

THE WORLD'S PAPER.

For the Discussion and Diffusion of Truth, and Exposure of Error.

VOL. I.

SANDUSKY, VT., FRIDAY MORNING, AUGUST 28, 1857.

NO. 10

THE
WORLD'S PAPER
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY MORNING,
At Sandusky, Vt.

A. C. ESTABROOK & Co., Publishers,
DAN'L TARBELL, Jr., Editor.

Associate Editors and Contributors.
D. J. Mandell, Mrs. H. D. Riker,
Nathaniel Randall, Mary A. Brown,
Thos. Middleton, M. S. Townsend,
John D. Powers, A. T. Harris,
L. C. Stevens, Miss A. W. Sprague,
A. C. Estabrook, Amanda R. Davis,
H. Foster.

TERMS OF PUBLICATION.
Single Mail subscribers in advance, \$1.50
" " at the end of the year, 2.00

Prospectus.

We do not enter upon this labor without feeling the necessity of an apology. Inadequate as we acknowledge ourselves to do that justice to the great subjects that may come before us; still, we feel it a duty to make an effort in the direction of what we deem reform; and as we do so, we ask the extension of all charity. Should we come short of our anticipations, we shall only be enrolled with the disappointed that have been. It will be our highest duty, as well as necessity, to present all matter in the most simple, and truthful manner. All attempts to make popular display, or style, will be neglected, and all patience to make plain and simple all subjects, will be employed. Our readers may expect these columns open for all subjects that are of practical importance to the world, Christianity, Religious, Spiritualism, Governments, Civil Law, Slavery, Railroads, Banks, Agriculture, Commerce, & all the reformatory movements of the age.

As believers in the *Great Truths* taught by our invisible friends, we shall look to them for our highest and most valuable instructions.

We shall, however, cast around us in every direction for truth. We shall seek it in the great book of Nature—we shall seek it in the Bible—we shall seek it in the numerous Churches of the age—we shall seek it in the Arts and Sciences—we shall seek it in the Animal Kingdom, embracing the human race.

Be it remembered, we shall hold ourselves at liberty to expose *error*, whenever and wherever found. The *truth* is what the world needs, and suffers for, and not the upbuilding of any sect or party. It is not our object to court the applause of the popular, nor, indeed, do we expect to make it a source of pecuniary profit to ourselves; but we hope, through its columns, to agitate thought in the bosoms of many, & thereby be instrumental in aiding the great work of reform.

No insertion will appear in our columns unless we are satisfied of its value, and none will be refused which presents that appearance, although the party may be found in poverty's vale.

With these preliminary remarks, we enter upon our labors cheerfully, understandingly, and with determination. In conclusion, we say, we invite no quarrels, nor compromise with errors; but hold ourselves at liberty to deal out strict and substantial justice to all, without the slightest regard to position or claim.

Sample numbers free to all.
D. TARBELL, Jr., Sandusky, Vt.
All who feel interested in our humble efforts will do us the favor to encourage the patronage of this paper.

FRIEND MANDELL:—I insert yours against Newton and Mayhew with some reluctance, on account of their personal character. You are aware that while we intend to keep open columns for all to discuss principles, yet we do not intend to let the ambition or egotism of individuals destroy the usefulness of our sheet. I discover from what I have noticed an unwillingness on the part of Mr. Newton to discuss the subject of free love with you, and this is sufficient. I think this feeling arises more from some

personal considerations than from any desire to evade the question, or to conceal his already avowed views on the subject. The production you last reply to, over the signature of Dr. J. Mayhew, I am sure directs no shafts at you or your articles, and I think appears in the spirit of kindness. Therefore I think these suggestive, insinuating, comparative, illusive, dogmatic, historic personalities are uncalled for, in connection with this subject of "free love," unless something has gone before to warrant more than I have seen. Pardon me for my plainness, as I know of no other way to write, without wasting too much ink. I occupy no place of special regard or attachment in the affections or confidence of Messrs. Newton or Mayhew, and had as lief you would attack them, who are abundantly able to bear it, as any one of less importance in public esteem, or I had as lief you would write freely on the subject of "free love" as any thing else. The manner you have on this occasion approached the subject, simply, is what I question. Still, I may be wrong. I think much of this kind of writing would injure the interest of the paper and the cause of spiritualism. However, I will insert your articles as they are, by expunging one or two sentences in one of them, which are manifestly wrong. I also insert an article of my own, relating to the subject before us, and should be as happy to hear your views simply and plainly stated on the same subject, or any other in a proper way, which you are abundantly competent to do. But keep out personalities as much as possible, and give full expression to your views. I should have written you a private letter on the subject, but we are often asked to open our columns to individuals for the gratification of personal piques, and we wish for all to understand the paper is not for such a purpose.

"Free Love"—Mandell vs. Newton.

BRO. NEWTON, of the N. E. Spiritualist, responds rather than replies to my queries, in World's Paper No. 6, relative to his statements that "all love is free, love is always free, &c." He thinks that his views on the subject have been too plainly stated in the columns of the Spiritualist to admit of any inquiry, or otherwise mischievous interpretation on the part of any reader whose vision is not veiled by prejudice or impurity.

BRO. N. may suppose his views to have been as plainly stated as he affirms, but he is evidently mistaken, and will be likely to be mistaken, so long as he uses the pet phrases of genuine free lovers, and assists in engraving them upon practical spiritualism.

BUT BRO. N. again intimates that he is not responsible for another's misuse of terms, when the construction which he puts upon them is strictly defined and philosophically correct.

IT IS MR. NEWTON who misuses terms, if he puts upon "free love" any other signification than that of the freedom of love between the sexes, the right of a woman to choose a different father for every child, if she is so disposed. For this is free love. This is the very thing which the phrase free love was coined to indicate. This is the original sense of the words free love. This is precisely what the world has understood the veritable free love to be. This is the sense the term rightly bears to every mind; for it is precisely what the term was primarily intended to convey. And persons who are in favor of this freedom of love between the sexes are very fond of this idea that "love is always free," that "all love is free," &c.; so much so that a lady, at a recent Spiritual Convention, stated that she was married to the whole human race, that all men are her husbands, and she had an undying love for them. Therefore I say, again, that if Bro. Newton attaches to the term free love any other than this, its original sense, he is the one who misuses terms.

BUT BRO. N. may claim that he is not deeming choice phrases from a corrupt application and usage, by making the distinction between free love and free lust. But the originators and advocates

of the genuine and actual free love make the same distinction for themselves. They don't wish to be understood as the advocates of lust, and in my queries to you in a previous number of this paper, I specified their claim to be entirely different from lust, and designed to set lust entirely aside. What I wanted to know, then, was wherein your position is superior to that of the declared free lovers, since they, as well as you, assert that distinction between free love and free lust; and your expressions are in general terms like theirs. And permit me to say that this point has not been plainly stated in any thing you have previously published. Certain explanations you have published seem to indicate that you are friendly to what I call free love, while in certain of your general expressions you use language which seems to place you on the very basis of those who are distinctively advocates of free love. It is this phraseology to which I wish to call your critical attention. My controversy is more with the free love expressions you use than it is with any published explanations of your personal opinions on particular points. In those expressions you evidently and palpably contradict some sentiments of your explanations; for in your explanations, even while you are striving to uphold the sophism that love is always free, you do actually show that love is really limited in many of its most important departments.

AND HERE you have to all appearance unconsciously come into contact with a problem on which the true beauty and unfolding of this subject absolutely turn, for love, rightly considered in all its noble functions and adaptations, is as much the subject of limitation as it is of expansion; so much so that the term free love is very far from expressing its legitimate relations and glory; and the statement that love is always free can not adequately convey its clear significance and beauty, for love, truly considered and applied, is in various important senses always restricted.

BUT I have much to say on this and kindred points, and shall probably say it, whether people are disposed to hear it in the exercise of a good temper or not. And here let me observe that Bro. Newton must have been "veiled" in an "impurity" worse than "prejudice"—that of passion, or he never would have expressed himself in the bitter spirit which he manifested in his last paper, relative to my recent article in the Boston Journal. It would have been well for Bro. N. to have remembered the language which he so courteously applied to the editor of the Boston Journal in the same paper: "Persons who are weak and timid should not allow themselves to be too much excited during the heated term."

MY article in the Boston Journal contained truths which Bro. Newton does not venture to gainsay. And had it not been for the effect of the "heated term" on Bro. N. himself, he would doubtless have seen that my quarrel was more with his free love expressions, and their injurious tendencies, than with his views. Indeed, the article explicitly declared of himself and others who are accustomed to use those expressions, that they did not intend to advocate lust, or sensuality, but rather the reverse of this. This did not look much like the language of "a vile slanderer," to use Bro. Newton's very choice epithet. On the contrary it was in substance precisely what Bro. N. claims for himself; so much so that after he had elaborately attempted to justify himself, in the Journal, against what he termed my misrepresentation, the editor of that paper said emphatically that he must confess he could not see a very broad line of distinction between the sentiments of the editorial extracts from the Spiritualist and those attributed to its editor by Mr. Mandell.

BUT the editor of the Journal could see, and expressed himself to the effect that the calm and philosophical observer can see in the free love expressions of Mr. Newton, the germ of the mischievous doctrines, which in certain cases have

ripened into the natural ultimate of the most repulsive free love.

MY remarks, then, have been and are directed against the free love expressions to which Bro. N. and others have habituated themselves, and which I say again do not correspond with what he claims to have plainly stated in explanation. If Bro. N. wishes to have his general phraseology harmonize with the main part of editorial expositions to which he has referred me, I would recommend him to use the term true love instead of free love, and to say love is always true, all love is true, instead of love is always free, &c., for freedom is but one element in genuine love; limitation equally characterizes it. It is like an arm, legitimately set in its own appropriate socket, working easily and naturally, or if you please, freely, because it is restrained for all its important functions, and in all its essential departments, by ligatures which keep it firm and steady, and retain it in its proper place, and assure it the noblest use and expression of which it is susceptible. The term free applied to love never indicates its entire nature or excellency, and makes it liable to be misconstrued and perverted, as is frequently the case now-a-days; but the term true indicates the wholeness of this beautiful gem of the soul, implies not simply its freedom of expression, but also its freedom from impurity and guilt, together with all the just and requisite limitations which are necessary to its purest, most honorable, and efficient exercise and influence, indicates likewise its majestic and Godlike strength.

BRO. NEWTON can, if he pleases, publish in his own columns this proposition, and these reasons for a change of terms; and specify his own objections thereto, if he has any.

AND here, with a few remarks on a particular point in Bro. Newton's article in the Journal, in reply to mine, I close. Bro. Newton says:—

"Any one who questions the philosophical truth of the statement that all love is free, will disprove it only by showing that people can be compelled or forced to love one another in any relation. I submit that any sentiment or emotion which is the result of compulsion or dictation, which is otherwise than spontaneous and free, is not love."

IN this extract Bro. N. seems to contend, first, that love can not be compelled or forced, and then again he appears to admit that it may be in the sense the result of compulsion or dictation, and yet he would not call it love.

THEN, by this position, Bro. N. virtually overthrows his own claims as a spiritualist, for he might as well say that the intellectual faculties can not be impeded or drawn out by an exciting cause, visible or invisible, or saying this he might as well affirm that it is not intellect which is thus called forth, and thus make all the manifestations through speaking mediums so many unintellectual abnormalities.

DOES NOT Mr. Newton himself admit that a clergyman may be caused to vacate his pulpit because he is forced to utter ideas which are contrary to his own? Has not Mr. Newton seen cause to acknowledge that a medium may be impelled even unto suicide? Has he not seen time and again the mental and moral forces of many a mind controlled both by visible and invisible agencies, and that too contrary to the customary habits, and even against the direct efforts of the individuals under influence; and can he not suppose, does he not know that the love element can be affected in the same way? Indeed, is not this the very secret of the seducer's detestable success in garnering into his nefarious embraces the warm and ardent attachment of maiden, wife and widow; the devoted, and alas, the sorrowing and stricken love of many a hapless victim? Is it not the boast of the reckless profligate that he can make this or that woman love him? Love is love, even where it is called out magnetically, or by the pretensions of the profligate. In such a case it is sometimes the warmest, heartiest, most self-

devoted sentiment, as truly so as the intellect, under the control of a spiritual or human manipulator, is intellect frequently most wonderfully expressed. Yet it is not a true state, and should not be appropriated as a principle, any more than should unconscious trance mediumship.

NEITHER do I conceive that Bro. Newton would any more advocate some spontaneous expressions of love any more than he would certain other spontaneous actions. If so, then where a woman conceives a warm affection for another woman's husband, an affection precisely like that of the wife for the husband, and as strong, and which he resists, should this case of spontaneous love be always free as that of the wife for her husband?

OR suppose, as a certain Mrs. says, that a woman should love the whole masculine race "with an undying love," and intimate her right to select from among them as many as she might choose, to be fathers to her children, would this, as a spontaneous love, receive the approval of Mr. Newton? Is this one of the loves that he would have always free?

MARRIED TO ALL MEN.

MY article in the Boston Journal, to which reference is made in a previous communication, was written with direct reference to an expression which was made by a spiritualist lady at a spiritual convention in Ohio. Her expression is quoted in my previous communication, to the effect that the lady declared herself married to the whole human race, asserted all men to be her husbands, and that she loved them all with an undying love; also declaring her right to choose among them for fathers to her children, &c.

TO this my reply was and is, that such a lady never was married to me for certain, as it takes two to make a bargain. She cannot be married to me, because I was never married to her, never agreed to have her, and I presume a large majority of the entire human race would forbid the banns on precisely the same ground.

I HOPE such occurrences will ere long show spiritualists the importance of restraining from mere free love expressions, and especially that great care be exercised to avoid the engrafting of such sentiments upon practical affairs in connection with spiritualism.

MANDELL.

The Tact of an Attack.

BRO. MAYHEW does not reply to Bro. Mandell's article, and he does not believe in attacking brethren. Probably, then, Bro. Mayhew has not yet outsoared the region of intellect, or philosophy, or ascended into the plane of reform or moral consecration, for both from this plane & from a still higher stand-point of truth, love and wisdom above it, there is a great virtue and providence in a well adjusted attack. And the true man, to whom all are brethren, will inevitably see that his very work of brotherhood requires now and then a true word and a strong word for the repulsion of threatened or gathering evil.

JESUS CHRIST was the very representative of the divine life upon earth, yet he hesitated not to attack even the very magnates of the land.

THE apostles were continually attacking the existing heathenish system around them, together with its supporters; and the noblest christian reformers of every succeeding age have been the mightiest and most unsparing in their antagonism to the false and vile surroundings by which they were environed.

IT is in this way that the earliest and most efficient breaches in the brazen walls of error and iniquity, have been made, and the triumphs of good over evil secured.

THERE is a paper established for most useful objects. The composers, proof readers, etc., were amazing careless in the finish of their work, and had many good natured touches about spelling, spelling books, punctuation, and such like, to some effect; but carelessness still predominated, and after a more than

usually heedless inprint, there came an attack in which the evil was directly and pointedly alluded to and condemned; and lo! the paper has been decidedly more right and readable ever since.

AN Englishman, witnessing the continued and determined apathy of his countrymen to the improvements of ships and shipping, in their model and general arrangements, and resolute not to see Brother Jonathan outstrip John Bull, has recently attacked the wilful and sleepy conservatism of the latter, and waked up "the Lion and the Unicorn" to a new scramble in the race of good old British glory.

I, D. J. Mandell, have frequently, in the course of my life, been under the necessity of making an attack upon various parties and persons, to carry some important and praiseworthy point, to the virtue of which they were then blind.

WHEN a more lad, the Baptists of Boston, or rather a certain minister among them, laid many a well formed plan to fetch me into their faith and fold, each of which was resisted and defeated, till on a last trial, having reference to singing, I arranged a brief and concisely worded attack on the horrible sentiments of some of their favorite hymns, and sent it as a reply. It touched the very chord that had been dissonant so long, went the rounds of the church, utterly spoiled in the choir the sublime harmony of "fiery coals and darts to inflict immortal pains," and ere long the very leading publications of the baptist denomination were launching fury at the wrath and indignation of the Lord, as written in their hymns—were unitedly declaring that the sheriff might as well sing his execution, or the hangman his death-warrant, as for Christians to sing such hymns, and so it came to pass that the hymn books of our baptist brethren were mostly if not quite cleansed from sentiments and songs which were more praise to the Devil than to God. And since then I am happy to say that the Methodists and other sects have to a great extent followed the same example.

IN like manner I have frequently been under the necessity of attacking the bigotry and intolerance which would have kept me back in various important plans for human progress and redemption, as in the cause of temperance and other kindred one idea reforms, and even in behalf of spiritualism itself, and more especially in aid of my more special and all-embracing enterprise of universal unity and brotherhood, regulated spiritual and human relations, &c., and in such attacks I have in several instances, by the force of a few well planted words, broken and scattered the entire opposition of prominent and influential persons, obliged them not only to yield me the field, but in some cases to invite me to the utterance of my views. I have thus a number of times secured the hearing ear, not only of whole townships of people and adjacent parts, but also to some extent of the country at large, and that, too, for topics on which the public mind had scarcely bestowed a single thought. I have likewise in this manner prepared the way for developments which have since occurred, and for a more successful opening of a series of important measures yet to come, i. e., if there is any thing in some of the most prominent and frequent spiritual predictions.

THERE are probably persons who will read this paper who are acquainted with some if not all the facts in my experience to which I have referred. And they will doubtless bear me witness that in these attacks I have usually been cautious in avoiding mere terms of acrimony, vituperation or reproach, while at that same time I have been pointed and direct in my illustrative condemnation of any wrong by which any persons or class of persons are likely to be endangered.

AND spiritualists will probably live long enough to learn that a pointed word is sometimes as necessary against evils which are growing up amongst themselves, as it is against the bitterness and bigotry of such as oppose them. They may, also, yet perceive that a person who

is determined to resist and overcome these evils as far as practicable, is by no means any less a true friend of the cause on that account.

As to the articles in the *World's Paper* of which Bro. Mayhew speaks, they can hardly be entitled to the appellation of an attack, for they were simply suggestive hints, designed to put spiritualists and others on their guard. The allusions were as much to the Christian public at large, as to those who are denominated spiritualists. Neither was it derogatory to spiritualists in general, as Bro. Mayhew mistakenly asserts. For it was only some spiritualists who were referred to in connection with the tendencies specified; and my object was, palpably, to warn spiritualists in general against the apparent tendencies of some, or rather against certain elements and expressions which had a certain suspicious appearance and bearing.

But my article in the *Boston Journal* was more in the character of an attack, and both for that article and for those published previously in the *World's Paper*, there were reasons beyond what appeared on the surface.

In fact, the confusion which certain agencies were to bring upon the spiritual movements, and the contest to which I was to be called in consequence, have been long ago pre-announced to me, and if necessary, I shall speak much more plainly on the subject than I have yet done.

Spiritualists in general will to some extent see the necessity of this, in a fact which is brought to view in an article which accompanies this.

By the way, we find Bro. Mayhew using the same kind of general expression to which I have before referred, especially in connection with practical spiritualism.

He speaks in his article of the fineness of love, and of what is to be done with earnestness to improve the race of men, even as the race of animals has been improved.

But these general expressions do not reach the point of even an attempt at explanation.

What I want is to be informed of the mode and manner how this special sexual mode of improving the race is to be accomplished.

As we have seen in my former article, there are indications that what is called practical spiritualism is to attempt this same said improvement on the genuine Andrews, Nichols, Noyse principle, that man or woman has a perfect right, under all circumstances, in all conditions and in whatever locations, to do as he or she pleases, &c.

Is this the way in which Bro. Mayhew proposes to effectuate the unfoldment of a nobler and more God-like race of men and women upon the earth? If so, then why does he and others claim any distinction between themselves and the advocates of genuine free love, for this is precisely the method urged by the leaders of the veritable free love system.

But as I have said from the outset, if I am wrong, please lift the veil.

MAKDELL.

Madame "Boundless Love."

In a short communication a week or two ago I made allusion to a lady who made a most explicit declaration of free love intentions and purposes in her affirmation that all men were her husbands, that she had an undying love for them, &c. The New England Spiritualist has implied that this lady's language might have been misinterpreted by unscrupulous opponents.

I might have thought so myself, had I not long ago been aware of the lady's actual proceedings in carrying out the spirit of her declaration.

But in the meantime facts and developments for the unfoldment of a nobler and more Godlike race (?) in the same direction, are coming along in magnificent array, one of the last of which is the ethereal exaltation and super-substantial arrayment of the lady "Boundless Love" as she styles herself. The history is this:

A certain Mrs. C. (I suppress names, out of regard to the feelings of relations) living in Lowell, Mass., some time ago, was informed that her own spirit had left her body, and had been supplanted by the departed spirit of another man's wife and that Mrs. C. (her form or body) must be made over to the widowed husband of the other lady.

The husband of Mrs. C. consented and the other man commenced acting the part of husband towards the lady.

I was acquainted with these facts in

the case for some time before they were published.

There was one or two riots on the subject, and the newly elected husband was treated to a coat of tar and feathers, I believe, and landed in Springfield, where he belonged.

But this did not remedy the evil, and so the matter rested for awhile.

Since then, and quite lately, Mrs. C. published a circular in the *Palmer Journal* from which this is an extract:

"The lady that was Mary C. has received a new name. It is hereafter to be called none other than Boundless Love. Since the body arose a spiritual body, a new dress has been put upon it; that is, a starry crown upon the head, beset with diamonds and gems of immortality, upon the breast a plate of righteousness; the feet are shod with gospel grace, and a sword of truth is placed in her right hand. Signed

Mrs. BOUNDLESS LOVE."

Is a strong word necessary occasionally? Is an attention to our expressions and to true honor essential? Should the principles and conditions which regulate and harmonize spiritual relations be better considered and observed, in order to prevent such manifestations as this? And is a certain brother right in speaking and claiming his right to speak for the hindrance of these delectabilities?

MANDELL.

Free Love.

The subject so much talked about, what is it? What, in its most common signification, as existing in the human race?

In a boundless world like ours, with all its beauty, it is not difficult for us to conclude that love is manifest in all diversities, and in all directions. When we contemplate the vast and unerring order of the stellar and solar systems, with anything like a just conception, we must conclude that design, wisdom and love had to do with the arrangement. Then, as we look at the earth, and discover in it a life bursting into living green, and overlying the surface with one universal carpet, variegated with sweetest flowers of every hue, filling the atmosphere with aromatic fragrance, so happy to all intelligent life, we cannot but conclude that there is a principle of undying love that is far beyond human conception.

But upon this principle we do not at this time propose to dwell, but will reduce our remarks to that common understanding of the term, as applied to the human race. Therefore, we do not intend to speculate or prevail, neither do we intend to personate, but give our own views plain and direct, and hope they may be understood.

Free Love, then, as existing in the sexes and uniting individuals to a unit, forms the connubial relations of life. It is that they shall both occupy the same plane of mental and spiritual life or condition. In other words that they shall in spirit be so equal, that their affections shall unite as two drops of water, and become one which never can be separated. When this is the case, love is free; and this pair will be heaven when in each others society, and will choose no other for the gratification of their sexual passions. They are one in sympathy, one in pleasure, one in pain, one in interest, one in heaven, and are free. In this condition they will keep inviolate the laws of God and of man (if they be in harmony with the laws of God) with pleasure, and by the union thus formed, their children will be free from physical disease, harmonious and friendly, making up the family circle in a manner that it will be a heaven of itself.

This, in substance, is what I mean by the much talked of question of free love, and nothing more. But the question does not stop here, as we all understand and know that the great mass of matches being made, are made from different considerations, and pure love is not free. I do not mean love of lust, love of money, love of praise, love of fame, love of crime, or anything but love of harmony and happiness, which is the only true love that elevates the race of man physically, intellectually, or spiritually.

But the other side of the picture, that makes the trouble, how is it? We have before us the up-rising generation, already impure in body and mind in consequence of the inharmonies of their parents where love is not free. These youths marry, as it is said. What are the leading inducements? Many marry to please their parents, many to please gossip who are ever ready to aid in the novel business of match-making. Many marry for money, many for personal beauty, many for standing in society, many for fame, many to better aid in the perpetration of crime, and many marry through fear, and what is the result? Wrangling discord in the domestic circle is unavoidable. The heads of families can no more unite in one harmonious bond of love, than water and oil can unite when they come in contact. There must be, at least, a cold neglect, and frequently riotous confusion and wrangling that is unbecoming and disgraceful.

This must be so, for when matches are made through fear, or to please friends, when they are removed from this cause the contract is ended, and no longer binding. When the

consideration was for money and they obtain the pile by the sanction of law, then they are free from the contract; as that was what they married, they take it and start. When they marry a face for its beauty, and have kept it in the parlor as long as it makes a handsome and attractive piece of furniture, they either move it out, or go and furnish another in some other parlor, with a picture that old father Time has not yet taken in hand to furrow the face. When the match was consummated by the consideration of fame, and the parties have floated in the sea of public approbation as long as they can, and the credit of the thunder is gone, they are done; the contract is ended, and by the laws of nature they are as free from each other as they were before, and so on we might enumerate the whole category of similar matches. Now in all such cases they pay too dear for their pleasure; it makes a bad bargain and the parties are the losers. The idea that they have conformed to the laws of the land by having a justice or a priest say over a few words and pronounce them husband and wife, is all nonsense, unless they are so truly. If the proper union in sympathy and love does not in nature exist, the parson or priest cannot unite them, and if such sympathy does exist no power can separate them, and love is free.

Whatever is established by the great first Cause of Nature is, and what is not thus established is not, and laws of mortals cannot alter it. They may mark out rules for each other, and inflict punishments, but that does nothing towards uniting in brotherly kindness the world, nor does it in fact, suppress crime, but greatly increases it. We may as well speak plain upon this subject, and leave no doubt in the public mind as to our views, as to waste time and paper in white-washing over the subject, hoping to make it tolerable to all classes. The fact is, the masses are ignorant upon this great question which, at the present, is causing more human suffering than perhaps any other; and conscientious ignorance, or a blind adherence to custom for mere show, is a very poor apology for the true Christian reformer who feels for the suffering world.

Then let love be free to flow down through the whole system of government, from God to the merest insect that has life, and by the effect we should see, gradually but surely, pain, sickness and premature death cease, and crime would soon be known and felt no more. D.T.

Dr. S. Spear, having the experience of forty years, a healing medium with an extensive practice and using the means and restoring to health thousands that other physicians failed to do, without the knowledge of medical books or the aid of man, being most worn out and feeling not doing his duty to God and man, to let all this knowledge die with him which can be so great a blessing to man.

Every family can be their own physician and save a large bill that they would otherwise have to pay. Dr. S. offers his services to the public in giving lectures on the healing art practiced by Christ and the apostles and explain many parts of the Bible with the Spirit and its true meaning, so that all that hear can be benefitted to live better and enjoy more, having a better understanding. He will also visit from house to house, those that are sick, and impart all the knowledge that he can for their benefit, if they will hand their names at the lecture.

All those that are wishing to avail themselves with the above knowledge, can have it by giving him a living and the means of travelling from place to place.

You can direct a letter to Dr. S. Spear, Braintree, Vt., and the appointment will be given out in *The World's Paper*.

S. SPEAR.

Braintree, Aug. 7th, 1857.

Selected Miscellany.

Remarks on the Constitution.

BY A SPIRIT FRIEND.

Inalienable rights cannot be surrendered, whatever may be the pretensions of tyrants. They may not be asserted by mind, or they may be trodden under foot by usurpation. It is well to assert rights at all times, and it is wrong not to assert them. If it be wrong to neglect liberty, or the pursuit of happiness under its smile, it is not right to incorporate any doctrine into the Constitution which excludes that right. Now, the Constitution compels minorities to submit their rights of government into the hands of others, who in many cases are less competent to rule than they are. The Constitution compels the industrious to support the indolent. It makes a penal offense for the mind to assert its inalienable right to freedom. I will say no mind dare assert its own rights to what is its own, as truly as nature is impartial in her gifts.

Constitutional liberty is understood to mean freedom of thought and speech, and not wrong action, the constitution-makers themselves being judges. The wrong of the constitution does not consist alone in word or speech, but in its works and effects upon the cause of popular liberty. You tell me by that instrument that he needs a governor, a controller, one who will take care of him, and the consequence is, he does not govern, control, or try to take care of himself. He recognizes the principle that what is others' business is none of his, and what is none of his business, he will be very apt to forget and neglect. It re-

moves the responsibility of the governed from themselves, and makes the executive responsible for their conduct. It makes the governor responsible for his subjects, and wrongs worth and right in him who rules.

The Constitution is wrong, because it makes majorities rule, and responsible for the rule. It is wrong, because majorities have no right to assume the responsibility of others. It is sufficient that wisdom should decide the wrongs of folly. Majorities never have, and never will, determine right and wrong; and if they never have, and never will, determine that question, for others, how are they beneficial? Majorities rule, but folly is with the rule. They are mistaken, and their mistakes are wrongs which affect others. They rule, but their rule is without wisdom. They sit in judgment on others, and they determine questions for others with all the confidence of wisdom and truth; but you know that no mind can so well determine what is right and useful for another as it can for itself. It is right with one mind to govern others, because he knows what is best for it; but who will allow another to judge for himself what he shall eat, or what he shall drink, or what he shall wear? In all these matters, mind is judicious from custom and education of its own judgment. It will not surrender its taste to the caprices of another, nor will it acknowledge the least supervision over its accustomed habits and practices. But when you call upon it to decide other questions in which it has a deeper interest, and is, in fact, better qualified to do justice to itself than any other mind, it yields its opinion to others, because law, custom, or habit has taught it to do so. It is constitution; it is fashion; it is nonsense. All questions pertaining to individual interest should be decided by the individual interested, and all questions of associate interest should be decided by the association.

The rights of mind are immutable, and immutable things never change. Consequently rights never change ownership. That which is the rightful possession of man, no contract which he may make can invalidate. He can not alienate a right, because he has no right to do it. Indeed, nature forbids it, because it is an injury to himself. Necessity never wrongs mind. There is no such thing as a necessary wrong. There is no such principle as moral evil. There is no wisdom in folly, no morality in evil, and no wrong in necessity. That which is necessary is useful, and that which is useful is not wrong. The useful and agreeable are inseparably conjoined; because whatever is agreeable is useful, and useful becomes agreeable. Whatever is disagreeable is not useful, unless it be to produce something disagreeable which will do good, or result in good. I will insist upon it, that there is no such thing as moral evil. There is no such thing as necessary wrong. There is no such wickedness as minds have represented with words. Man may dispose of all the morality of evil, and lose nothing; and what wrong can there be in any thing which is necessary? You tell me about the necessity of government, and the necessity of constitutional law to protect the innocent from the assaults of the guilty and wicked. The protection which the law affords is shallow. No constitution or human law ever prevented a single crime. It is not law which weakens the power of wrong, or stays the assaults of the vicious. No law of mind will be equal to such a work. In these States, you have laws, constitutions, governments, and all the just upents which human wisdom could devise to arrest the assaults of crime, and you see the result. You see no law equal to the attainment of your benevolent purpose. You have done all you could, and yet crime remains. Your Constitution is no help for the removal of wickedness.

The reasoning of your argument is superficial. You reason, that society needs government to prevent wrongs. I reason, that wrongs necessarily grow out of government, and that the more you govern men, the worse they are. Government is restraint, and restraint is an abridgment of liberty. Abridgment of liberty is denial of want, and denial of want induces resistance. The resistance of want is cruel, and whatever is cruel, nature instinctively opposes. I want my wants satisfied. This is the law of my nature. I can not change that law, or improve it. It is law above and beyond my control. I feel it; I know it; and there is no neglect which will meet my wants. The wants will not be satisfied with excuses, or constitutions, or laws conflicting therewith. The less restraint you impose on man, the less resistance you will realize. It is restraint which induces rebellion. This you know. And you know that the more restraint is imposed on man, the more resistance will appear. You wrong man by restraining his wants, by commanding his nature, by fixing bounds to his liberty, and you kindle a war which no constitution can restrain. You imprison the spirit, you deny nature, and disown God. You say nature is wrong, and needs restraint; I say it is right, and needs no human improvement. You would tell God his work is not so good as you can make it, and hence you go to work and get a constitution to improve the laws of his being. You want your wisdom in constitutions; I want the wisdom of nature without constitutions. You want laws of human weakness to restrain man; I want the freedom of heaven to be the freedom of earth, so that no want shall be restrained, no liberty abridged, no resistance to mar the harmony of nature, or destroy the bliss of mind.

The most that constitutional law can do is to bind in fetters the living spirit. So far as it abridges the rights of man, it is opposed to rights; and so far as it is opposed to rights, it is at war with the good of humanity. I will show you, that opposition to nature is oppression to men, and what is oppression to men is productive of evil. The wrongs of oppression generate crime. Imprison the mind, and it will contrive expedients to release itself. It will strive to unlock the door and escape. It has an innate desire to be free. This desire will not rest satisfied in confinement. It will struggle to regain its freedom. Constitutions are restraints, and restraints are prisons. They are something the mind does not want. They are what it wishes to avoid. Under this state of things in society, rebellion is certain. There never can be law, which opposes liberty, without rebellion. One is sure to follow the other.

In your opinion constitutional law is necessary to secure the good of the greatest number. In my opinion constitutional law is unnecessary to secure such a result; it restrains mind to make it submissive, but the submission is not welcome. It is dangerous to human welfare. It is destructive of harmony and peace. It is ruinous to public tranquillity. It unfraternalizes the brotherhood of man. It sets man against man. It creates discord and misrule among minds, and rolls backward the wheels of individual advancement. Take any case you please from the calendar of crime, and it may be traced to legislation. The rights of the criminal have been legislated away, so far as to deprive him of their exercise. He may have been in the wrong, as all criminals are, but his wrongs have been induced by legislative interference with his rights. They have been denied him. In many cases you have seen men arraigned for asserting them. You know my imprisonment on that account. You will acknowledge that my views on that occasion were popular in this country, that constitutional law would have protected me here. But despots have no constitutions. The law of the king is his pleasure. That is his constitution. It is no mine.

I disobeyed his law, his constitution, his wisdom, and what was my offense? I asserted the liberty for which you contend—nothing more—and that caused me much harm. I was never before so much of a democrat as my confinement made me. I saw what human authority would do, and I saw the results of my confinement. It was fear. The governors were afraid of me. They were afraid of my principles. They knew my principles were hostile to their own. The tyrant and his counselors saw that others would imitate my teachings, and they feared a revolution. This was my crime. It was a crime in their sight; but you believed it a virtue. They claimed control which you denied. What was a vice to them was a virtue to you. But why? Because they judged by their own laws, and you judged by the inalienable rights of nature. You saw no crime in the defense and advocacy of freedom. They saw the overthrow of their dynasty, which they regarded as the greatest of all possible calamities. You both judged me, but you judged differently. Neither could judge of my case so well as myself. I know the integrity of my motives. I knew the rights of man, and what I knew I sought to make them know also. But tyranny is jealous, tyrants is a coward; it trembles with its own guilt. I saw her pretensions; I knew her snares; I felt her malignity hot as wrath and furious as sin. But I escaped. The iron doors of the prison were opened, and I was never so much of a democrat as then. The prison did not convert me. The Constitution made me no more a patriot of despotic power than before. The king's law was more offensive than ever; I loved him with a malcontent's wrath. It was bitter as hemlock, and could I have overthrown his power, and re-released his subjects, my life would freely have been given to attain it.

Against such usurpation you pledged your whole soul and strength. It was a glorious day that tried men's souls. It tried their principles, it tried their professions. It tried their confidence. This national birthday will carry victories to other climes. The national rights of these confederated States will pass into other forms of government. You will understand me, that all the rights secured to man by the Constitution and the laws of his Republic, I most fully approve; but there are some rights which the Constitution and laws of this nation deny. They are rights which you know are natural and inalienable. I will say, the Constitution allows rights which other forms of government disallow. Among the rights of man which the Constitution disallows, are freedom of opinion and freedom of action. In the first place, the Constitution prohibits freedom of opinion on political subjects. It requires man to vote with his eyes closed, or not vote at all, for his rulers. It subjects every voter to the alternative of voting for men to vote for him whom they wish to hold the highest office in the gift of the people. It restricts popular liberty with majorities. Majorities in this government are really minorities. Majorities by the Constitution are minorities under the Constitution. The greatest number are not recognized as worthy of respect. If the Constitu-

tion provided that a majority of those who are subjects of its provisions should control the government, I would admit the assertion, that the greatest good to the greatest number was secured to it which is or can be effected by law. Instead of majorities ruling in a popular government like this, you see minorities wielding the whole power. Nor is it possible under this Constitution to realize more. The greatest number are not even consulted, and the Constitution prohibits an expression of their voice. It is not right; it is not just; it is not wise; it is not safe; it is degrading, humiliating, anti-democratic, anti-natural, and arbitrary.

You see that constitutional majorities are natural minorities. You see who control, and who are controlled. Are not both subject to the same law? Do both enjoy the same rights of legislation? Who says the majority should govern? Not he who supports and upholds this Constitution. Not he who scores the inalienable rights of every woman controlled by this law. Not he who from habit or false education sustains the doctrine, that women are mere chattels in a free country, incompetent and unworthy of a voice in the legislative councils of the nation. Not he who associates rights with colors, sexes, and occupations. Not he who mocks with fondle the inalienable rights of females to a voice in making such laws as are consistent with their welfare and honor. Majorities are really minorities in this Constitution. The natural birth-right of woman is arbitrarily denied her, and yet this is not the worst evil. There are millions who are incapacitated to exercise the voice of the free, because they have not the wisdom to understand its true import; they neither understand justice nor recognize human rights. Educated in the school of wrong they are incapacitated to judge with justice and wisdom. Under all these disadvantages, they are suffered to rule, by votes, the nation. They are constitutionally competent to make laws and elect rulers, while the well-cultivated female, because she is not a male, must be constitutionally outlawed, as an alien from the rights of nature and the society of legislators.

Constitutions make freemen of fools, and slaves of the intelligent and deserving. Constrain rights and usurp powers. They restrain the expression of opinion by worthy citizens and females, and confer authority upon ignorance and barbarism. They monopolize the rights of womanhood, and neglect the wisdom which natural justice and equity impose upon all who are governed by law, to participate in the construction of that law. Under your administration, opinions were prescribed, as though the inalienable rights of citizens were in jeopardy, and the Constitution in danger by tolerating freedom of speech. It was a mournful commentary of your confidence in popular rights, when you excommunicated the federalists from offices of trust and emolument. There was more fear than wisdom in that prescription. There would be equal wisdom in excluding a man from office on account of his religion, or his occupation, as far his politics.

If there be any virtue in constitutions or laws, the public servants must obey them without the necessity of official displeasure, emanating from some despotic throne, to awe them into servitude. But law gave you power, and power proscribed men for their opinions. Kings do no more, though they sometimes set more severely. I was proscribed in France. Others have been proscribed in constitutional countries. For what? They disagreed with the majority—the constitutional majority. Was that criminal? Was it not their right to differ? And yet you levied your maledictions upon faithful public servants for no other reason. They were friends of popular liberty, and some of them faced the enemy of reform, and stood shoulder to shoulder in the cause of inalienable rights. It was your constitutional prerogative to hurl them from office, but much as you deplored tyranny, it was a sorry comment on your forbearance and magnanimity. It was childish; it was ungrateful.

There is this principle recognized in your administration; Love those who love you; do good to those who do good to you; proscrib those who differ from you; exclude those who exercise the right to vote as they please, and for whom they think best; oppose those who repudiate tyranny constitutionally exercised, and believe that all is not freedom which comes to man under the name of liberty. The objections to the Constitution are nearly the same. It allows this abuse of power, and contracts the expression of the popular will. Popular will may rule majorities, because it is what they want; but popular will can not control minorities in this sphere. It may control man in the body, but it is not free under such control. It is just so far a slave, as rule makes it do otherwise than it desires. And it is just so far irresponsible for what is done also. When the minority are compelled to do otherwise than it desires, the compelling power is responsible therefore. Responsibility and compulsion are strangers in the scale of justice. When man acts voluntarily without restraint or compulsion, he is responsible for his conduct, and he will not excuse himself before the throne of his judgment for what he has done; but when he acts as others make him he can not justly condemn his conduct, be it what it may. He may regret that he was compelled to do as he did, but he will justify the act, or acts, as the works of another.

tion provided that a majority of those who are subjects of its provisions should control the government, I would admit the assertion, that the greatest good to the greatest number was secured to it which is or can be effected by law. Instead of majorities ruling in a popular government like this, you see minorities wielding the whole power. Nor is it possible under this Constitution to realize more. The greatest number are not even consulted, and the Constitution prohibits an expression of their voice. It is not right; it is not just; it is not wise; it is not safe; it is degrading, humiliating, anti-democratic, anti-natural, and arbitrary.

You see that constitutional majorities are natural minorities. You see who control, and who are controlled. Are not both subject to the same law? Do both enjoy the same rights of legislation? Who says the majority should govern? Not he who supports and upholds this Constitution. Not he who scores the inalienable rights of every woman controlled by this law. Not he who from habit or false education sustains the doctrine, that women are mere chattels in a free country, incompetent and unworthy of a voice in the legislative councils of the nation. Not he who associates rights with colors, sexes, and occupations. Not he who mocks with fondle the inalienable rights of females to a voice in making such laws as are consistent with their welfare and honor. Majorities are really minorities in this Constitution. The natural birth-right of woman is arbitrarily denied her, and yet this is not the worst evil. There are millions who are incapacitated to exercise the voice of the free, because they have not the wisdom to understand its true import; they neither understand justice nor recognize human rights. Educated in the school of wrong they are incapacitated to judge with justice and wisdom. Under all these disadvantages, they are suffered to rule, by votes, the nation. They are constitutionally competent to make laws and elect rulers, while the well-cultivated female, because she is not a male, must be constitutionally outlawed, as an alien from the rights of nature and the society of legislators.

Constitutions make freemen of fools, and slaves of the intelligent and deserving. Constrain rights and usurp powers. They restrain the expression of opinion by worthy citizens and females, and confer authority upon ignorance and barbarism. They monopolize the rights of womanhood, and neglect the wisdom which natural justice and equity impose upon all who are governed by law, to participate in the construction of that law. Under your administration, opinions were prescribed, as though the inalienable rights of citizens were in jeopardy, and the Constitution in danger by tolerating freedom of speech. It was a mournful commentary of your confidence in popular rights, when you excommunicated the federalists from offices of trust and emolument. There was more fear than wisdom in that prescription. There would be equal wisdom in excluding a man from office on account of his religion, or his occupation, as far his politics.

If there be any virtue in constitutions or laws, the public servants must obey them without the necessity of official displeasure, emanating from some despotic throne, to awe them into servitude. But law gave you power, and power proscribed men for their opinions. Kings do no more, though they sometimes set more severely. I was proscribed in France. Others have been proscribed in constitutional countries. For what? They disagreed with the majority—the constitutional majority. Was that criminal? Was it not their right to differ? And yet you levied your maledictions upon faithful public servants for no other reason. They were friends of popular liberty, and some of them faced the enemy of reform, and stood shoulder to shoulder in the cause of inalienable rights. It was your constitutional prerogative to hurl them from office, but much as you deplored tyranny, it was a sorry comment on your forbearance and magnanimity. It was childish; it was ungrateful.

There is this principle recognized in your administration; Love those who love you; do good to those who do good to you; proscrib those who differ from you; exclude those who exercise the right to vote as they please, and for whom they think best; oppose those who repudiate tyranny constitutionally exercised, and believe that all is not freedom which comes to man under the name of liberty. The objections to the Constitution are nearly the same. It allows this abuse of power, and contracts the expression of the popular will. Popular will may rule majorities, because it is what they want; but popular will can not control minorities in this sphere. It may control man in the body, but it is not free under such control. It is just so far a slave, as rule makes it do otherwise than it desires. And it is just so far irresponsible for what is done also. When the minority are compelled to do otherwise than it desires, the compelling power is responsible therefore. Responsibility and compulsion are strangers in the scale of justice. When man acts voluntarily without restraint or compulsion, he is responsible for his conduct, and he will not excuse himself before the throne of his judgment for what he has done; but when he acts as others make him he can not justly condemn his conduct, be it what it may. He may regret that he was compelled to do as he did, but he will justify the act, or acts, as the works of another.

er, and not his own. A man can not be responsible for what compulsion makes him do. The government of these United States is semi-despotic. It rests in one man power over the weak or over many millions. True, he is bound with the Constitution, and the Constitution is his justification. He sees what it requires in the name of the people, and in the name of the people, not half of whom are permitted to express their opinion of its merits in any manner to change its provisions, he proscribes minorities because they do not see with his eyes, and reason with his judgment. This proscription for opinions is a borrowed doctrine from Rome, and it is time the lender had received some acknowledgment for the hypocritical deception.

Minorities are entitled to the same rights as majorities. They have the same right to control majorities as majorities have to control them. It is a false and delusive idea which supposes that majorities confer rights. Rights are inalienable; they are not conferred, nor can they be taken away. Majorities can not oppress or proscribe minorities without violating their inalienable rights. The wisdom of this sphere would not approve of the wisdom of the radicalism. Here we have no constitutions, no forms, no laws, to bind us in chains. Here no majority rules the minority, no proscription awes mind into submission and exclusion, to favor one person more than another. All is equality of rights and of citizenship. Our constitution is nature, our law love, our religion duty, our duty wisdom. Minds in the radical sphere will have a constitution, will proscribe their brethren, will denounce opposition, will rule with arbitrary sway those subject to their ignorant control. They will reject natural majorities, excluding more than one half from all participation in the government, all control over the constitution, all emoluments of trust, honor, or profit, all voice in legislative assemblies, and all interference in the nation's shame or glory.

No majority will control you in this sphere. You will pursue your own happiness as your inalienable birth-right. Apathy will not hold you in bondage, fear will not deter your investigation, popular opinion will not guide you without effort, nor give you elevation without merit. This day is now closed.

All men are endowed with inalienable rights—except poor men. All men who do not pay their honest debts, are great scamps—except those who cheat on a large scale. All men are born free and equal—except negroes. All men are allowed to think and act freely—except those who work for a living. All will dress and accomplish to one are ladies—except factory girls.

An Englishman traveling through the country of Kilkenny, came to a ford and hired a boat to take him across. The water being more agitated than was agreeable to him, he asked the boatman if any one was ever lost in the passage, and was answered by Terence as follows:—“Naver, naver. My brother was drowned here last week, but we found him again the next day.”

THE PRICE OF PROGRESS.—Our time demands a faithful valor beyond that of chivalry. There may be suspicion and contempt to be encountered, as cutting as the cold steel, before which the clear eye scorned to flinch. There may be endearments as tender to be torn asunder in the struggle toward internal freedom and truth, as ever drew a manly tear from the strong knight bidding adieu to his lady-love on his way to Palestine.

There may be a deliberate abandonment, for the sake of a pure conscience, of respect long accorded to power of intellect, of sympathetic joys from truth shared and loved in common, causing severer pangs than were ever felt by the true warrior, who would still march on, though his companions fell by the wayside, or the ground was slippery with blood that was dear to him. The loneliness one feels when afar from the habitations of man, on the ocean or in the desert, is but a faint emblem of that dread feeling of solitude which many a noble soul has experienced when compelled by voices inaudible to his fellow men to pass forth alone into new regions of thought and belief.—[P. Bayne.

Why in the Dark.

A correspondent requests us to explain why it is necessary that the room should be darkened when wonderful phenomena are performed in the presence of certain mediums.

In reply we can only repeat the statement so often made by the spirits who produce that class of manifestations, that the action of light agitates, dissipates, or in some way so disturbs the fluid, gas, magnetism, or whatever the instrumental-ity be called, which is employed by spirits in acting upon grosser matter, that they are unable to control and employ it.

As this is a statement which cannot be tested by the external senses, or by any method as yet known to positive science,

its truth must be judged of by its analogies and probabilities.

That spirit can not come into contact with what is usually called matter, without some intervening medium, fluid, or substance, is generally conceded. In the human body, this intervening medium has been variously termed, nerve-aura, nerves-spirit, nervo-vital fluid, human magnetism, &c. Through this the mind is able to act upon and control the body. But the points of contact, in the vital organs, are interior, hidden, secluded from the external light: so that, very probably, were this fluid in the human body disturbed, by the admission of daylight into the vital organs, the spirit would lose its hold upon the body as quickly as “King” is said to drop the drumsticks, or “John” the ropes, when a match is lighted in the midst of these dark performances.

If, then, such a fluid exists, and is the instrumentality of spirit action, the probability that it may be affected by the action of light is very great, whichever theory of light be adopted. The “corpuscular theory” (of Sir Isaac Newton) is that particles of matter are projected or emitted from luminous bodies with the velocity of about 200,000 miles per second. The undulatory theory (of Descartes, Huygens, and others) is that an excessively rare, subtle, and elastic medium, or ether, fills all space, the molecules of which are set in motion, or made to vibrate, by the action of the luminous body. In either case, the effect of light is to produce incessant action or vibration, which it is very probable may be communicated to other subtle fluids besides that in which it originates.

Moreover, it is asserted by philosophic spirits that human magnetism has intimate chemical relations to light (or the producing cause of the sensation called light) and hence it is supposable that the latter may act chemically upon those magnetic emanations so as to change their qualities, and render it impossible to use them. But this we throw out merely as a hint to the scientific.

Furthermore, human magnetisms are said to differ greatly in quality with different persons, each distinct quality having its peculiar color—presenting (to those whose vision is sufficiently spiritualized to see them) prominently the seven colors of the solar ray, with all intermediate shades and blendings.

Moreover, it is asserted that some qualities of magnetic emanations are more affected by light than are others; and hence, in the presence of some persons, who furnish the right quality of fluid, manifestations can be performed with some degree of light, while it is impossible in the presence of others.

All this, certainly, is very plausible; and while it may not be positively demonstrated, yet neither can it be positively denied.

And it furnishes a rational solution of the difficulty which some people find in witnessing phenomena which occur very frequently to others.

Had we time and room here to go into details as they are presented to us, it would be seen why the suspicious, cunning, shrewd, evil-surmising, and determinedly sceptical, so seldom find satisfactory evidence of spirit agency. The magnetism given off by those mental states is not that in which spirits can easily manifest themselves, and hence there is a natural law at the basis of the fact that “he did not there many mighty works, because of their unbelief.”

A calm, quiet, elevated, philosophic receptivity (not credulity) is everywhere a more desirable state of mind.

Lastly, another reason for the requisition of darkness may be the necessity of averting the magnetism of the human eye. If light were allowed, all eyes would of course be concentrated upon the spot where the phenomena were expected. Now that the eyes (or some eyes) send forth powerful currents of magnetism, most people know from experience; if not they may soon learn it, by attempting to look a powerful keen-eyed man full in the eye for five minutes. Such concentrated currents, surely, would be likely to affect a subtle fluid of similar nature, such as is alleged to be used in these operations. To attempt to manage it, therefore, in the midst of an audience of excited gazers, would be something like trying to navigate a skiff underneath the pouring tide of Niagara.

To be sure, the requisition of darkness is a serious drawback on the class of manifestations to which it is necessary, and it gives some shadow of reason to the suspicious and determined doubter for supposing that it is only a cover to trickery. That it may have been in some cases, we do not question; but that it is in all, no reasonable man can believe. Man has other senses besides that of sight; and if one cannot devise means to

thoroughly test this class of manifestations in the absence of light, then of course they can not furnish to him evidence of spirit-agency. *New England Spiritualist.*

Hume at Paris.

The following paragraph, from the Paris correspondence of the New York Times, indicates that, though a severe struggle is going on between spirits in and those out of the body for the control of this singular medium, yet the disembodied have the best of it thus far. While the spirits who manifest through him appear to be good Catholics, yet they do not seem inclined to obey in all things the authority of the “church militant.”

“Whether it is the effects of the diabolical heat that reigns, or some other appreciable phenomenon in the life of that strange individual, Hume, it is yet true that he professes to have recovered his powers again, or, to use his own expression, has fallen again under the power of the spirits. This relapse is the despair of his father confessor, the Pere de Ravignion, for you perhaps know that Hume some time ago connected himself with the Catholic Church, and that this conversion was made under the influence of the Pere de Ravignion, who has thus become the young man's spiritual director. After the numerous experiments of last winter at the Palace and in high society at Paris, Hume fell sick, or rather prostrated to fall sick, and sent for the father confessor or I have just named. The reverend father obtained from the medium a promise that he would cease forever evoking the spirits of the dead, and a retraction of the maneuvers he had been in the habit of practising. This retraction was sent to the Emperor with the expression of a wish more implied than spoken, that no inducements would be held out to Hume to cause him to fall again into the power of the infernal spirits, for such the celebrated Jesuit believed them to be. But curiosity has gained a victory over the exhortations of the reverend father, and Hume had no sooner announced that his power had returned, than his patrons returned also; and he is now again in the height of his diabolic reputation. He has not left for the Rhine, as was intended. The power of this man, to those who are not prepared to believe in the supernatural origin of his exploits, and fortunately for the credulity of mankind in general, these are in the majority, is an enigma. The passage of this man through Paris will form a singular chapter in the history of the French Court of the present day.”

Tribunals of Conciliation.

BY D. McMAHON, JR.

In our republic, the legal profession possesses the power of doing good or evil to an incalculable extent. Its influence ramifies throughout the arteries of society. Our judicial and most of our executive and administrative officers, and many of our legislators, are lawyers. Much of our social happiness depends upon their education and moral character.

Yet the influences surrounding the advocate at the present day tend to force him into an antagonism to the true society.

His position is probably more hostile to the advancement of his fellow-men than either of the other so-called learned professions.

These influences all tend to deter him from the office of a peace-maker, from harmonizing interests and the passions of his fellow-men, and from checking the avaricious pursuit of gain.

From which of these influences, in the main, does this arise?

Is it from his natural depravity, the studies which fit him for his avocation, or from any thing that is extrinsic to the doctrines he is taught?

A moment's consideration will furnish us with what we believe to be the true answer.

It is because his emoluments depend upon the spirit of litigation which may exist in his particular sphere, and the extent to which they may be developed. Now if his position be altered so that his emoluments depend upon his professional services as a conciliator, we apprehend that he would be influenced towards what we conceive to be his true sphere of action.

We may define the true functions of the advocate to be first, judicial; second, arbitrational; and third, the legislative. He would act in a judicial capacity when called upon to determine abstract principles of law, which are to regulate, not the passions of men, but the noble pursuits of the human intellect.

His duty is arbitrational when he offers himself as a conciliator, general umpire, or referee, to settle differences among men.

And it is legislative when he, with a spirit of prescience, forms laws and institutions for the exaltation and dignity of labor, the removal of influences to vice and crime, and for the leverage of the wheel of progress.

But we do not propose in the present article to consider him in any other light than that of the arbitrator or conciliator.

It may be demanded, and with some force too, how can you alter human nature?

How can you prevent people of litigious temper, when they are injured, from resorting to the laws of their country for redress?

How can you prevent the advocate from siding with the longest purse, and from acting for his client in a way which the stoical philosophy of Paenatius and also of Cicero has approved?

We answer, by simply laying before the advocate and before the suitor some facts and reasonings developing what may be their true interests.

Were I to say to a lawyer, do good: do not wrong any one; advise your client to the right; do not persecute his adversary; would I not be met with the answer, we do all that, and yet these things exist.

Yes, you do what is the letter of the law, and of the stoical philosophy—you are the personation of your client, yet you would scorn to act the part of the criminal or the persecutor.

But in the judgment of the great first cause, are you in the right path? are you the peace-maker? If you are not, it is probably not so much your fault as it is the fault of the state of society in which you live, and that exists from a vitiated state of public sentiment on the subject of legal reform.

We have around us a parody of judges, advocates, et id omne genus—the formula and majesty of the law and the courts, and yet we spend nine-tenths of our time on forms; that is, settling what is the office of a pleading; what is irrelevant and redundant; what is the practice; and after litigating through the round of the tribunal, we at last, perhaps, arrive at the right, and then, forsooth, the suit or is not as well off in morals and in fortune as when he commenced.

We would rather have the conservatism of fifty years ago than the legal reform as at present understood. The forms and ceremonies, and the practical operations of that period, tautological and peculiar though they may have been, were understood, while our present legal reform consists of the simplification of the practice, so that every one of common understanding may know what is intended, and after the courts have spent many years in settling the thousand questions which the art or finesse of lawyers now moot, we will find ourselves at the starting point—will have been moving in a circle.

Such reform is but novelty, mere change; it is but deepening or clearing out the channel of the human passions.

The happiness of society does not depend upon retribution, or, as your reformer would have it, justice. We have no doubt it depends upon its opposite, forbearance. Society is a compromise, wherein members of the social body do yield up portions of their natural rights, to the intent that they may the more perfectly enjoy the remainder. So ought social differences to be compromised when an indulgence in them leads to strife.

The true law-reformer conciliates; he desires to end strife, for the Divine principle of Love is the spring and ultimate of his reforms. Now if we can show it to be the interest of the advocate and of the suitor to end this strife, and to act in a forbearing and conciliating way, we think we shall establish our position. How then can we do this? Let us inquire of the suitor, suppose we settle your difference with your fellow-man in a speedy and harmonious manner, and without ordinary forms and costs of a court; would you not be willing to employ and compensate an advocate to represent your grievances, and secure an acknowledgment of your rights? Can there be a doubt as to the rational and probable answer to this question? and does not the decision guarantee to the advocate that his profession is necessary, and may be honorably pursued?

On the other hand, let us inquire of the advocate, suppose you found that your business increased rapidly by having your client's differences determined without form or ceremony, in a week, instead of a year, would you not advise him to adopt that course, and would you not endeavor to conciliate and harmonize your client with his adversary? Would you not drop your finesse, your chicanery, and honestly strike at the pith of the controversy, and have it decided? We mistake human nature if the reply would not be in the affirmative. How, then, is all this to be accomplished? We answer, by establishing courts of conciliation. Mankind at the present have a horror of the fatuousness of the law; but circumstances compel them to resort to it. Yet nine tenths of the litigation which now occupies our courts, is the result of a want of sufficient discretion at the commencement. Men heated by their litigious passions, desire legal strife, and law-

yers, because it is for their interest, pander to this desire. But if you can devise a court or tribunal wherein they must stand for a few moments—we speak figuratively—before they enter the difficult portals of the law, it gives them time for reflection—to regain their senses—and they will generally desire to have their differences determined by that tribunal, because it will be for their interest to do so. And if such tribunals establish no other good result, they would effect much in properly directing that motive-power by which man can, if he will, move the world.

Some present mind; no doubt influenced by necessity for such tribunals, in 1846, came to be inserted in the Constitution of the State of New York, a provision that Courts of Conciliation might, from time to time, be established, the judgments of which would be binding, whenever the suitors agreed on submitting their differences to the decisions of such tribunals; and in 1849 the codifiers of the practice, in their third report, presented a synopsis of such a court for legislative action. The legislature, however, was not ripe for it, and it stands as yet not enacted. This synopsis presents the general features of a court of conciliation; we will not allude to it.

An Inquiry Answered.

“Why is it that spirits, while controlling a medium's hand to write, cannot write one thing as well as another? or, Why can they not give tests through one writing medium as well as through another?”

A correspondent requests an answer to this query in our columns. The fact on which it is based is one of perhaps universal observation among investigators of Spiritualism, and is the occasion of no small degree of perplexity in many minds. The same difficulty applies equally, however, to “speaking” or “impressed” mediums, and to those through whose agency communications are given by “raps,” “tappings,” etc. We do not know that we can elucidate the matter fully, but will submit such suggestions as our observations and reflections enable us to make.

It is well known that persons differ very much in their abilities to remember and to state with positiveness and accuracy, matters of fact, such as names, dates, events, or anything requiring precision and exactness. Some are able to recall at once all such details, while others do so only with difficulty, or fail to do it at all, though they may be able to speak fluently and ably on generalities.

Phrenologists attribute these differences chiefly to differences in the degree of development or cultivation of the perceptive faculties, those which take cognizance of matters of fact, the organs of which they locate in the lower forehead, above and around the eyes. Though not a practical phrenologist, yet our observations have accorded with the general teachings of phrenology on this point, namely, that marked ability to observe, retain and use matters of fact is somehow connected with a prominent development of the portions of the brain alluded to.

Now it should be recollected that a medium is an instrument; and an instrument cannot be expected to perform what it has no capacities for. A chisel cannot do the work of an anvil, nor an anvil that of a grooving-plane. If, therefore, a medium is lacking in the development or normal activity of those faculties which take cognizance of facts and details, he or she cannot be expected to be used with facility for any purpose requiring the use of those faculties.

In some writing mediums, the idea is evidently communicated through the brain or mind; while in others, neither mind nor brain appears to be employed at all, but the magnetic connection between the arm and the brain is apparently severed, while the hand is controlled by another mind. It is commonly imagined that, in the latter case especially, the spirit's action is purely mechanical, just as when one person seizes another's hand and guides it by eternal force. But this, we think is a mistake. The control is electrical, not mechanical. And hence, if the hand does not possess the right electrical or magnetic qualities for a specific purpose, it cannot be used for that purpose. But the hand must derive its electric qualities from the brain with which it is connected, and of which it is but a prolonged organ. If, then, the brain is lacking in the observing, mathematical, or any other faculties the magnetism of the hands, of the vocal organs, or of all parts of the organism, lacks the corresponding elements; and hence the disembodied operator finds an imperfect instrument for projecting his thoughts into external expression, whether by spoken or written words or by other signs.

Our observations upon the phrenology of mediums seems to justify these general conclusions.

So far as we have noticed the best test mediums are those in whom the perceptive powers are well developed; though they may sometimes be greatly lacking in the reflective, the moral, the religious and spiritual departments, and hence very unreliable as channels for moral instruction.

Sometimes, however, the spirit operator seems to find a difficulty in magnetizing and bringing into use the matter-of-fact organs, even when well developed; though he may control other faculties,

and thus speak on general topics. Very few persons are found in whom there is a good balance of all departments; and one reason why there are so few good test mediums seems to be that a large development of the perceptive and mathematical faculties is usually attended with a low degree of spirituality, and hence a tendency to materialism and skepticism.

Persons of this cast are with difficulty made mediums; and if they can be, they have not sufficient interest in any thing beyond the present life to induce them to devote themselves to giving evidence of a spiritual existence.

It is obvious that the imaginative, religious and spiritual faculties in man are most easily affected by inspirational or spiritual influences—are more easily controlled and used in mediums than are the observing faculties and the reasoning powers.

Hence it is that trance speakers, inspired writers and spirit communications in general deal to so great an extent in what seems fanciful, vague and intangible to mathematical and logical minds—why they “longe at the stars,” and set forth mainly “glittering generalities.” These are the natural expressions of the faculties most used. When different organs can be brought into use, different results follow.

It is then clear to us that spirits, while controlling a medium's hand to write, can not write one thing as well as another.—[N. E. Spiritualist.

DEPRIVITY.—I have never known one who was fond of maintaining the selfishness and extreme depravity of human nature, who was not in himself an exemplification of the soundness of his doctrine.—Boce.

CALUMNY.—Calumny is like the wasp that teases, and against which you must not attempt to defend yourself unless you are certain to destroy it; otherwise it returns to the charge more furiously than ever.

The darkest cloud which overshadows human life may often appear the brightest to the angels who watch over us from Heaven.

DON'T GRUMBLE.—He is a fool that grumbles at every little mischance. Put the best foot forward, is an old and good maxim. Don't run about and tell acquaintances that you have been unfortunate. People do not like to have unfortunate people for acquaintances. Add to a vigorous determination a cheerful spirit; if reverses come, beat them like a philosopher, and get rid of them as soon as you can. Poverty is like a panther—look it earnestly in the face, and it will turn from you.

HOW TO MAKE AN ARISTOCRAT.—Take a plebeian rascal and a million of dollars, and let them simmer slowly together.—REV. E. H. CHAPIN.

Announcements.

A Prophet at fault.

Mundy, the prophet, as he was called at one time, used to preach against theatres, and entertained the Quixotic idea of converting all the managers to his particular faith.

On one occasion, he went to the Arch Street Theatre, Philadelphia, and inquired for Mr. Burton the call-boy was the only person in the office at the time, and he, knowing the character of the inquirer, did not choose to answer him satisfactorily, until he had indulged his own cariosity by putting a few queries to the Prophet.

“What do you want with Mr. Burton?” said the boy.

“I am sent on an important mission, to save his soul from utter ruin, and I must see the man of sin,” replied the Prophet.

“Who sent you?” asked the boy.

“The Lord of Hosts!” blasphemously exclaimed Mundy.

“Then it is a pity the Lord of Hosts did not know that Mr. Burton is in New York, and has been for a week;” and with that the door of the office was shut in the Prophet's face.

653 A young man in the town of W—, in Portage county, Ohio, lately visited Cleveland, accompanied by a fair damsel. The young man never having been from “lum,” was somewhat unaccustomed to the “usage of the world.” He put up at the Weddell, and ordered dinner, which, in due time, being announced, the young gallant boldly walked into a sumptuous repast, leaving the young lady alone in the sitting room. After partaking a meal that astonished his stomach, he returned to his companion—who was rather astonished at this proceeding—and remarked: “The dinner was darned good, why didn't you buy some?” The above is an actual fact, which the Cincinnati Commercial vouches for. The lady was sixteen hours without anything to eat.

SHAM ELOQUENCE.—There is a kind of eloquence that is of the voice only—that seeks to awaken our sensibilities as barbarians try to awaken fear in their adversaries, by assailing them with loud shouts and fearful outcries. But truth whispered is more effectual than nonsense thundered.

Poetical.

Freedom.

O Freedom, let thy banner wave
O'er man below, his mind to save,
And keep him safe from bondage here,
And the face of clay learn not to fear.

Be brave, dear youth, for truth will stand,
And error fall by God's command.
The winds now strive upon the sea,
The honest call for liberty.

Come on, brave youth, I call these now
Into the field to hold the plow,
The harvest is great, the laborers few,
We call the honest, good and true.

The noble mind that's good and true,
Will seek to set the captive free,
Saw off their chains, their fetters part,
And take the pardoned from the heart.

This pardon was sent by priests, I see
And kept men's minds from liberty,
How dark their minds no one can tell,
That have tried to send the soul to hell.

Forever there the souls of men
Pitched by the devil into burning flames,
The flames do roar, the devils hiss,
Oh! what a God, dear friends, is this!

Behold, he sits upon a throne
And listens to their horrid groans,
That shake the golden throne above,
Say, man, is this your God of love?

"Oh!" says the spirit, robed in white,
"I see my father in his light,
If he be thus, O let me go!
His house shall be my home, I know."

And thus good angels all would say,
"To comfort my friends, O let me go,"
And there in heaven all alone,
Sit God and Jesus on the throne.

Then reason, man, and on this day
Hear what Old Ethan now can say,
He has let me in, I now can tell,
There is no dark and dismal hell.

And thus I come, my spirit free,
I give the captive his liberty,
My spirit by great truth is led,
Believe me, friends, I am not dead.

I now intend to take Old Ti,
And show each man his liberty;
Though priests may try to keep me down,
The fires are kindled all around.

Bound not by sectarian creeds,
Man will soon be man, indeed;
If truth demands, he will not flee,
But stand for truth and liberty.

"This freedom that the mind still craves;
Pray, who is free when he is a slave?
From popular opinion deliver me,
Old Ethan calls for liberty."

Now priests and teachers, look around,
See! light is dawning, hear the sound,
Your creed lit tapers nearly out,
You see it now, and stir about.

The more you stir the brighter it grows,
You have held the people by the nose,
No wonder then, you do despise,
And say we are devils, telling lies.

But your dismal deeds, they soon will fall,
God's love and mercy are over all,
Be still the earth with shining grace,
And in all nature shows his face.

ALLEN.

What is Dying?

Hush the foot fall; hush the voice-tone;
Our brother's dying, almost gone—
A plunge into the dark unknown,
Passing through the mortal gate alone.

Is that dying?
Nay, it is not what it hath been
When the great truth-lights were more dim,
And the world wide was wrapped in
Darker folds of ignorance and sin.

Such is not dying.
What is dying? Mark that placid brow,
Saw thou ever there such shine as now?
While the earth-life waneeth slow,
How those eyes soft burn and glow.

With the dying.
Eyes, they have caught a visioned sight
Of a blessed land enrobed in white,
Bearing wreaths of spirit roses, bright,
Bringing a robe of woeen light

Unto the dying.
When that heart shall cease to beat,
His loving clasp shall meet,
Then to higher pleasure's greet
They shall lead his spirit feet.

Such is dying.
DREAMER.

Onward.

Onward rolls the ocean,
In its mighty grandeur on,
Onward, through the brightening heavens
Rolls the hotly panting sun.

Onward creep the myriad stars,
With the silver moon of night;
Onward glide the golden years,
In a chain of ceaseless flight.

Through all space and through all time
Onward sweep created things,
Shall then deathless minds not soar
Onward, with their spirit wings?

DREAMER.

Where is Heaven? Where love and truth
Preponderate?
What is love? The pure, spiritual essence,
The diffused soul of Deity.

What is truth? Immutability, revealed,
Revealing, and to be revealed.

Original.

Civil Law.

Be it remembered that in our prospectus we promise to treat of various subjects; among which is civil law.

From this source proceeds much misery and crime; and it will be our object, so far as we can, to set all subjects before the public in a simple manner; simply for the purpose of the exposure of these errors so common in our midst; and not for any personal relief; but we shall from time to time be under the necessity of speaking through the press of individuals who appear in the several cases, in order to point out more clearly the errors; but in no case shall we speak of them simply to gratify any hatred or prejudice; but to set forth the true nature of those errors, as better illustrating the wrongs which so abundantly exist in our midst. We shall most usually speak of cases we have been personally acquainted with, their causes, their result, their effect in the community, the manner of trial &c. &c. We shall sometimes make our descriptions humorous that we may better portray the scene, as the parties dance attendance with the helpers so well trained for the occasion.

We will therefore in consequence with the prospectus and these introductory remarks, call your attention to a small case just commenced in this place, and when the same is closed, it will give me pleasure to record the balance of the history, and see if the world will not profit by the result.

Action before a justice for trespass.
Title of the case will be,
Curtis ex. Smith and others.

It appears that one Roswell Curtis of Brainerd Vt. claims to own land cornering down near this place, which is a forest, and lies without a fence in common with other forest lands adjoining.

Those interested in the other lands thought they would cut and peel some few hemlock trees, and thereby lighten them for saw-logs; so as Curtis claims one Parker, two Smiths, and one Davis, did cut and peel a few trees over the line on his said Curtis land; and when said Curtis heard of this wonderful havoc (namely of about two cords of bark) he straightway came to Sandusky village, to ascertain who had committed such havoc and waste.

We by chance happened to see him as he most furiously advanced. He met us with apparent emotion and suspicion; but shortly, cautiously and adventurously, wanted to know who had peeled bark in the woods. We readily informed him that it was some of our people. Well, said he, before Monday night they suffer. We then enquired his name and also if he owned land there; on being informed that he did we told him that if any trees had been cut over the line it was mere accident; and that he might cut as many on ours if he wished; if not we would pay him some other way, and if we did not agree on the amount, we would leave it to disinterested persons to fix the amount.

But this kind spirited reception only seemed to inflame his already heated passions, and nothing of the kind could be done; so after getting the story from people in the village, as to the persons engaged in the matter, he went straightway to one Battles, who we understand to be a sort of standing witness for him, and I brought him hither, that he might plant his suit in the most safe and secure manner, as we suppose. When he had thus taken preparatory steps for this purpose, he proceeded to send out the officer with his writ, demanding one hundred dollars damage.

This visitation was made on Friday, Aug 14th. We did not suppose that this was one of the most eventful days in our history, or in the history of the State; but this officer seemed to take a different view of the enormity of the case than we did. He seemed to see before him the crime in all its accumulating consequences. He imagined himself liable for the debt and costs, provided the criminals did not attend the court. He imagined the prospect of the case being carried to higher courts, and therefore insisted with great authority that he must have full bail on the writ, from each of the criminals. This must be given by men out of Sandusky; men of reputed standing and property. He alluded to some reports that were about concerning us, and inadvertently touched our religion (Spiritualism.)

He seemed to rest his eye on Parker, and arose to drag him off to Middlebury to jail. But Parker having a young wife, the only member to form his society in the domestic circle, did not wish to leave if the thing could be got along with safely without, and was perfectly willing to give any bail that might be proper, if any of his acquaintances would be satisfactory. His friends came in and offered to do any thing they could to help him, but it seemed impossible to get relief from their feeble efforts. We expostulated with him in behalf of those persons, but all to no effect. We told him the amount could be but a trifle, and that the parties were either of them good for it, would each be held for the same, and if they should not appear at court, and judgment was rendered, he could then take their bodies if they did not pay.

We informed him that three out of the four, were married men, with families, and it was not probable that they would all leave for Canada, for a debt of that magnitude. But at

length we got over the visit, and we parted to meet again at court.

Now we should not set forth this matter in detail were it not to show a principle, which I am sure we shall be able to illustrate hereafter when this case shall be ended, and as we have been often charged by the public (who are ignorant of the facts,) that we are fond of suits and of the law, the fact is, I know of no way a man can avoid the law while the public countenance such practices as the case above recited, and men who are so blind to their duties, to their neighbors and themselves, as this Curtis seems to be. What blindness! Does he suppose he is going to frighten people out of their senses by a little park lawsuit? Does he for a moment suppose that he can create any friendly emotion in the bosoms of these men, or in the community who understand the nature of the case by bringing a suit when the parties were willing to settle equitably without a suit? How long have we got to live to see people turn their faces against such paltry practices? How long will it be before we shall see the great truth established, that no man can cause an injury to his neighbor, without suffering himself? This law is unbending in its nature and is sure to execute itself sooner or later.

Correspondence.

Woodstock Vt., Aug. 17th 1857.

Friend Tarbell: It should ever be remembered, that Truth is only discovered by those who think deeply and for themselves.

It has been said by a certain writer, that it is to speculative people, fond of novel doctrines, and who by accumulating themselves to make the most fundamental truths the subject of discussion, having directed their minds of that undue reverence which is generally felt for the opinions and practices of long standing, that the world is ever to look for its reformation and advancement.

Truth is imperishable and eternal, and will stand independent of man's belief or unbelief; it is something taught, either by inspiration, or by the existence and movements of the natural Universe, and which has God for its author; and hence all that can be accomplished by the minds of men, or of angels, is to discover it.

In this important work, humility and a teachable disposition are necessary qualifications. The fact of any doctrine's simply having antiquity for its authority, or that it has been advanced and defended by men of talents and learning, should not be permitted to influence our minds in the least, in our research for truth. This spirit of investigation was approbated by the great Apostle of the Gentiles; for says he, "the Boreans were more noble than those of Thessalonica, inasmuch as they searched to know if the things he taught were true." In fact he told them to "Prove all things &c., Ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you &c." Truth suffers nothing by investigation—in fact, if revelation itself will not admit of the strictest scrutiny without being found to contradict itself and to be at war with the truths of Nature, then it cannot be what it purports to be. But its principles will bear investigation, and the better they are understood, the more perfect will appear the harmony of Nature and Revelation. It is true that philosophical truths are often found to be at variance with sectarianism, and in fact contradictory to some of the fundamental doctrines of modern Theology. But when this is found to be the case, we should not rashly conclude that the Scriptures are false, but that their interpretation of its principles are so.

In searching for the truth, nothing should be taken for granted—everything now believed, should be questioned.

The man, therefore, who assumes this unpopular position, will be sure to come at some truth.

It is not strange that the science of Spiritual intercourse should be rejected at first, and the characters of those who advance its principles and endeavor to defend them, should be defamed and traduced by the multitude; this has been the fate of every science which has been discovered in its first introduction to the world, no matter how glorious or useful it was to mankind. When the circulation of the blood was discovered, it won for its author poverty and persecution. And when Astronomy was in its infancy, those eyes which nightly and unweariedly searched the expanded heavens in pursuit of the burning stars, often quenched their light in the damp cells of a dungeon's gloom. Truth is ever unwelcome while we press error to our hearts as the pearl of great price. How strange it seems, that men will not see, that truth, being indelible in its value, universal and boundless in its design, cannot be limited to any one period, or held within the pale of any one, or all the sects of religionists, but in all periods of time past, present, and to come, is God's eternal messenger to men and angels, and indelibly imprinted upon all created things, speaking in silent eloquence to the spirit within, and like the glorious stars which bespangle the azure vault of Heaven's eternal dome, "Forever shining as they shine, The hand that made us is divine."

Now condemnation rests not alone with the past, and what has induced me thus to address you is simply to show how much in accordance with the opposition to the progress of

truth in the past, is that of the present, and that now as then, the strongest opponents are to be found in the ranks of those learned men of the age, and to whom mankind have as it were by general consent conceded the attributes of wisdom and prudence; how far this concession may have been merited by those of the past, I will not pretend to judge. But I find it somewhere written, as of God, "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent." Of whom I ask may this now be said? May it not be in justice, and with propriety be applied to those proud savans of science, who have so recently and with hasty judgment denounced that of which they are profoundly ignorant, and to those Theological Solons who profess to teach the theory of Spiritual intercourse as it existed of yore, but now in the neonate glory of its practical demonstration among men, stoutly deny the truth of its existence, (or, if admitted, as it is by some, they contend that it is only evil,) and thus virtually deny that God can again do what it has pleased him once and of old to do, to convince men of the reality of an immortality beyond the grave, and in this way establish forever and aye, the eternal truth of our existence beyond this earthly life. These wise ones seem to forget that a principle once established cannot be destroyed.

Then I would ask by what authority do they venture to assert that though God has once thus chosen to communicate with his children of earth, he will never do it again, and that the Heavens have indeed become as brass to the noblest and holiest aspirations of the human soul, and that its pure and fervent breathings may never again rise as grateful incense to the throne of our Heavenly Father and bring down to the erring, but repentant children of his love those kind, ministering spirits, who have, and will ever minister to all such as shall desire their ministrations.

Yes but say some of these learned ones, the age in which these things were done, has passed away never to return, and if they did, surely they would come through us, the ministers of God, and through his Church; and not through such impure channels as we now behold in the various mediums of the day, (and whom Prof. Felton has been pleased of late in an oration before the pupils of the Salem Normal School, to designate as "corrupt men and immoral women.") "Most learned judge, most upright judge, yea a very Daniel come to judgment!"

O ye wise and self complacent ones, wise in the profoundness of your own profundity, answer if ye can, Why did not the many wonderful things given and done of old, come through the High Priest and the rulers and elders, rather than through the channels they did? Let the deep convictions of your own hearts respond, and in the revelations through their silent chambers, learn the secret that "God's ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts," and that what he has been pleased to cleanse, call not thou it common or unclean.

Yours in the cause of Truth.

THO. MIDDLETON.

South Wallingford, Aug. 13th 1857.

Mr. TARRELL, Dear Sir:—I received a letter from you which put me on the right track as to your location. I presume you will not charge me any more at the end of the year, than if I had paid in advance, if I do what I can to assist you in getting subscribers, which I will cheerfully do, although I cannot do much for the reason that there are not many about here advanced far enough to realize the benefit of a paper in their own native State, devoted to the cause.

You ask if I am with you; most certainly. With me it is no more matter of faith, the substance of things hoped for, and evidence of things not seen.

It is now nearly four years since I became convinced of man's immortality. Four years ago last April the outward form of a loved companion was laid in the grave.

She was one of the most beautiful beings of earth. I said to myself, can it be possible that so much loveliness and beauty shall moulder away in the tomb.

Bro. S. C. Loveland who preached the funeral sermon, pointed me to the Bible as containing sufficient for all my sorrows.

I sought diligently for it but could not find enough to answer my desires. If I could only know that this loved one still lived, all else in the world would sink into nothingness compared with that. In my reading of the Bible I learned that some of those who had passed from earth, had again revisited it, if the record was true. Well I most devoutly believed that God was no respecter of persons, and if I sought for it truthfully, he would grant the same privilege to me that he had to others, and if he would not then would I cast the Bible aside as being of little value to me.

For a while I was all alone as I thought, not a solitary mortal could I find that thought and felt as I did, but in due time I came across some Spiritualist papers from which I learned that I was not alone in these things, still there was none in this vicinity that could assist me.

Alone I sought and struggled on, at last when I had nearly given up and at a time too when I was not thinking about it, that loved one again stood by my side and instantaneously impressed with words which I know well enough had never entered my mind before, and of which I also know my own mind had nothing to do.

This was something of which in all my dreaming or imagining, I had never formed but a very faint idea.

The beauty, the loveliness, and the rapture that came over me; human language is feeble, very feeble, to impart it to mortals.

When the lost were found there was joy in that house. Now there are many here that listen attentively to these things.

We have Spiritualist meetings this summer once in four weeks at Danby, five miles south from here and they are well attended. Bro. Gibson Smith of South Shattisbury is the principal speaker, and he is a fearless and able champion of truth, or the intelligence that speaks through him.

The cause of truth is flourishing here as well as its best friends could wish. At South Wallingford, Rutland, Clarendon and Danby you will find many earnest and warm hearted ones in the cause of truth. I will now write those impressions referred to in another part of this letter.

"What form is this divinely bright,

That comes now to my enraptured sight?

She meekly says I am no less

Than one who wore an earthly dress,

And by your side on earth did walk.

I am the one you loved so well,

And she of whom you often tell.

Such cheering, lovely, heavenly talk,

That loved one now from spirit land

Stands by your side and moves your hand

To write that I am here.

Then why shrink back and fear to say,

That you my counsils do obey

And feel that she is near. MARIAM."

Yours for Truth. O. EDMUND.

For the World's Paper.

A Friendly Chat.

Brother Tarbell:—you are a stranger to me; but what difference does that make? None at all. You are just as good, just as near, and just as dear to me as though I had always been personally acquainted with you. It is enough for me to know that you are a man, to love you; although I have a preference for those of radical and conservative sentiments.

I never saw the man or woman who was too free, plain, or out-spoken for me yet, nor do I ever expect to.

You have just started a paper, and I judge from the title of it, that you intend to make it one of the most free, outspoken papers in the world. Surely if it is the "World's Paper" it must be for some other will meet the demands of the world. However we are well aware that the world is composed of a variety of minds, which would render it impossible for a God or a Devil to make a paper to suit all, therefore we think you did not mean your paper should meet the approbation of all. We have lived in the world long enough to learn that there is a class of minds, who have not reached a higher plane of development, than the low animal sensualism of their nature.

We are perfectly conscious of the fact, that bitter and almost demon engendered prejudices, hatred, and abuses, are measured out by our Churches, to every one, who dares to think and act independently of their dictation, on matters of religion and morality. To all such as far these things, we wish to give ample time for reflection.

We are sensibly aware that educational prejudices can't be exterminated in a moment. It requires for investigation and analysis, and a sincere desire to know the truth, for a person to overcome and cast off those preconceived opinions, which have been instilled into the mind from the days of juvenility.

We have had the trial of this, and speak from experience. But when the mind once becomes disenthralled, and dares to think and reason for itself, when the reasoning faculties are once allowed to sit as umpire on the throne of reason, and are determined to decide between truth and error, fact and fiction, independent of all coercive authority, then, and not till then, does the mind exercise its legitimate rights of determining what is right for itself.

We are glad to say that we are surrounded by a class of purely spiritual beings, both in the body and out of the body, who use their united efforts to nerve us up to the work of eradicating the evils which so sorely afflict humanity.

We have been told from the pulpit for fifteen years (that being seven years less than our age) that if we did not repent of crimes and misdeeds which we never committed, that our Creator would take pleasure in inflicting punishment for such neglect. We take it as a self-evident truth, that such a belief is inconsistent, unjust and derogatory to the character of a just Creator, and consequently we don't believe one bit of it.

We are told also that God has sent his only Son from Heaven, whom he created in a miraculous manner, being as they say half God and half man, to die for a world of sinners that a way might be provided for a few to be saved. We answer that these opinions are either unjust in themselves, or so inconceivably mysterious, that they bear on their own face the impress of imposture, as well as absurdity, and therefore we don't believe one word of it.

We are told again that if Adam had not sinned he would have gone to Heaven soul and body, as the prophet Elijah is said to have done. To this we answer that such a belief is not only absurd, but extremely re-

dicious, and consequently we do not believe it.

Thus we might go on and enumerate a thousand things which are the subjects of religious faith and belief, that are so contemptibly absurd and ridiculous, that the wonder with us is, that man can become so completely devoid of reason, as to give them unbounded confidence.

According to the Christian sin-annihilating plan, a man may, all his life, deal falsely, by wilfully acting unjustly in a thousand ways; and yet at the last moment of his wicked career, he has a way provided for him to escape the penalty of all his sins, by simply mumbling over a prayer, and asking God to forgive him, and exercising a pretended belief for it can't possibly be real in the healing efficacy of the blood of Christ.

This belief is prolific of a thousand crimes, that never would be perpetrated, if man was taught to stand firmly and steadfastly on his own integrity and honor, instead of being taught that his nature is such that he must and will sin, but that he may after all lay his whole load of guilt and crime upon an innocent brother.

May we all learn to be honest in this respect, and if we do wrong—commit sin—let us bear the stigma, and suffer the penalty ourselves and not pitch it off on to the shoulders of an innocent person.

To our sense of right, the whole plan of Salvation, as expounded by the prevailing sectarians, is founded in ignorance and dishonesty. Man should do right because it is right, and labor wrong because it is wrong, and not for fear of endless torment; nor should we shrink from responsibility and think to saddle it upon another.

Let us learn to keep good fences around our moral enclosures, and not depend on internal bull dogs, nor a heavenly umpire, to keep us in our proper places.

Those memorable words of Burns are brought forcibly to my mind, which read thus.

"God knows I'm not the thing I should be.

Nor am I ever the thing I could be,

But twenty times I rather would be,

An Atheist clear;

Than under Gospel clouds hid be

Just for a screen."

We have respect for every Orthodox man, and acknowledge him a brother, but we have no respect for his imaginary God at all.

My God is Humanity, and all other Gods are idle to me, for I believe in none of them.

Your Friend and Brother.

E. B. LANDON.

Mrs. M. A. BROWN.

Trance Speaker and Healing Medium.
May be addressed at Sandusky, Addison county, Vt. Prompt attention will be paid to all applications.

Terms—For examination and prescription, if presents one dollar; if absent, either by lock of hair or signature, two dollars.

NEW DEPOT

FOR SPIRITUAL AND REFORM PUBLICATIONS,
No. 5 Great Jones street, N. Y., 2 doors east of Broadway.

S. T. MUNSON has opened a Publication Agency at the above place, where he intends carrying a general assortment of all works pertaining to Spiritualism.

The time has come when the facts and phenomena of Spiritualism are arresting the attention of the best and wisest men of the New and Old World. All orders for Books will meet with prompt attention.

T. S. MUNSON.

ENGLISH BOOKS AND STATIONERY—LONDON AND LIVERPOOL PAPERS.

MUNSON,

No. 5 Great Jones street, 2 doors east of Broadway and also at the Lafrige Hotel, New York City, receives by the weekly steamers all the important London, Liverpool, Paris and other European periodicals, Books and Magazines; all new American publications as soon as issued. A good assortment of Toy Books, Fine Stationery, &c. Book Binding in any style.

CHARLES UPSON & Co.,
Attorneys and Counselors at Law, and Solicitors in Chancery.

COLDWATER, MICHIGAN.

CHARACTON. GEO. A. DOE.

Books for Sale.

All who may wish to investigate the subject of spiritualism, or natural philosophy, will be accommodated with any of the following list of books, at New York prices.

It will be seen that we have all the various productions of A. J. Davis, S. B. Brittan, and Judge Edmunds, on the subject of spiritualism, and indeed many other valuable works. Address World's Paper, or,

D. TARRELL Jr. Sandusky Vt.
Golden Age. Spiritualism, Vol. I. and 2.
Prof. Robert Hale. Present Age, and Inner Life.
Skekinah, Double. Seers' Precat.
Skekinah, Double Gilt. Courtney Review, Dod.
Telegraph Papers. Light in the Spirit, Paper.
Spiritual Telegraph. Approaching Crisis.
Tables Turned. Philosophy Spt. Land.
Dynamies. Voice Spt. Land.
Epic of the Stars Heavens. Revelations.
Discourses from Spt. World. Hartford Bible Convention.
Disquisition. Arnold and Others' Treats.
Celestial Telegraph. Voice from Spt. World.
Stilling Pneumatology. Sene's Morals.
Review, Beecher, Muslin. Combs's Constitution of man.
Review, Beecher, Paper. Macrocosm.

BOOK AND

JOB PRINTING

Of every description, both

PLAIN AND FANCY,

Sealty and promptly executed at this Office, on

Terms as Low

As those of any Printing Establishment in the State, and in a manner to compete well with work done in Boston or New York. We trust that our extensive experience in all branches of Book and Job Printing, together with the large and tastefully executed Printing Establishment we have purchased will enable us to merit and receive a large share of public patronage. These having job printing to do, will find it for their advantage to give us a call.