeed by making it popular, hence each strives to adapt his theory to the wants of the popular mind, as if its acceptance by the world would make any theory truthful. It is thus that Christians have been operating with Christianity. The theories taught by Jesus were not adapted to the carnal, vulgar mind; so it has been found necessary to modify them; for it has been the great aim of the sectarian world to make the people accept “Jesus and him crucified.” Thus, instead of the world becoming converted to Christianity, Christianity has become converted to the world.

All agree it is just as impossible for two conflicting truths to exist, as it is for two parallel lines to cross each other. We must then understand this phrase to mean the part of the truth, or the *principles of truth* taught by Jesus. This I apprehend is the real meaning of the phrase, for the Orthodox world have fenced

up so much of Jesus' teachings as is handed down to us by his biographers (and that is not the one-hundredth part) and told us we may believe that, but no more. Now, lest I have not read all the truth uttered by Jesus, I beg liberty to go among the heathen as did Paul (see Acts xvii : 22-28; Rom. i : 14, 19, 20,) and get some truth; but if I do this, I am denounced as an infidel. I must accept "the truth as it is in Jesus," and especially must I eat the husks of it. What matters it to the starving man whether he eats bread from the wheat of A.'s or B.'s field; or whether in fact it grew in any field at all? It is wheat, and will serve the purpose of the famishing man.

Perhaps the term, "*The truth as it is in Jesus,*" is an ancient phrase, and simply means, "*the principles taught by Jesus,*" contrasted with those taught by Moses or the Orthodox of Jesus' time. Now, unless I had a correct report of all that Jesus said, I cannot tell whether I would believe all the principles he taught or not; but from the meagre report of his teachings handed down to us, I am of the opinion that I would be his disciple. Very certain am I that in contrast with the clergy of his time, or even of the nineteenth century, I should accept the teachings of Jesus, though I should certainly be called an "Infidel" if I did so.

Jesus' teachings were very radical. Yet, at the same time, he claimed to be, and probably was, more conservative than were his opposers. They continually arrogated to themselves the title of "Moses' disciples," while he not only showed that some of the teachings of Moses were unsound, but that they themselves believed no more of Moses than he did. That they raised the popular cry of infidelity even before he had delivered his first discourse, is evident from his defense, found in Matt. v : 17. "Think not," says he, "I am come to destroy the law and the prophets." Such language as this could not have been spoken only in self-defense. Somebody had been telling the people that Jesus had no veneration for creeds or books; while he would have them understand that he believed all truth is sacred, whether taught by the royal David in his splendid palace, or the poor slave working in the brick-yard. Neither was error any better, in his estimation, coming from a high source. He accepted truth for its own sake, and he weighed men according to their actions.

Solomon was a very wise man, it was supposed, but to Jesus there was more beauty in the lily of the field than there was glory for Solomon with his thousand wives and concubines.

Jesus could not attack error in high places and expect to be popular, but he felt a consciousness that he was doing the world good, and that compensated him for all the jeers and jibes of a vulgar church. The Scribes and Pharisees claimed to be the theological thinkers of their day, but he tells the people that their righteousness must exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees. Here he teaches them that it does not all consist in *believing*, but in *doing*. Orthodoxy has never been able to harmonize with such teaching as that.

Notice him as he takes up their creeds and commences to review them, "Ye have heard," he says, "that it was said by them of old time, thou shalt not commit adultery. But I say unto you (as if he were contrasting his teachings with their sacred books,) that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." Ah! there is the rub. The narrow-minded bigots of that day in common with those of the present, exonerated the male party and disgraced the woman. So it was in the case of the woman taken in adultery.—John viii: 3-11. They brought the woman up to be stoned, but never thought of bringing up the man. Their law taught, "thou shalt not commit adultery," but they interpreted this to have reference to women. How could a man commit adultery? But Jesus teaches that the very moment a man in his heart plans the ruin of a woman he is guilty of adultery—no difference if he does not succeed in his nefarious designs. He had no idea that the victim of a man's lust was guilty while the victimizer was innocent. Language such as he used was unpopular. Does well enough to talk of the sins of others; but to make those long-faced, lustful Pharisees as guilty as if they had succeeded in disgracing some person, whose ruin they had planned, was getting too far from their sacred books.

Jesus was emphatically what the Orthodox world of the nineteenth century calls a *free-lover*, that is, in his estimation a man was no better than a woman, and a wrong committed by him was just as bad as if it had been committed by her. He liked the

women well enough to respect their virtue, and too well to ruin their character. Ah! he went further; when he found a woman disgraced he was ready to pity and help her, and even allowed her the privilege of kissing his feet, and I think his face, if she had chosen to. See John vii : 37-39.

I should be happy to contrast the principles taught by Jesus with those taught by ancient and modern Orthodoxy; but space will not permit.

SOJOURNER TRUTH NOT A SPIRITUALIST.

BY MOSES HULL.

The *Advertiser and Tribune*, published in Detroit, Mich., like many other papers is *reliable*; that is, it lies and lies over again and again. We have never heard of its telling the truth about Spiritualism, or a Spiritualist.

Not long since, happening in Battle Creek, Mich., we picked up a copy of the above-mentioned paper and saw an article under the above caption, which read as follows:

“Rev. E. S. Wishard, of Battle Creek, recently took occasion to question this remarkable colored woman as to the truth of the report which some time ago went the rounds of the papers, to the effect that she had become a Spiritualist. We prefer giving his own description of her manner of contradicting it:

“She looked at me in amazement, and said, ‘Who tole you dat, chile?’ ‘It is so stated in the newspapers, and I want to know if you have joined the Spiritualists,’ said I. Straightening up her tall frame, somewhat lowered by the weight of ninety years or more, her eye kindling, and her long right arm coming down with a vigorous gesture, she replied, ‘Bress your soul, chile, dah’s *nothen to jine!* You may tell all the people, Sojourner ’long to Jesus dese many years—she’s true to the Master as de anvil to the hammer. I never gib up my faith in Jesus for anything else.’ And so the woman that was converted to Christ

long years ago finds it difficult to be converted to 'nothen' just at the end of her journey.'

Having been thoroughly acquainted with Sojourner and received many benedictions for stirring remarks she had heard us make on the subject of Spiritualism, we at once in our own mind nailed the statement as an Orthodox falsehood. However, not being willing to condemn without a hearing, we invited Mrs. Rockwell and Mrs. Lakeway to accompany us, and went to visit Sojourner. After calling her attention to Spiritualism, and conversing with her a few moments on the subject, we read the above extract to her. She expressed a great deal of surprise; said she never had had any such conversation—that she was a Spiritualist—she believed that old Joseph Merritt was often with her. Said she, "That an't my talk, any way; I don't talk so niggery as that." "If you publish anything," said she, "print that I believe in Jesus. I do, for I have seen him." She then went on to relate several unmistakable tests she had received through E. V. Wilson, and others. Sojourner Truth is to-day perfectly independent, she was once a Methodist, but her language to us was, "The Methodists growed one way and I growed the other, so we are apart."

Her son Pete, who has been in the Spirit World thirty years, has visited her several times and given unmistakable signs of his presence.



Oh, my friends, let the thought of the houseless, the dying, and the outcast children of sorrow sound in your midst, not like a requiem note of mourning, but a sweet Sabbath bell, calling upon every soul to join in this cathedral of nature's own erection, and upon the altar of sweet flowers and fragrant summer grass offer up the only worship which the common Father requires—the incense of pity for the wretched, help for the helpless, strength for the fallen.—*Emma Hardinge.*

IN MEMORIAM—S. L. A.

OBITU MDCCLXXVII.

BY FREDERIC R. MARVIN.

Sleep, sweetly now, and take thy rest ;
Thy day of life is o'er ;
The years, with joy and pain, will come,
Alas ! to thee no more.

Oh ! nevermore my voice of love
Shall fall upon thine ear :
Thy sunny smile, thy winning grace,
No more my heart shall cheer.

Sleep on—I would not end thy rest,
Though thou wert all to me :
Enough, that He who called thee hence
Hath set thy spirit free.

Yes, free, I know ; for oh ! I feel
Thy presence like a spell,
And, mute with glad surprise, I hear
Thy spirit-voice, '*Tis well.*

And sometimes through the twilight dim
Thy spirit-form I see ;
And, oh ! thine angel eyes do oft
On me beam tenderly.

Sleep on—the years shall come and go ;
The flowers shall fade and bloom ;
And winter winds, unheeded, sweep
Above that lonely tomb :

And I, who weep with stricken heart,
Ere long shall know thy rest ;
Rejoice thee in the upper world—
The home where all are blessed.

HOW WOMEN CAN EARN A LIVING.

BY J. H. HAWES.

In the July number of the *ROSTRUM* I notice a nicely written article under the question, "How shall Women earn a living?" It is supposed that the writer wishes to be informed. I consider it my duty to render all the assistance in my power to one earnestly searching for something to do wherewithal to gain a livelihood. But I confess on the start, that the task seems a difficult one, inasmuch as the question implies that there are *no* means now open to *women*, and the inquirer, after canvassing the whole field of employments incident to both men and women, from the kitchen to the highest professions, leaps them all crying, "foul precincts; heaven forbid that any *woman* should enter them." Finally, after admitting that money is a *necessity*, the earning of which is equivalent to earning a living, concludes that "there is absolutely nothing that woman ought to do for money." In fact, I feel a good deal as Beecher did when a young man wrote to him, saying, that as he [Beecher] held that honesty ought to be rewarded, he being honest with himself, his fellow-man and his God, desired him to get an easy situation for him; that *honesty might be rewarded!* Whereupon, Beecher after considering all the avocations from a farm to a seat in the highest court this side of Heaven, concluded that none among them all would fit his exceeding honesty, and if any there were that would, they were not "easy;" that the only place really suitable for one of his constitution was the grave; and so wrote him. Now for it: "How shall Women earn a living?" I answer, in the briefest manner possible, just exactly as everyone else does, *Work*. The same avenues are open to women in that respect that are open to men—the same means at their service—labor with head, hands and feet. I have yet to learn that it is discreditable for man *or woman* to work at any employment in the catalogue—according to capacity—from the humblest to the most refining; have yet to learn that by so doing necessitates dishonesty, impurity, ignorance or brutality, of which—if quotations from most of the writings of the other sex at the present day be true—man is chiefly made up.

There are many and grievous embarrassments incident to women, and the same can be said none the less truthfully of men. When we look abroad all over the land and survey the toiling millions, we find that the door stands as freely open to woman as it does to man. It is *not true* that the pulpit is closed against her, except among certain sects. It is not true that the avenues of trade and commerce are *usurped* by "monsters in the shape of men" to the exclusion of *any* woman under heaven who chooses to enter them. It is not true that she is *absolutely* debarred from all the offices and emoluments thereof of societies and states. It is not true that she is in any way debarred from pursuing the arts and sciences. It is not true that she is "*compelled* to enter the marriage relation for support." The only real and absolute preponderance of privilege the one sex has over the other is the *right to vote*, and that this bone of contention may soon be "thrown to the dogs," is my earnest prayer. This being true, it becomes woman to adapt her ready wit and cunning fingers to the production of things of practical utility as she conceives them to be, exercising the same charity toward others in the matter of taste that she craves for herself, instead of spending her time in distorting one-half of humanity—the opposite sex—into all the hideous shapes and forms that soured dispositions can conceive of, with *monstrous* cognomens, and satirizing the peculiar dress and manners of the other half—their own sex—which has no earthly effect except to foster ill feeling and general contempt. I believe that just as "imperial" (whatever is meant by the use of that word) natures flourish under "upholstery and toggery" as under ear-cropped hair, straight waists and half-grown skirts. These are matters of taste, and women of the most noble natures all over the world with hearts yearning for humanity are at this moment preaching, teaching, writing, thinking, working and *earning an honest living* under both and all conceivable styles of costume, the banning of which applies as well to one as it does to the other. All are effects from causes with which none but themselves have any business.

That "there is now nothing that a woman can do without compromising her integrity," is a remarkable statement; and, if true, the "dear creature" is in a terrible plight. I do not believe a

word of it. On the other hand, both men and women to-day, married and unmarried, are plying honest vocations *honestly*, and instead of "compromising integrity," are growing stronger in that beautiful element, day by day, urging others by precept and example to follow in the good way, while "plenty sits smiling at their door;" the result of earnest effort and frugal lives. What one can do all can do, at any rate, if they have the same chances there is no cause for complaint. If one cannot earn a living by preaching, teaching, or writing honestly what is true to him or her, better not enter that field; or having entered it and failed, make a change. It can be no worse. If the same difficulty obtains in the professional walks of life and you cannot open your mouth without telling a lie, better betake yourself to manual exercise, where you can employ your hands and keep your tongue still.

If by compromising integrity is meant, what will the people say? will it be popular? all that we have to say is, that the poor soul who waits for the time to come when everybody else will endorse what one says and does as just right, before one can condescend to earn a living—if a woman—will really have to get married, or do some other equally "wicked thing," in order to subsist on earnings not her own, until such time shall have arrived. In nine cases out of ten, instead of woman being compelled by man or any one else—except perchance her anxious mother—to marry for support, she does it voluntarily, having for her end and aim *support without exertion on her part*; and to accomplish it she summons to her aid all the seductive arts only known to *woman*, and when the "monster" is finally trapped, the law steps in and holds his fingers eternally in the vice, considering him deserving of no better fate—but I husband my ink for the marriage question. I hope the time will come when all, from the least to the greatest, without regard to sex, will perform a certain amount of manual labor every day, according to their adaptability; everyone having ample time and scope for writing, speaking, dressing, and doing just what seems to him or her to be right.

As one of the shadows of this coming event cast before, I hail Woman Suffrage; next, the Labor Question; the relation of cap-

ital and labor will be more equitably adjusted; Spiritualism poured into the ears and souls of the material world, heralded by all the hosts of heaven "to the pulling down of strongholds" of musty theology and dilapidated idols of pagan mysticisms, together with many other forces, the tread of which even now shakes the earth, are on the march and will surely come as great levelers, bringing order out of chaos, love out of envy and spite, placing man and woman on an equal footing, bringing humanity nearer together, nearer to God and the angel world.

PROF. I. G. STEARNS, THE PSYCHOLOGIST.

BY W. F. JAMIESON.

The gentleman whose name heads this article is the greatest psychologist of the age, and has done more to advance the cause of Spiritualism, through this wonderful science of the soul, in the development of mediums, than perhaps any other person. Crowds have flocked to his psychological entertainments who have been delighted and instructed by his power over subjects. By interblending the pathetic and ludicrous in psychological experiments he causes his audiences to weep and laugh, and laugh and weep, and sometimes to laugh when weeping, as little children sometimes do.

He acknowledges the fact that he is aided in his experiments by a spirit band. Spiritualism has a mighty advocate in the person of Prof. Stearns. He has caused many orthodox people to turn pale with fright, some of them asserting that he exercised a power over his fellow-beings that belongs only to God.

Not long since I received a good, genial letter from my tutor, —having been the professor's pupil in the science of psychology about seven years since—in which he alludes to my discussion with Prof. Grimes. My acquaintance with the science enabled me to meet Prof. Grimes on his own ground much to the satisfaction of Prof. Stearns, who read the report in the *Banner of Light*.

More than ten years ago Prof. Stearns visited Battle Creek,

Mich., and announced a psychological entertainment. Our noble-hearted brother, J. M. Peebles, resided there at the time. There was a wild, reckless, little fellow in the town, a generous-hearted boy withal. He told one of the professor's subjects (a Mr. Simpson,) that the professor was a humbug, and that he was going to expose him the next night! Mr. Simpson told him he had better let the psychologist alone, or he would be caught before he knew it; for Prof. Stearns understood his business. "Well," said the lad, "I am going to try it, any way." Sure enough! he was as good as his word, and boldly walked up to be experimented upon; but he was caught, as thousands of others have been before and since, and, under the iron will of Prof. Stearns, was like a mere child in the grasp of a giant. He proved to be an excellent subject.

The second night the professor announced that he was going to give some Spiritual manifestations. He had some of his subjects drawing, some writing, and the smart, little hero, who was going to expose psychology as a humbug—and became a subject thereby—wrote a communication. This feat pleased the professor so much that he did not stop to read it, but passed it to some of the skeptics in the audience, who commenced crying "humbug," "chicken tracks," etc. It was written back-handed. Some kind angel impressed J. M. Peebles to hold it before the light of a lamp, when, to the astonishment of all present, it was easily read. It proved to be a communication from a person who had been killed on a railroad a short time previously. The young man became rapidly developed as a healing medium, and has through the kindness of Bro. Peebles and the instructions of the good angels, become a useful member of society, and one of the ablest lecturers in the field of Spiritualism. The name of that lad, now a man, is Dr. E. C. DUNN.



To know that we are immortal, ever-progressive beings, who through eternal ages must grow in goodness, wisdom and glory above our highest conceptions, must take hold of our natures and lead us to respect and aid the lowest and humblest of the race.—
Hon. F. Robinson.

TRUTHS FOR PROGRESSIVE WOMEN.

BY FREDERIC R. MARVIN.

1. Marry no man who believes that your sex renders you his inferior.

2. If nature, accident, or your own carelessness deprives your person of what the sensualist calls its charms, seek not to make up for that deprivation by practicing the deceptions of art, but always appear to be just what you are, and always be just what you appear to be.

3. Seek not to thwart nature, but treasure in your heart her lessons of truth.

4. When you are allowed to vote, vote for the advocates of reason, justice and virtue.

5. Do not fear to be singular, and do not aim to be odd.

6. Live up to the dictates of your own conscience, and not the dictates of another's conscience.

7. Rely upon your own efforts for success, and despond not when misfortunes come.

8. Live soberly and calmly. Set your face as flint against tobacco and alcohol.

9. Be kind, gentle and forgiving, but firm, determined and fearless.

10. Do your own thinking. Think independently, and fear not to say what you think. In order that you may think well, acquaint yourself with the rules of logic, understand the laws of thought, and then read but little, and be careful what you read.

11. Be not too willing to submit yourself to the control of another. Remember that those who are the least able to govern themselves are always the most desirous of governing others.

12. Do not allow the unjust estimates which men will place upon your character to despoil you of your peace of mind. Remember that your character is the sum of your internal mental habits, and nothing more.

Be infidel to every selfish and mean act, to everything unjust, to policy when made the rule of life, but do not be infidel to your true character.—*Mrs. M. A. Wood.*

SAYINGS OF DISTINGUISHED SPIRITUALISTS.

Spiritualism bids us seek within ourselves for the ideals, and in the angel world for the types, of a true, social, affectional life. Communion with the beatified and beloved, the good, wise and holy who have passed into the divine land, may aid in unfolding the loftiest ideals of conjugal relationship, and in keeping the heart and life as pure and peaceful as the love of the skies. Let no unhallowed lust or lawless liberty seek shelter beneath the outspread wings of Heaven's descending hosts. Nothing but a fabulous hell or a mundane demonism shall be held responsible for the licentious spawns with which Spiritualism has been besmearingly slandered. True love is no mere animal passion sweltering in sensualism and ending in satiety. Born of heaven, it pours its baptismal tides of divine life into the human heart, till all is pure and clear as the crystal waters of Paradise, on whose placid bosom is mirrored the face of God and angel beauty. Oh, it is a sacred thing to love truly, with all the depth of human tenderness; and sacred are the truly beloved! There is a fraternal, an angelic plane on which all men and women may and should love freely and purely.—*Uriah Clark.*

The human soul is a grand microcosm of the spiritual realm, for there is nothing that exists in the spirit world but has its counterpart in the human soul. Yet the individual soul differs from every other soul in the universe, because it is an immortal thing, an individuality, and contains within itself the kingdoms of heaven and hell.—*Mrs. J. H. Conant.*

Men and women, prepare yourselves for stirring times. Be true to God and the right, and let come what will. There is a God who speaks out over the voices of all the people.—*Lizzie Doten.*

I do not believe in an organization that shall form a creed or establish a church. I recognize every individual's duty to form his own standard of right and wrong, so long as we occupy different planes of development and growth.—*Dr. H. F. Gardner.*

OUR ROSTRUM.

MOSES HULL, W. F. JAMIESON, D. W. HULL, EDITORS,

PUBLISHER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS.

Having purchased Joseph C. Gill's interest in the ROSTRUM, W. F. Jamieson is now its publisher and proprietor, to whom all communications concerning the ROSTRUM should be addressed, 90 Washington street, Chicago, Ill.

We have secured the invaluable services of Moses Hull, and his brother, Daniel W. Hull, as members on the editorial staff of the ROSTRUM.

Moses Hull and the present publisher commenced its publication over a year since, and, mainly through the energy of Mr. Hull, it proved self-sustaining the first year. During the past half year, on account of lecture engagements, we have been unable to give it our personal attention. It has nevertheless been faithfully managed by our worthy brother, J. C. Gill. In future, we will give our best energies toward making the ROSTRUM deserving of the high encomiums it has already received.

THE "ROSTRUM" AND "UNIVERSE."—The new first-class weekly Spiritual paper, the *Universe*, and the ROSTRUM, the only Spiritual Magazine published in America, will both be sent to subscribers for only \$3.50 a year; or both for six months for \$1.75. During August and September, 1869, subscriptions will be received for the *Universe* and ROSTRUM at \$1.00 for three months for both.

THE PRESENT AGE and ROSTRUM will also be sent for only \$3 a year. Subscriptions for both received at this office.

A Divine who was asked to preach a sermon for relief of the suffering poor, walked into the pulpit and announced his text, "Proverbs xix : 17. He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord; and that which he hath given will he pay him

again." His sermon was a surprise to his hearers; it was shorter than the text. Said he, "If you are satisfied with the security come down with your money." That was the whole sermon! A large collection was the result.

The *application*: To those who receive this number of the ROSTRUM, if you like it, and you are not already subscribers, we say in the language of the divine—and our printers!—"come down with your money!" "Business is business." If you desire to second our effort in the publication of the only Monthly Spiritual Magazine in America we delicately *hint* that "greenbacks" are publishers' lubricators. If you do not want the Magazine inform your postmaster of the fact, whose duty it is to inform us.

SPIRITUALISTIC LECTURES.—Reformatory lectures by our representative speakers and mediums will be made a special feature of the ROSTRUM. They will be of present interest and use; published in convenient form for binding, they will be of great value for reference in future years when the present workers shall have passed from this to a higher stage of action. Debates and Biographical sketches of our lecturers will belong to this department.

It will be perceived that the plan and general scope of our magazine is distinct from the weekly paper, and should therefore be in every family where a weekly is taken.

Send for the *Universe* and the ROSTRUM. Address W. F. Jamieson, 90 Washington street, Chicago, Ill.



VALEDICTORY.

Having disposed of my interest in the ROSTRUM to Brother W. F. Jamieson, I take this opportunity of saying "*adieu*" to the many readers of this Independent Journal. My connection with it during the past year, has been a very pleasant one, and I shall always look back to it as being one of the happiest periods of

my life. The friendships formed through that channel shall always be cherished as the most sacred of my life, and hope to keep them up through correspondence and personal acquaintance.

The Magazine will be published in its present enlarged and improved form by Bro. Jamieson, who is an indefatigable worker, and well deserves the patronage and support of that class who are hungering and thirsting for the truths of the gospel. Its pages will always be filled with the choicest food from the great laboratory of thought, well adapted to satisfy a hungering world.

J. C. GILL.



GREETING.

Only one month since we took a "leave of absence" from the editorial corps of the **ROSTRUM**. We did not then expect to resume our position in it so soon, but change is marked everywhere, and a general dissatisfaction having arisen from our withdrawing, Brother Jamieson has persuaded us to again fire our artillery through its pages. Having all confidence in the integrity and financial ability of its present publisher, we shall work for it with more zeal than ever before.

The **ROSTRUM** will continue to maintain the manly, independent spirit which has hitherto characterized it. It asks no favors from those who require it to sell its freedom or truthfulness in order to obtain their support. It is not a charity institution, it asks you to subscribe for it and peruse its columns *because it has thoughts which are worthy your attention*. We ask you to lend us your hearty support and co-operation because we believe *it will pay you to do so*. Feeling determined to be free from financial matters, we have no connection whatever with that department of the **ROSTRUM**.

Please examine this number critically, and if you find it worthy inclose two dollars in a letter and send to our publisher, and receive for your money and trouble two hundred cents worth of as good reading matter as is handed out from any other house in the land.

MOSES HULL.

MEDIUMS.

There is perhaps no class in the world, who are as little understood as mediums. They take upon themselves all the sins of the world and die daily deaths on account thereof, but the world does not appreciate it. As we are now writing for the benefit of mediums, we wish to state to those who are not, something of the trials of that class of people, that they may be better appreciated.

Did you ever think, dear reader, as you met a medium and as you clasped his hand, that whatever of inharmony there is in your nature he felt it piercing his soul as a thorn? that as he entered your house he felt all the angularities and inharmonies of it in the very depth of his being?

Many times the medium is brought in contact with conditions that crush his soul within him. Are you sick? He feels and realizes it as you do. Are you unhappy? He is made unhappy when with you.

But these things are really necessary. The world has always needed saviors—lambs to bear away its sins; and such are most emphatically the mediums of the nineteenth century. Dear, desponding sister, perhaps you are a wife and mother, and as such you are understood by none—not even the members of your own family—not even by the husband of your own bosom. You would tell your feelings and the sorrows that are crushing you down; but your own family do not understand you, and you dare not open your heart to others. If you are afflicted your husband takes it as a common event; seems to think it is your nature to be half way broken down, and (if he does not say it) thinks you are made of whalebone, and will yet outlive him. But a medium comes along, takes hold of your hand, tells you of all this, and, for the time, takes your nature upon himself by entering into sympathetic relation with you, feels all that you feel or have felt; and knows your inmost suffering. This to you is better than worlds of wealth. You now know that at least one soul knows your trials and feels your disappointments. You feel, for the first time, that you are understood. Ah! that load of trouble is gone.

The Scripture which says, "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ," is fulfilled by the medium. You feel better without knowing why. We will tell you why: The troubles of your life were taken upon the medium, and he tremblingly bore them "to a place uninhabited." "Come unto me all ye weary and heavy laden and I will give you rest," says Jesus and so felt the medium who took your yoke upon himself.

Again, have not many of you felt that somehow or other you were better and happier for being in company with a medium. Why is this? Your angularities and inharmonies rendered you unhappy, but as you came in contact with the medium his magnetism softened your angularities. Thus it is, we constantly give and take.

"Nothing but sin have I to give,
Nothing but love shall I receive."

We hope our readers will not think everyone is charged with inharmonies. On the contrary a majority of Spiritualists are absolutely a blessing to mediums, as they supply that which they are always losing; they must come in contact with these discordant elements; their mediumship makes them sensitive to all such conditions. Mediums are the sufferers of the age. In addition to bearing the sins of the world they are keenly alive to their own imperfections, and unlike the world, they often have no earthly friend to help them. How often do they retire to the sad Gethsemane of their own soul and pray with that fervor which must be felt to be understood, "O Father, if it be possible let this cup pass from me," but they must drink of it. No one feels more keenly than the sensitive medium who suffers, not so much in his physical organization, but in the cultured garden of his own soul, the sting of calumny, compelled to drink the vinegar and gall of the slanderer's tongue. Wherever he goes, or if he doesn't go at all, he knows the tongue of the slanderer and calumniator will be busy. "In a village in the west," said one medium to another, "you will hear a bad report of yourself which will cause your heart to sink within you. As you realize that no one can appreciate your sorrows, your heart will break forth with bitter weepings, and you would welcome an exchange of worlds; but such is not for you, you must drink of the cup. The traducer

must follow your track, and you must bear his sins. Look up, when that time comes. O, that I could be there with you then; I should be inspired for the occasion. Think of me and know that I feel and know the worst of your sorrows."

So it is with the medium. Perhaps you wonder that he should feel the poisoned arrows of slander which are hurled after him. If he did not, he would be unfit for the great mission he has to fulfill.

D. W. H.

BIBLE MAKING.

The world has always been blessed with a class of men who seem to be very fearful that some poor soul will go astray and be lost for want of the knowledge which *they* possess.

In the fourth century, the controversy became very bitter over the doctrines of the Arians and Trinitarians, each party proving its doctrines by the writings of some sainted martyr. Finally the Council of Nice was assembled by order of Constantine, and it canonized the writings of some of the martyrs, and profaned the writings of others. This was not done until after they piously beat and kicked one obstinate dissenter to death. Why should *he* object to the decisions of that venerable assembly. They had met there for the purpose of deciding an inspiration for the nineteenth century, and what business had *he* to differ about what was and what was not inspiration? They had might on their side, and in this case, it should not only make right but inspiration. Those who could not see with the venerable bishops, by the grace of God, were pounded till they could. If the Lord was not able to get rid of heretics, they would help him. But the nineteenth century is highly favored. We have the Bible as it was fixed up for us by those bullet-headed men, who made up their lack of common sense by their bullying prowess.

We are told that it has been translated wrong. The Bible Society convicts it of over 150,000 errors, and they set themselves to giving us a correct translation; but, then, they have no God

Almighty or Constantine. There is another little point in these propositions which we wish the reader to notice. They first resolve that the people need a better version, and second, that *they are the ones to make it*. If this does not amount to ecclesiastical dictum, it is little short of it. It reminds us of some resolutions once passed by an assembly of Ecclesiastics. Having met together they

“*Resolved*, That the earth and the fullness thereof belong to the Lord.

“*Resolved*, That the Lord has given the earth to his people.

“*Resolved*, That we are the ‘people of the Lord;’ therefore,

“*Resolved*, That the earth belongs to us.”

It is well for the people that doctors differ.

D. W. H.

THE DISCUSSION.—But one article will be published in each number as there is a probability of an increase in volume, as we believe there is in interest. These discussions are great agitators of thought. Mr. Wheadon, as a Universalist minister, has been engaged in a large number of controversies of the kind.

REPORTS OF CONVENTIONS.—It would give us pleasure to publish reports of meetings, but they are more appropriate for weekly or daily papers than a monthly magazine. We gave a synopsis of the proceedings of one Convention, but afterwards concluded to omit them in the future. Good, well-prepared lectures will always be acceptable.

To the friends who have so kindly forwarded us reports for publication we return our sincere thanks; hope to publish their biographies and lectures instead.

W. F. J.

Drs. McBride & Cleveland, 137½ Madison street, are establishing an excellent reputation as healers. Mrs. Cleveland is a reliable clairvoyant. We have conversed with several of the Drs.’ patients and they speak in terms of commendation of their mode of treatment. Patients from abroad will receive the kindest and best attention. See their card.

Thanks, Bro. Jamieson. Your grand notice of the dear old *Banner of Light* is more than we expected from your prolific pen. We do not mean to be charitable at the expense of justice—no, no, not at all. But there is a vast difference between *man's* justice and *God's* justice. We pray continually to be governed in all our dealings with our brothers by the largest charity, for “to err is human, to forgive divine.” Thus far we are satisfied with the course we have pursued. To the spirit-world we give all the credit.—*Banner of Light*.

You are welcome, Bro. Colby. How much better it would be if Spiritualists in general would manifest the same commendable spirit of fraternity that you have shown toward those who may not agree with you exactly on every point, or even in anything. We speak our mind plainly, earnestly, but always in love, concerning either institutions, opinions, facts or truths. We deem the Press an institution, and no more above criticism than the Pope of Rome. Our aim is to advance the sacred cause of truth whether man will bear or forbear. While we highly prize the good-will of our many dear friends, we have found ourself impelled by our intellectual convictions—and, we think, an invisible power behind the throne—to advance views counter to those entertained by many Spiritualists. We have been thus far, and mean always to be, true to the God within. We have, ever since we were first baptized by the hallowed influence of the angels, steadily walked according to this inner light. The peace, comfort, Heaven we have derived therefrom, more than compensate for all the misrepresentation and unkindness we have encountered. In comparison with this inward satisfaction the plaudits of a fickle public are dross.

Our good brother says there is a vast difference between *man's* justice and *God's* justice. Didn't know there was any difference, Bro. Colby. Is not that a remnant of Calvinism, that justice in God is a very different article from justice in man? Sounds like it.

“To the spirit-world we give all the credit.” Dear brother, now do keep a little for yourself. We know that the spirit-world is not entitled to it *all*. If it is engineering any one, and he is to be deprived of every morsel of credit for the good he does, then

it ought to take the responsibility of his sins. That has a look of *indulgence* about it. Tetzal, come this way!

For many kindnesses that we have received from the glorious old *Banner* since we have been in the lecture field, we expect to remain ever grateful. "A true friend tells thee thy faults." We rejoice and are proud that there is published so able an advocate and defender of Spiritualism as the *Banner of Light*. Brethren, let us always cherish toward each other a fraternal spirit, no matter how diverse our views may be. It is not in the nature of things that we should see all points in the same light.

THE ROSTRUM IN FAVOR.

We have no sympathy with that sickly modesty that would refrain from publishing commendations of a good work, indeed anything in which the public have a common interest. Whatever is designed to bless the world, as is this Magazine, cannot receive *too much* support and encouragement. We know we are engaged in a noble calling—the diffusion of knowledge, of truth. Reader, we ask you to sustain us, not only with your means but your moral influence. Do so, and in time we will publish a Magazine that will be second to none in any respect. Speak to your neighbors about it. Work for us, and then we can do more for the sacred cause of Reform.

For the many favorable notices the *ROSTRUM* has received from the press we return heartfelt thanks. We shall reciprocate these courtesies. We have not room in this number for many extracts from letters, but the following from our dear, good friend and brother, Andrew Jackson Davis, filled our heart, we confess, with pleasurable emotions:

Yours is "truly a progressive Monthly Magazine—always teeming with strong, sturdy, brave, intelligent, independent THOUGHTS.

"As ever your friend,

A. J. DAVIS.

"Mary's best wishes go with this."

This is a specimen of many letters that we are receiving. We

value Brother Davis' good opinion of the *ROSTRUM*, because of his great love of universal liberty, and knowing that he was once the editor and publisher of as free and independent a paper—*The Herald of Progress*—as thought and type ever made. W.F.J.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

X SEERS OF THE AGES: Embracing Spiritualism, Past and Present. By J. M. Peebles. Boston: Wm. White & Co., 158 Washington street. 1869. Pp. 376. Price, \$2.00; postage, 32 cents.

A large and splendid looking volume, packed with glowing thought expressed in beautiful language. It is a rare collection, original and selected, of intellectual wealth. Every page is full of precious soul-food. The refined and scholarly author will be esteemed by the readers of "Seers of the Ages" as a master workman, building not for the present, merely, but the far distant future. The book evinces depth of research, and excellent taste in arrangement.

Here are a few extracts:

"It is difficult to Jerusalemize Anglo-Saxons. If the soul-lamp would burn brightly, illumining the living *now*, it must be lit from such inspirational fire-fountains as the wants of this age have kindled."

"Sectarian churches, doubtless, are partial necessities, and for the time being, *well*; as were baptismal-waters for John's disciples; but give *us* the baptism of the Holy Spirit; or the descending divine afflatus from celestial hosts, submerging and suffusing our natures in a measureless ocean of purity and wisdom."

"The great throbbing heart of humanity calls for living inspirations, and greater, grander truths, fresh from the Father and the angels that do the divine will."

"Incontrovertible evidences in confirmation of spiritual presences in our midst to impress, inspire and communicate—testimonies from clerical and literary gentlemen—from poets, authors, priests, judges and honored senators—are nearly as numberless as stars in the firmament. Put the inquiry directly to some of the clergymen—Do you believe in Spiritualism? believe that departed

spirits communicate with friends on earth?—and piously declaring against ‘physical manifestations’ by way of sprinkling a few grains of incense upon the altar of a church-begging respectability, they will answer—‘We believe in the *Bible* ministry of angels.’ Down on this slimy policy—this consummate cowardice! Stirringly writes the English poet, Gerald Massey :

“Out of the light, ye Priests, nor fling
Your dark, cold shadows on us longer!
Aside! thou world-wide curse, call'd king!
The people's step is quicker, stronger.
There's a Divinity within
That make men *great* whene'er they will it!
God works with *all* who dare to win,
And the time has come—to reveal it!
—*The People's Advent's Coming.*”

On the subject of evil spirits the author discourses :

“Why are evil—undeveloped—spirits allowed to return? Why does God unbar the gate immortal to all conditions of spirit life for every quality of control, knowing that mischief will be wrought and misery produced? As well ask, why did God constitute man a moral actor? Why is suffering permitted in this world? Why does might prevail over right? Why is confidence betrayed, virtue outraged, the honest robbed, and peace-men murdered? We must accept facts as they are, and build thereon true philosophies. What if through such hells humanity must necessarily pass to heaven, shall we therefore complain of the divinity that educes order from discord? The rainbow from the cloud, the lily from the mud, the crystal spring from the sand, the sweet summer from the frozen winter, the immortal from the mortal, life from seeming death—is not this development?”

From the beginning to the end the reader is delighted with the author's happy manner of presenting truth. The work will be of invaluable service in the advancement of the religion of the angels. Certainly no book has ever been issued from the Spiritualistic press over which Spiritualists may feel more justly proud, and it reflects great credit also on its energetic publishers, Wm. White & Co., for presenting to the public such an excellent work both as to its typography and binding.

W. F. J.

THE QUESTION SETTLED; a careful comparison of Biblical and modern Spiritualism. By Moses Hull. Boston: Wm. White & Co.

This book demands more than the passing notice given in the July number of the ROSTRUM.

It is what its title indicates. No man is better adapted for such a work than Brother Moses Hull—convincing the Orthodox that Spiritualism is sustained by the Bible. True, there are Spiritualists who believe that it is of but little consequence whether Spiritualism can be sustained by the Bible or any other book. This class may not be starving for the facts and truths which Mr. Hull treats upon in this volume, but there are thousands and millions still in bondage to creeds and priests and books who do need just such a book. The great battle of ideas between Orthodoxy and Spiritualism is to be fought upon the very ground selected by Moses—Bible ground. We found in our discussion with him, several years since, that it was not until we had brought the Bible *canon* to bear upon the Advent ship, in which he then was sailing, that we were able to shoot away its mainmast, and *Hull* was at our mercy. Like an honest man, our brother at the close of the discussion declared he had preached his last Adventism. He is now doing gallant service for Spiritualism. As J. M. Peebles once said, "Moses Hull is a walking Bible encyclopedia." "Question Settled" proves the justness of the remark. No one should be without a copy of this book. For sale at this office.

W. F. J.

THE PRESENT AGE. Published by the Michigan Publishing Co., Kalamazoo, Mich. Dorus M. Fox, Editor. Terms, \$2 a year.

This paper has just closed its first year. No Spiritual paper has ever grown more rapidly in popular favor than *The Age*. It is a large folio sheet, well printed on book paper. It has a splendid editorial corps: Dorus M. Fox, Editor-in-chief, Mrs. S. A. Horton, J. W. Van Namee, Prof. E. Whipple, Corresponding Editors. Dr. F. L. H. Willis, Editor New York Department. J. S. Loveland, F. L. Wadsworth, Editors of Western Department—seven editors, to which add such contributors as Mrs. H. F. M. Brown, Prof. Putnam, and others, and it could not afford to be anything else than a good paper.

We do not belong to the "mutual admiration society," and, therefore feel free to say that there are some Spiritual papers that we like better than others; the *Age* is one of them. In the line of what we consider duty, we intend in the future, as we have

done in the past, to freely criticise human relations and institutions, including Spiritual publications. In short, to speak and write what we believe to be true, and of sufficient public and general interest to warrant utterance. Whatever we see to commend, that will we do gladly; and whatever we judge to be pernicious to the race, we will oppose vigorously. We hail all such papers as *The Present Age* as co-workers with THE ROSTRUM in eradicating error from the human mind, and substituting within the soul a higher conception of the Divine, as revealed in the beautiful religion of Spiritualism.

W. F. J.

STANDARD PHONOGRAPHIC VISITOR. Monthly. Edited and published by Andrew J. Graham, 563 Broadway, New York. Twelve pages in Phonography, and twelve in common print. Terms, \$5 a year.

Among all our exchanges there is none that we value more highly than the *Visitor*. Parents, subscribe for the *Visitor*. You cannot put a more valuable periodical into the hands of your children. Do not allow them to grow up without a knowledge of the time-saving art—Phonography, the study of which induces habits of thought, patience and perseverance.

W. F. J.

ALICE VALE: A Story for the Times. By Lois Waisbrooker. Boston: Wm. White & Co., 158 Washington Street. Pp. 255. Price, \$1.25; postage, 16 cents.

Some stories when *once* told lose all their interest, but not so with the story of Alice Vale. Repetition does not destroy the beauty of her character or the loveliness of her disposition. Every time we read it we find something to admire and approbate in her conduct. The independence of her character is worthy of imitation by every man and woman who wishes to live a true life. She never shrank from duty through fear of the scorn and obloquy of the so-called virtuous world, but boldly dared to say and do whatever the inward monitor dictated.

This story should be read at every fire-side and pondered in the mind until the reader can muster courage to go and do likewise. The author has done justice to her subject, and the book will doubtless have an unprecedented sale.

THE UNIVERSE.—A living journal for the New Age. J. M. Peebles, Editor-in-Chief; H. N. F. Lewis, Managing Editor and Publisher.

The Universe is a large Quarto Weekly of eight pages and forty-eight columns, printed with beautiful new type, on the best paper, and is devoted to Choice Literature, Science, the Spiritual Philosophy, Woman's Independence, General Intelligence, etc.

Terms—\$2.50 per annum; \$1.25 for six months; single numbers seven cents.

Specimen numbers free to those who will procure subscribers.

Address,

THE UNIVERSE, Chicago, Ill.

The ROSTRUM and *Universe* sent on trial for three months for \$1.

PETERS' MUSICAL MONTHLY for May is to hand, and well sustains the proud title that it has borne—"The Prince of Musical Monthlies," for if there is *any one* periodical adapted to suit the wants of all lovers of music, professional or amateur, it is certainly this Magazine.

The May number comes to us overflowing with choice new music. There are four new songs, by Hays, Thomas, Danks and Eaton; three piano pieces; and we notice a new feature in the shape of six pages of quartet music, which will prove a valuable addition; also, a dozen or more pages of biographical sketches and reviews of new music, that will be of interest to all musicians. Being largely engaged in the publication of sheet music, Mr. Peters has always a fresh stock from which to make his selections, and seems nothing loth to draw from his resources to any extent to make the Monthly what it should be. Besides the musical sketches and reviews of new music, each number contains no less than thirty full-sized pages of new music by the best writers in the country.

When music is furnished so cheap, what musician can afford to be without such a publication? \$4 worth of good music cannot be picked up every day for 30 cents, and we feel justified in saying that a subscription at \$3 will give as much music (and good music, too,) as you can buy for \$50.

This valuable Magazine is published by J. L. Peters, 198 Broadway, New York, (P. O. Box 5429.)

"THE LYCEUM BANNER."

Published Twice a Month by Mrs. Lou H. Kimball.

Edited by Mrs. H. F. M. Brown.

It is an octavo, printed on good paper, and embellished with fine electrotype illustrations. Some of our best writers are engaged as regular contributors. We teach no human creeds; Nature is our law-giver; to deal justly our religion. The children want Amusement, History, Romance, Music—they want Moral, Mental and Physical culture. We hope to aid them in their search for these treasures.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

One Copy, One Year, <i>in Advance</i>	\$ 1.00	Fifty Copies, to one address	\$45.00
Ten Copies, to one address.....	9.00	One Hundred Copies, to one address.....	90.00
Twenty-Five Copies, to one address.....	22.50	Address,	

MRS. LOU H. KIMBALL,
137½ Madison Street, Room 84, Chicago, Ill.

A. C. CORPE,
IRON FOUNDER and MACHINIST,

And Manufacturer of Improved Flock Cutters, Nappers, Gigs, Cloth Stretchers, Cloth Winders, Flock Renovators, Waste Dusters and Elevators, Shafting, Mill Gearing, etc. Jobbing done on reasonable terms. Stafford, Conn.

SPIRITUALISTS' HOME !

Spiritualists when traveling are often annoyed by being compelled to stop at hotels, and endure all the inconvenience of hotel life.

In Boston it is not necessary. At 54 Hudson Street, is a SPIRITUALIST BOARDING HOUSE, where board can be had, by the day or week, on more reasonable terms than at hotels.

WINSLOW & COMPANY,
MANUFACTURERS OF HOP YEAST CAKES,
BATAVIA, ILL.

These Cakes are manufactured from the best material and have in every instance given entire satisfaction.

You that love good, sweet bread use Winslow & Co.'s Hop Yeast Cakes, for they are the best now in use. Buy them and try them.

DRS. S. M'BRIDE, WM. & MRS. P. J. CLEVELAND,
Eclectic, Magnetic & Clairvoyant Physicians,
137½ MADISON STREET, Room 86 POPE'S BLOCK,
CHICAGO, ILL.

They heal by laying on of hands. They treat gratuitously every day from 1 to 2 o'clock P. M. "By their works ye shall know them."

HAZLITT & REED,
Book and Job Printers,
90 Washington Street, Chicago.

Orders by mail promptly attended to. Estimates furnished when desired.

The Rostrum Advertiser.

THE PRESENT AGE,

A WEEKLY JOURNAL,

Devoted to the Spiritual Philosophy, Polite Literature & General Intelligence.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING, AT KALAMAZOO, MICH.,

BY THE

MICHIGAN SPIRITUAL PUBLICATION COMPANY

The Resident Editors will be assisted by a large corps of the ablest writers in the East and in the West.

Terms of Subscription, \$2 a year; six months, \$1; invariably in advance.

The above named Company are for the first time in the history of Spiritual papers, publishing a 26x40 inch, seven column, folio Journal, on new, clear type and book paper, at sufficiently low price to place it within the reach of all.

☞ Specimen copies sent free. All Communications for Publication, or pertaining to the Editorial Department, and all letters containing remittances in payment for Paper or pertaining to any business connected with this office should be addressed to "Col. D. M. Fox, Kalamazoo, Mich."

DORUS M. FOX, *Pres.* DR. WM. WEYBURN, *Sec.* JEREMIAH BROWN, *Treas.*

THE AMERICAN SPIRITUALIST

Organ of the Ohio and Wisconsin State Associations,

A Weekly Journal, devoted to the Discussion of all Reforms, and the dissemination of Liberalism and Spiritual Philosophy.

The American Spiritualist is now publishing, in the form of detached essays, the last unpublished work of Hudson Tuttle, which contains the best inspirations of fifteen years mediumship,

"THE ARCANA OF SPIRITUALISM."

A. B. French, Prof. E. Whipple, A. A. Wheelock, Prof. J. H. Powell, Mrs. H. F. M. Brown, Mrs. M. B. Lane, "Janet Sewell," and others, contribute to its columns. Emma Tuttle will contribute a poem to every number for the year. Terms, \$2.00 per annum in advance.

HUDSON TUTTLE & H. O. HAMMOND, *Editors and Proprietors,*
111 Superior Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

AN INTERESTING PAMPHLET!

THAT TERRIBLE QUESTION:

— OR —

A Few Thoughts on Love and Marriage,

BY MOSES HULL.

They Twain shall be One.—*Jesus.* Love Worketh no Ill.—*Paul.*

PRICE TWENTY CENTS. ☞ Address Moses Hull, Hobart, Ind.