

THE  
VEIL UPLIFTED:  
AND  
MESMERISM TRACED TO ITS SOURCE.

BEING  
AN EXPOSURE OF THE LEADING ERROR OF PHRENOLOGY;  
OF THE  
OBJECT OF MESMERISTS TO CONFIRM THAT ERROR;  
AND AN  
EXAMINATION OF THE PRETENSIONS OF ELECTRO-PSYCHOLOGY.

BY A CHRISTIAN.



London:

BENJAMIN L. GREEN, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW.  
1852.

265. L. 35.

W. J. AND J. SEARS, PRINTERS, IVY LANE, CITY.

## INTRODUCTION.

---

It cannot be denied that Evil (which the Scriptures term Sin) is in the world, and that it is a Principle or Influence, producing certain results which are, by the general voice of mankind, pronounced to be intolerable; and which, if unchecked, would lead to the total disruption of society.

Neither can it be denied that God has, in the Scriptures, both authorised and commanded punishments for evil, in this present world; and that he has therein declared that he will also, himself, punish for evil in, and through, Eternity.

But it follows necessarily, from the last-named circumstances, that he cannot by his own act in the constitution of man, have planted in him that principle or influence by which crimes are evolved, for if he had done so, it would be *impossible* for him to sanction punishments, either in Time or in Eternity.

Since, however, Evil does exist, and since it is impossible he can have been the author of its introduction into the world, it follows that that principle must have come in, in some other way; and the Scriptures have, in the most clear, unequivocal, and explicit language declared what that other way was.

Yet clear and unmistakable as is the language of the Scriptures on the subject of the entrance of evil, it has, nevertheless, not met with adequate attention. The Church seems to have been ashamed of so very simple an account of it, and has tacitly disavowed it; as if the declaration of the Scriptures upon this head, had not precisely the same claim to implicit reception that every other of its statements have—namely, that both it and they are alike “*by inspiration of God.*”

Had it been otherwise: had the Scripture account of the mode of sin's entrance into the world, been always taught and insisted upon, in its literal simplicity and upon the ground of its being contained in the Word of God, the disquisitions of Materialists and others, on that point, would either not

have had place, or would have been felt to have been but the reasonings of persons in open and avowed rejection of Divine Truth.

But the consequence of failure to uphold this truth, has been, that Materialists and others who reject revelation have been encouraged in the endeavour to give an explanation of their own of the mode of sin's entrance into the world. The door, which God had closely shut, but which his servants have, in a manner, declared to be open, has been eagerly seized upon by those whose sole object is to justify themselves and others in evil, and the result has been precisely that which might have been looked for at such hands; the subtle effort, namely, to cast the authorship of evil upon the Creator himself.

It is one object of the following paper to point out afresh the simple solution which the Scriptures give of the mode of sin's entrance into the world. It is a point of especial importance in the present day, as few who will be at the trouble to look deeply into the *objects* of Phrenology and Mesmerism will be disposed to deny. It is hoped that others, more competent than the writer may be, will be induced to take up this point of Divine Truth; first, because it is most unequivocally declared in the Scriptures; secondly, because it lays the axe to the root of materialism; and lastly, because the name of God can be vindicated from the impious ascription to him of the Authorship of Evil *only* by the weapons himself has put in our hands.



# THE VEIL UPLIFTED,

AND

## MESMERISM TRACED TO ITS SOURCE.

---

THAT there was division amongst the Jews on the subject of the soul's immortality, is evident from the fact, that while many, perhaps the majority, did "think they had eternal life in the Scriptures," (John v. 39,) others, the Sadducees, believed them to contain no such doctrine, and that there was no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit. (Acts xxiii. 8.) When, therefore, we read that "Life and immortality were *brought to light*" by the Redeemer, we are to understand that He placed the fact of the soul's immortality, and of its eternal futurity of bliss or woe, on the additional basis of His own solemn affirmation, who both knew all things, and to whom it was impossible He should lie.

But it is very certain that the soul's immortality, i. e., its *absolute imperishability*, was plainly deducible from many of the statements of the Old Testament. Let us consider but one of them.

It is written that God first framed man out of the dust of the earth; that He then breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and, it is added, "Man became a living soul." Wherefore, unless we are prepared to believe that any essentially perishable thing could possibly emanate from the living and eternal God, we are impelled to conclude that consequently upon His *personal* act of imparting to man the breath of that life which was *in Himself*, man necessarily became a living soul; in other words, the essential imperishability of the soul follows necessarily from the fact that it proceeded forth from the Creator personally.

Wherefore the doctrine of the soul's immortality rests, not only upon the declaration of one who could not possibly be mistaken, but also upon the antecedent fact that it is necessarily so, because it emanated from the eternal God Himself! How glorious, therefore, is the soul's origin! How exceedingly high in essential relationship even to the Deity Himself! How infinitely valuable must it appear in His sight, since He hesitated not to give His own Son, the express image of his own ineffable excellency, *to die* for the eternal salvation of every soul that will but receive it at His hands! On the other hand, how infinitely valuable is the soul *to man*! and seeing that it must necessarily *exist* for ever, of what exceeding importance is it that each should look to himself, and ascertain by every available means, and by the most searching inquisition, *what* is the probable destiny of his own soul when it shall be called to quit its tenement of clay! Finally, if the soul *be* immortal, how utterly futile will every attempt prove by which men seek to deny it as a fact! If it be but *possible* that the Scripture testimonies are true, how

terrible is such a possibility to those who disregard them ! How overwhelming their confusion, how unutterable their horror, when awakening in an eternity which they have refused to believe and anticipate *here*, they find that the soul certainly has immortality, but to them an immortality of woe alone !

But if God imparted to man a soul which was necessarily and essentially imperishable, it follows that when He spoke of *death* in connection with Adam's disobedience, He could not possibly have intended the annihilation of the soul. As Adam stood erect before God in the day he was created, he had a body, which having been composed of matter, was *not* essentially imperishable, and a soul which, having emanated from the living God, *was* essentially imperishable. If, therefore, the death of which God spoke had any character of annihilation, it is evident it could respect that of the body alone ; wherefore the words spoken to Adam after his disobedience, "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return," could refer only to the part of Adam which *was* dust, and could have no sort of reference to that part of him which was *not* dust.

But the Scriptures give sufficient reason to conclude that the death of which God had forewarned Adam that it would result from eating of the tree, had no sort of reference to the death of his body ; that it was not of its death he spoke, but of the entrance of evil alone. In the first place, the death of the body did not result from eating of the tree, but was brought in by a separate sentence of God ; a sentence which was pronounced because of the *disobedience* of Adam ; but evil did result, and it resulted from the eating of the tree alone. In the second place we see that God had distinctly apprised Adam both of the nature and of the property of the tree of which he forbade him to eat ; He had called it the tree of knowledge of good and *evil*. Now we know that no good whatever resulted, but that positive, unmixed evil, did result from Adam's eating ; wherefore it was of *the nature* of the tree, as of *evil knowledge*, that Adam was forewarned. God had also apprised him of the consequence of his eating, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou wilt surely die ;"\* the *property*, therefore, of the tree was that it would bring in an *immediate* death. Let us reflect if these two results were not in fact *identical* ; in other words, whether it was not of *one* result, namely of evil knowledge in its character of *moral death* alone, that Adam had been forewarned.

The words of God point to the tree as that from which the death was to result. The words of the serpent (Satan) were more pointedly expressive of the same fact ; he said, "God doth know that in the day ye eat *thereof*, THEN your eyes shall be *opened*." Adam and Eve ate, and immediately, even as Satan had said, "the eyes of them both *were* opened." But to *what* were they opened ? To a perception of evil alone. If we trace the results we observe that they perceived they were naked, were ashamed, and made themselves aprons ; they conceived an aversion to the presence of God, and hid themselves from Him ; and, finally, we see in Adam a combination of meanness, lying, and daring impiety ; he accused the woman, he lied to God, and ended by casting upon Him the authorship of his fall, because He had given the woman to be with him.

Now the Scriptures give just reason to believe that before Adam had eaten

\* Note.—The entire context evinces that the words of God were in *warning*, and o that "*wilt*" is the proper rendering. Eve's words corroborate this ; she says, "God hath said ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die."

of the tree, he had been in the habit of open, face to face communion with God, and that supposes, not merely the absence of fear, but the presence of confidence and love; but from the moment he had eaten, his whole soul had undergone a revolution, and had been translated into the very opposites of confidence and love! Why was this? There are but two ways of accounting for it. It must have been *either* because Adam feared the consequences of his disobedience, *or* the revolution in his soul had sprung entirely from the tree of which he had eaten.

But the former of these conclusions will by no means meet the facts of the case. No doubt Adam feared to meet God because he had disobeyed; but had that been all, had fear been the only inmate of his heart, it would not necessarily have induced the mingled course of meanness, lying, and impiety, which he took; there was the equally open way of confessing and deploring his fault. Had Adam's original perceptions of the character and goodness of God been *unchanged*, they would certainly have impelled him to the latter course; therefore the fact that he took its opposite, is clear proof that his perceptions of the character and goodness of God had become radically changed.

But besides this, neither fear nor a guilty conscience at all serve to account for the previous opening of his eyes, nor for his knowing his nakedness, nor for his being ashamed. The whole mystery lies in these circumstances, and it has been solved for us by God Himself. He said, in reference to these very circumstances, "Who told thee thou *wast* naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee saying thou shalt not eat of it?" That is as though He had said, "Thou *knowest* thy nakedness! *Then*, thou hast eaten of *the tree*!" It is the effect seen, and its cause distinctly assigned. There can, therefore, be no doubt that it was of the entrance of evil *alone*, in its character of moral death, that Adam had been forewarned. The death of the body neither followed "*in the day*," nor did it result from the tree itself. It was added by God *because* evil *had* entered, and in the sole view of limiting the period of its action in the race to spring from the man in whom evil knowledge had become the principle of sin. This may be seen by a careful sifting of the reasons assigned for driving Adam out of Eden. See Gen. iii. 22, 23.\*

But there is another most important conclusion resulting from the Scripture record of the entrance of evil; a conclusion which strikes at the very root of the doctrine both of Phrenologists and Mesmerists. It is this; if the Scriptures are the word of God, if they were penned by inspiration of God, and are therefore THE TRUTH, it follows that evil did not result from the matter of which God created man, and that so far from "*the actions and thoughts of man being*" (as Materialists assert) "*the inevitable results of his cerebral organism,*" they are the result of an *acquired* principle of sin. But let us enter more deeply into this important subject.

The Scripture narrative of the creation and fall of man, warrants two lines of induction; separate, yet pointing to one and the same conclusion. They are these:—

It is written that Adam was created in the image of God; and as this

\* Note.—Thus, omitting all those words, which are, in a manner redundant, the passage will read, "And the Lord God said, behold, the man is become—to know—EVIL: and now, lest he—take also of the tree of life and eat and live for ever—THEREFORE—He drove out the man." In other words, Adam being now possessed of the principle of evil, was driven out of Eden that he might *die*, and not live for ever in the flesh.

cannot be interpreted of bodily shape or substance, it must needs be understood of moral or spiritual resemblance; that is, *the soul* of Adam when it emanated from the Creator, presented an entire conformity to the mind of God, a conformity which must originally have evidenced itself in all his thoughts and ways. But we see those thoughts and ways had become totally changed from the moment he had eaten of the tree; wherefore Adam must have lost his conformity to the mind of God, the image in which he had been created, *from that moment*. But he had lost it *solely because of the effect produced upon him by the fruit of the tree!* Wherefore that fruit must needs have acted upon his soul *through* his body, and it follows that as the soul is *one* and *indivisible*, there must be, in all probability, some one organ in which the soul may be especially said to *dwell*; some one organ in which the soul and body meet, and are so really and literally united and made *one*, that whatever acts upon and energizes the one, necessarily acts upon and energizes the other also.

2nd. When Adam had been formed in all his parts, so that there lacked only the vital spark which should set his whole frame in motion, that vital spark was imparted by the Creator Himself. It was, therefore, the soul which in the first instance animated and energized the body; but it follows that there was, in all probability, some one organ of the body which having been especially and primarily energized by the breath of life, became thenceforth the seat of the life of the flesh; some one organ, which while it was *first* set in motion by the breath of life, not only *imparted* that impulse to the rest of the members, but became thenceforward, the seat and organ of the soul which had animated it.

Now that the soul first energized the body and retained it in conformity to its own original impulse of good, is a strictly logical inference from the fact, that up to the moment he ate of the tree, Adam was in fellowship with God; and it is equally evident from the effects recorded, that from the moment Adam had eaten, his *soul* became in its turn, obedient to the evil impulse his body had acquired; a subjection of the soul to the body which has characterized men since the entrance of evil.

What then, is that organ, at once the seat and source of the life of the flesh, and the seat and organ of the soul of man? The anatomist will answer the first part of the question; he will point to *the heart* as occupying precisely that relative position to the frame of man which the main-spring does to the watch. The Scriptures answer the second, in declaring *the heart* to be the alone seat and source of evil in man.

The parts of Scripture which affirm this are too numerous to be cited here; we shall content ourselves with the solemn asseveration of the Creator, namely, of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. He has said, "those things which proceed out of the mouth, come forth from *the heart*; for out of *the heart* proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies," and the like. We have, therefore, as plainly as language can assert it, and from the lips of One to whom mistake was impossible, the distinct declaration that the heart is the alone source of evil in man.

But that which is the seat of evil in the descendants of Adam, must needs have been its seat in Adam himself! It was therefore the heart of Adam which having been, as it were, poisoned by the fruit of the tree, brought both his soul and members under the law of evil which it had received; and finally, if we consider the nature of the evils evolved by the heart, and that they are

brought into fruition by the members of the body, it follows that the heart is, in fact, the seat and source of evil, in the sense of prompting, or originating ; —in other words, the heart is the seat of *volition*. The words of 1 Cor. vi. 18, "Every sin that a man doeth *is without the body*," present an additional assurance that the members do not originate, but merely subserve, the emotions of sin.

These thoughts are presented to the reader in order that he may have not merely the letter of the Scriptures, but also that chain of induction by which the soul's immortality,—its actual subjection to a principle of evil, whose seat is the heart,—are seen to be but simple and unavoidable conclusions from the data of revealed truth.

But if the soul be imperishable, it is evident it can, at no time, cease to *be*; and the continuance of its existence after the death of the body, is mere matter of course. Concerning the body itself, God has declared He will, by and bye, raise it again from the dead; that He will at that time assemble before His throne, all those who shall not, as believers in Christ, have had part in the first resurrection—that namely which will take place at the second coming of Christ; that He will enter into judgment with all such—a judgment which, as it will proceed upon the ground of the evils men *have* done in the flesh, can end only in their condemnation.

And what is the object for which the eternal God has revealed these truths to His fallen creature—Man? That object is one of infinite mercy *alone*, viz. : that men should be induced so to dwell upon those truths, as to become thoroughly imbued with the one-engrossing conviction of their helplessness and danger:—of their helplessness, because He has Himself declared that by his own righteousness no man living can escape condemnation;—of their danger, because He has said He will *nevertheless* punish evil doers *through eternity*—UNLESS, they lay hold of that escape from condemnation for evil which He has provided and freely offers to all men in Christ Jesus.

Wherefore the one object of God's declarations concerning the soul's immortality and of its liability to His wrath because of indwelling sin, is solely that of SAVING MEN FROM ETERNAL PERDITION.

But if such be His gracious object; if there be such a thing as eternal perdition, how pregnant with diabolical evil must every system be, which, denying the very being of the soul, ignores the possibility of its eternal punishment, and which teaching that men are not justly accountable for evil, persuades them there can be no need of the mercy of God in Christ? How self-evident is it, that, if the Scriptures be of God, no such system can, for a moment, be supposed to have His sanction or approval.

Mesmerism properly so called, i. e., mesmerism as distinguished from its offspring "Electro Psychology," is such a system. It is, however, impossible to enter upon its pretensions without a previous notice of those of Phrenology, because the former has based itself upon the latter. It has not merely identified itself with the worst errors of Phrenology, but has claimed for itself to have given those errors the force of truth.

\* NOTE.—The supporters of a system which upholds such doctrines are *themselves assailants of Divine truth*; it is therefore no common degree of effrontery to turn upon the Christian with such words as these:—"Physiology is an inductive science. The intrusion of metaphysical abstractions into physiological discussions is *unwarrantable*." (Zoist for April, 1845, page 9.)

Phrenologists have laboured to establish two premises. The first is that the mere matter of which the brain is composed is *itself* the originator of the evils of which men are guilty. The second—that there is no such thing as a principle of volition. They have concluded from these supposed truths, that it is unjust for men to punish to extremity, even for the worst of crimes—as murder; from which it follows that it would be unjust in God also to punish such crimes to extremity; and as even Phrenologists are not prepared to conceive that God can *now* look upon with complacency—or hereafter receive to Himself with complacency—those who have been guilty of horrible crime, they have been driven to deny for the evil (and of course therefore for all others) the existence of any such thing as soul, or spirit.

We do not propose to enter, at any length, into the reasonings of Phrenologists, but shall content ourselves with a simple exposure of their leading error—that namely which ascribes the evils of which men are guilty to the matter of which the brain is composed.

We shall consider the question, first by the light of revelation, and then upon its own merits.

If the matter of which the brain is composed have the inherent *property* of evolving evil—or if, in other words of the Phrenologist, “the actions and thoughts of man are the *inevitable results* of his cerebral organism,” it must have been so from the beginning, and thus the authorship of evil is cast upon the Creator himself. We say nothing of the fearful impiety of such a thought, but shall prove that it has no shadow of foundation. This is most evident from two circumstances—first, in that He has both sanctioned and commanded punishments for crime, in this present life, and has declared He will punish for it in eternity, neither of which He could possibly be justified in, if crime be, *in any wise*, the necessary result of His own act in the constitution of man.

The second of these circumstances lies in the fact recorded in the Scriptures, that evil did *not* arise out of the matter of which man was created, but came in by *other* means. We have already noticed that point, but may observe, in pursuance of the same line of thought, that there can be no doubt Adam’s brain was—as to the matter of which it was composed, the same before as after the entrance of evil, yet had it never originated one thought of evil! This is a most important point, and has very conclusive bearing upon the subject; the more especially as there is every reason to believe that the period during which the organism of Adam evolved *no* evil, was a very lengthened one. This appears both from analogy of God’s dealings with His creatures, and from the letter of the Scriptures themselves; it would be at entire variance with the recorded character of God’s dealings, if we were to suppose Adam was tempted immediately upon his creation. Both the glorious attributes of God, and the analogy of His dealings with men, render it becoming in us to suppose He would not have suffered Satan to approach the newly-created pair, until they had had amply sufficient time to learn, understand, and appreciate, the excellency of their Creator, and the perfect happiness they owed to His goodness. It would require, and we ought therefore to suppose God would give them, a very considerable course of such experiences before they would *feel*—or He *exact*—any responsibility upon any point. And there is just reason to believe they had such a period given to them. It is written that Adam was 130 years old when he begat Seth;

now if we allow (though it is not probable it was so long) that Seth was not born until 20 years after the death of Abel, and that Cain was 50 years of age when he slew his brother, that gives us 60 years of Adam's life unaccounted for, and which was, in all reasonable probability, passed in Eden, and which intervened between the creation of Adam and Satan's approach to Eve. It is, at all events, clear from the Scriptures that evil did not arise from the matter of which Adam was created; that evil was therefore not inherent in it, and that his actions were not "*the inevitable result of his cerebral organism*," but were the alone consequence of the influences to which he had become subject upon eating of the tree; influences which the Scriptures place in the heart, and not in the brain. But if the actions of Adam did not result from his cerebral organism, neither can those of his descendants result from their cerebral organism; the evils which men do must needs have the same source in them which they had in their progenitor, namely *the heart*, and not in the head.

Let us now consider the question upon its own grounds;—it lies in a mere nutshell. The question is simply, does the matter of which the brain is composed originate *both* evil and good; does it both suggest the evil and the desire to restrain it?

Phrenologists have grouped the manifestations of the brain under three general heads:—the Intellectual—the Moral—and the Animal perceptions; they, indeed, term them *functions*, but we shall not adopt that word because it implies more than we can concede. Now we do not object to this grouping; we would only point out that even by the shewing of Phrenologists themselves the intellectual and moral are as two to one against the animal perceptions. And if we consider the minute subdivisions into which Phrenologists have arranged the, so-called, functions of the brain, we perceive that those organs which plead on the side of order, and therefore *against* evil, are no less than *ten to one* against the organs whose pleadings are on the opposite side. It results therefore, even from this view of the question, that it can be more justly said, that the brain has, by its very structure, more the character or tendency to *restrain* than to originate evil.

That the brain is the seat of the intellect—that the intellect is capable of a high degree of refinement, so as to exercise a real and efficient check over the lower manifestations of the brain;—that it is also the seat of the moral perceptions;—that these, too, are susceptible of such training as in a great measure to neutralize or control the baser suggestions of the brain, there can be no shadow of doubt. Nor does the Phrenologist deny this—but asserts it. He says (in a passage which we shall presently give,) that he is able to make a more rational appeal to man than a Christian can do—the latter, he says, gives mere words, while the Phrenologist gives him *facts*, and says to him "*do this* because it is *right*—because it is *just*—because it is *your duty*;" and as the Phrenologist admits of no medium (as of mind or spirit) this concedes the point that the brain of man has the power to restrain evil. We are therefore not at issue with Phrenologist on the question that the brain *has* by its very structure, *the property* of emanating, or of being brought to exercise an actual and efficient *control over evil*.

Wherefore the question is narrowed down to this, Does the brain *also* emanate the evils of which men are guilty? Is it possible that the same matter can evolve two diametrically opposite tendencies? Evil, and the desire to restrain.



it? Viewing it in an abstract light, the idea is absurd, and we cannot better expose its absurdity than in the words of the Phrenologist himself. He is criticising the following passage from the writings of an opponent, "We insist that the brain is the servant of the mind; that man is not the slave of his organization; but is bound to execute the laws of the Most High; and in so doing, so to restrain, and modify, and govern his organic suggestions, as to keep himself in the paths of rectitude, and protect all others, within the social circle, from injury." To which the Phrenologist replies, "Now since brain *is* the servant of mind, and man is *not* the slave of his organism, we should much wish to be informed, how these *organic* suggestions he refers to are produced, and which we are told man is to restrain, modify and govern. If *organic* suggestions result from brain, and brain *is* the servant of mind, *mind*, on his own shewing, must be *the cause* of those actions, which *mind* is to *restrain*, modify, and govern." To this he adds, "O! Mr. Newnham! Mr. Newnham! alas for philosophy, logic, and common sense, when you attempted to use such weapons." (Zoist for April, 1845, page 15.) The Phrenologist has not seen that in ridiculing his opponent, he has pronounced sentence upon *himself*, and that the gist of his objection is absolutely suicidal to his own induction that the brain evolves evil! The notion he ridicules as unphilosophical, illogical, and void of common sense, is, that that which *causes* can be also supposed capable of *restraining* the evil; but himself allows that the brain *does* restrain evil; himself appeals to it to *do* so; it is therefore manifest, even from his own shewing, that it cannot also *evolve evil*. This is the passage in which he makes that appeal; he is contrasting the Christian with the Phrenologist; of the former, he says, "You give mere words, we give him (Man) *facts*. You say, Do this in the fear of God, and for the hope of everlasting happiness; we enter not into this question; we give him high motives, and say, Do this because it is *right*, because it is *just*, because it is *your duty*." (Ibid.) But to *what* does he address his "*facts*," to *what* his "*high motives*," to *what* does he say "*do this*?" Even to the brain; to that matter which, while he ascribes to it *the property* of evolving evil, he nevertheless, in defiance of his ridicule of such a course in *another*, himself adjures it to restrain, modify and govern its own organic suggestions! Wherefore the brain, which has the property of restraining, cannot rationally be supposed also to *evolve* evil.

But if it be in an abstract point of view, absurd to ascribe the origin both of good and evil to the matter of which the brain is composed, it is no less unphilosophical and illogical to infer, as Phrenologists have done, that because great crimes have resulted from men's having suffered themselves to be carried away by the suggestions of some one or more organs, it is therefore *the property* of such organ or organs to evolve *those crimes*! This is indeed the grand, the fundamental error of Phrenologists, and it is contrary alike to philosophy, logic, and common sense. It is to argue the truth of a principle from the *exception*, instead of from the *rule*. Great crimes are, and ever have been, the *exception*; the *rule* is, and ever has been, a certain amount of general *good order* in the masses of mankind. How perverse, therefore, is the view which, setting aside the testimony to the property of certain organs, which is afforded by the general rule of good order in the masses, would infer from the exceptional crimes of the few, that those organs have the property of evolving evil only! For those organs which are said to evolve evil are in equal



development in the masses, or they are not. If they *are*, then the testimony of the masses is adverse to the induction that it is the property of those organs to evolve evil : if they are *not* in equal development in the masses, then those in whom they are unduly or excessively developed form but *exceptions* to the general rule, and it is monstrous to infer the *general property* of an organ from its *ultra* manifestations in those in whom that organ is itself in *ultra* development. Such a line of inference confounds the abuse of a thing with its right use, nay, rather, it lays hold of a manifest abuse, and affirms that to be the original and designed use. This they have done, who have named the various organs of the brain; they have named some of them after their worst manifestations, that is, have designated them from the abuses men have made of them; and have thus sought to *bespeak* for those organs an essential *character of evil*; a character which belongs *not* to their general manifestations as evinced in mankind at large, but which belongs only to the individual manifestations of those, comparatively few, who have been hurried into great crimes. Thus "Combateness," "Destructiveness," and "Amativeness," bespeak for these organs the ideas of battle, murder, and the vilest excesses of lust; as if these which are but the abuse, were their right and lawful use. This they have done by averring those excesses to be the *property* of those organs, and by the further assertion that "the actions and thoughts of man are the *inevitable results* of his cerebral organism," crime is not only palliated but *justified*! But in all this they have ignored the fact that those very organs are *mainly* suggestive of far other influences; influences *not in themselves* of the nature of evil, but which both conduce to the well-being, and are essentially necessary to the very continuance of the human race. It is from this fact that the properties of the various organs of the brain should have been inferred; namely, from their designed use, and not from their abuse; a line of thought which as it would *reverse* the inductions of Phrenologists, would establish the opposite induction, that it is *not* the *property*, either of the brain at large, or of any one of its organs to evolve evil.

But if it be so, if the brain does not originate the evils which men commit, yet that its organs are capable of being urged into such excessive action as to impel to great crimes, there is a need for the supposition of some other originator, some other organ, which being itself the seat of an evil influence, in some instances uses the brain as its instrument, while it is, in others, itself governed by the brain. The Scriptures place that influence in the *heart* of man. He who receives their dicta, will possess a clue to those phenomena which present but a mass of contradictions to all who reject their testimony. The Christian will perceive, that while the brain may be conceded to be, and to have been *by creation*, the seat of the intellectual, moral, and animal perceptions, they were, before the entrance of evil, so nicely balanced as to conduce only to the happiness of man, and were at the same time under the influence of a heart whose every pulse beat in conformity to the mind of the Creator. So wise and beneficent, however, had been His foresight, that the brain was adapted to be, and has since the entrance of evil actually become, to a considerable extent, the controller of the heart itself. The Christian may therefore admit the general idea that the brain is the seat of the intellectual, moral, and animal perceptions; he may go still further, and admit that the Creator not only endowed the brain with the general property of evolving thought, but also endowed certain of its organs with the peculiar property of evolving certain

lines of thought : following up this concession, he may freely admit that in some instances—either from the excessive development of some one organ, or from the lesser development of other organs, which if more equally developed, would tend to neutralize or counteract the action of the first supposed organ—men may seem *impelled* to follow the dictates of a heart of unmixed evil, which, finding no adequate resistance from a brain of that structure would easily overpower it to its own purposes. The Christian may admit this, and yet understand that if in the man in whom excessive development of any one organ exists, there be *also* found to *co-exist* a certain degree of judgment, a degree of judgment which enables him to discern between good and evil, right and wrong, a degree of judgment which serves to keep *himself* from harm, and to perceive what is good for *himself*, such an one is righteously answerable, both to God and to man, that he do not to others, any thing which he judges would be hurtful, and would not like to have done to *himself*. This is indeed the fundamental principle of all law, whether human or Divine. Both the one and the other pronounce certain actions to be evil, and punish them, even to death. And with what face can Phrenologists pretend that extreme punishments have not answered their purpose ! They have done so. Punishments speak to the understanding, their language is understood by the masses, and they are restrained from the commission of much evil which, but for the penalties to which they *know* their liability, they would certainly commit. Crime is the exception, the rule is that amount of good order by which alone society exists, and it will remain the rule so long, and only so long, as every exception from it shall be dealt with by law.

Let us now enter upon the pretensions of Mesmerism. Those pretensions are two in number. First, that diseases are curable by its means ; secondly, that it confers upon those in whom the higher character of the mesmeric sleep is induced, certain powers, which though termed "*clairvoyant*" only, are, if they be real, of a decidedly supernatural character.

We shall deal chiefly with the latter pretension, because as it is the highest manifestation of the same principle as that by which cures are effected, it follows that whatever is *its* source, must necessarily be the source of the other also ; and our main object is to trace Mesmerism to its *source*.

The grand dogma upon which the pretensions of Mesmerism rest, is that the brain, the *matter* of the brain, has the *inherent property* of evolving thought. It is a conclusion which has been pushed to the inference, that man is irresponsible for the evil he commits ; while in fact the opposite inference, that of *absolute responsibility* is the natural and necessary result from that fact. For if the brain have that inherent property, it follows that it was so endowed by the Creator himself ; and we have seen reason to conclude that he *so* endowed it, in order that it *should* evolve those influences by which evil is *restrained*. If the brain therefore has been endowed with that property by which it discerns between right and wrong ; by which it approves of good and condemns evil, it is manifest, that men are accountable to Him for the right exercise of that property with which He has endowed them, for the very end that they might discern and disapprove of evil, whether in themselves or in others.

Now there seems but one imaginable way of avoiding the above conclusion, and that is by saying that the thinking principle belongs to the matter of which the brain is composed, *only* as other principles belong to other forms of

matter:—as for instance it is the inherent property of a tree to produce the blossom which afterwards becomes its fruit—and that without volition of its own—so it is the inherent property of the brain, equally without volition of its own, to evolve those thoughts which lead to actions—and that man is therefore no more accountable for his thoughts and actions, than a tree is responsible for the nature of the fruit it bears.

It is the grand object of Mesmerisers to establish this belief:—they claim to have proved its truth, and appeal to the phenomena of clairvoyance as affording that proof. Clairvoyance is described as a state in which the brain is made, at the will of the Mesmeriser alone, to produce all its phenomena; while the patient, having been deprived of every vestige of natural consciousness, is, whether to perceptions of pain or of his own thoughts and actions,—but as a corpse. But the phenomena of Clairvoyance do not end there: it is further pretended that the patient is, in some instances, invested with the power of describing with the utmost accuracy, both the nature of the disease under which he may labour, and its cure; and that those who have acted upon the information thus received, have found the result to be in precise conformity to that which had been predicted by the Clairvoyant. It is pretended of others that they see with their eyes closely shut; that they hold communion with their Mesmeriser—a communion in which the Clairvoyant replies to *the thought*, although no utterance has been given to it; and finally that some have been able to know the whereabouts of absent persons, and foretell their approach: none of which phenomena belonged to the patient before or after, but only *during the state of clairvoyance*; and it is carefully stated by Mesmerists—with the obvious view of confirming the belief that the brain acts apart from the man, i. e., apart from his own knowledge, consent, or participation—that when *de-mesmerised*, the patient is in utter ignorance of all that has either proceeded from, or been done to, him while in the so-called clairvoyant state.

The above offers, indeed, but a brief and meagre summary of the wonders of Mesmerism; but it is enough for our purpose. Any one who doubts such things are claimed for that art, has only to peruse any one of the numbers of the “*Zoist*,” he will therein see far greater wonders than these.

We shall not, at present, touch upon the question whether such results are or are not supernatural: we must first dispose of the previous question, viz., are they *facts*. Is the state called clairvoyant, true or false: are the phenomena of that state real or are they simulated; in other words, are we dealing with a substance or only with a shadow?

This is a very important question, but it has not, so far as we know, been as yet taken up in a right spirit. Unbelievers in Mesmerism—those, that is, who from any motive, whether of professional jealousy, or from a habit of rejecting anything which smacks of the marvellous, have *pre-resolved* not to admit its truth, have been from that very fact not in a position to come to a just conclusion on the subject. Even where some of its opposers have *seemed* to proceed to a deliberate investigation of its claims they have, unknowingly, taken with them a state of mind which was a *necessary bar* to the presentation before them of the phenomena of Mesmerism;—without the actual presentation of which they could be in no respect more competent judges after, than before, they seemed to have taken up the subject. The state of mind referred to is *unbelief*—whose presence is a necessary bar to

the exhibition of those phenomena upon which the claims of Mesmerism rest. This has not been thought of, but its truth—the *fact* that unbelief has the power to neutralize or altogether hinder the putting forth of far greater powers than those which are claimed for Mesmerism, is very evident from the Scriptures; for we read that it was so even in the instance of the almighty power of the Redeemer himself! It is stated (compare Mark vi. 5, 6, with Matt. xiii. 55—58) that because of the unbelief of the Nazarenes Christ could do no mighty work among them. Now while it is admitted Christ had *infinite* power, and that therefore nothing can be supposed capable of offering *essential* resistance to its display, yet the result was that *unbelief did* in some way actually hinder its exercise! We are therefore to suppose the Lord perceived that the unbelief of the Nazarenes was so entire, as to render it, in His sight, *unadvisable*, so that He *would* do no mighty work among them; still the result to the *Nazarenes* was the same: their unbelief hindered the exercise in their presence of powers which were undoubtedly *infinite*. We may therefore reasonably conclude that those who—while manifestly in the worst possible state of mind—viz: in total unbelief of the reality of the Mesmeric powers—have also tested their powerlessness to produce the wonders of Mesmerism before them—have never yet been in a position to pronounce any judgment whatever upon the subject. This unbelief may have been—and has undoubtedly been, the sole cause of the apparent failure in their presence; but its wonders may be real for all that the opposers of Mesmerism have shown to the contrary. Would the miracles of Christ which He performed at other times, and in other places, have been less real, because the Nazarenes could say “He could do no mighty work among us?”

It is evident, then, that if we would form a right opinion of Mesmerism, we must examine—not the statements of those who have confessedly *not* witnessed—but the statements of those who profess to have been eye-witnesses of its wonders; and we should not, even for a moment, permit our judgment to be swayed by any consideration of the marvellous nature of the things which are reported, as if they constituted in themselves any sort of ground for rejecting Mesmerism; for what would be the consequence of such a course in respect to the Scriptures themselves? The sole question with which we have to do is, whether they who report the wonders of that art, are or are not worthy of credibility: whether, that is, they are both competent judges of the facts they relate, and are, on the score of personal character, worthy of belief. How the wonders are to be accounted for is a wholly separate question, it has nothing whatever to do with the reality of the wonders themselves. We may or may not be able to account for many things we see, but if we do really see them, we are certain they come to pass. It may also be observed that although some—perhaps many—have simulated the state of Clairvoyance, that fact is no sort of proof that others have not simulated it. The reality of Clairvoyance is no more disproved by false pretensions to it, than the real existence of gold is disproved by the counterfeit coin.

But are those who have reported the wonders of Mesmerism competent to judge of the facts they relate, and are they, on the score of personal character, worthy of belief? Surely there can be no doubt they are both the one and the other! Speaking of them as a body, it is not to be *questioned* that Mesmerisers are men of talent and character; their name is legion; they number in their ranks gentlemen of the first education, barristers, physicians,

and even clergymen, as able and competent witnesses as ever yet testified to any fact.

Of the things they report we have already given a brief summary. They may be resolved into phenomena of two distinct classes. The first of these is the mere mesmeric sleep, during which it is pretended that the patient is entirely divested of natural consciousness, so that he is utterly insensible to bodily pain, and to every thing which passes around him. The second is the state of *Clairvoyance*, during which it is pretended that while still in the mesmeric sleep, and utterly insensible to natural things, *another* consciousness supervenes, and that during its continuance the brain of the patient exercises powers to which it can lay no possible claim while uninfluenced by Mesmerism.

In proof of the first of these phenomena—namely, that during the mesmeric sleep the patient is undoubtedly and really divested of natural consciousness—we shall confine ourselves to the simple fact that amputation of a limb has been successfully performed upon one in that sleep, and without his knowledge.\* This is a case in which collusion cannot, for a moment, be supposed, and is enough, if there existed no other instance of it whatever, to prove the fact that mesmeric sleep is real, and that in it the natural consciousness is wholly suspended. But we cannot deal thus summarily with the phenomena of Clairvoyance. It is needful, both for the purpose we have in view, and for the reader himself, that we should give these in greater detail. Premising, therefore, that the quotations we are about to make are to be found in the *Zoist* for April, 1845, that the article itself from which we quote is by the pen of Adolphe Kiste, Esq., and that the case reported has the great advantage of having been witnessed by two gentlemen referred to, the one as "Colonel B., who was a determined sceptic before he came and saw," the other as "Colonel Hamilton Smith, who is well known for his vast scientific acquirements, and who was a sceptic until that day;" we proceed to the phenomena of Clairvoyance, as exhibited in the person of Miss Martin, who is declared to have previously known Mesmerism only by name, but absolutely nothing of its nature.

Miss Martin is the daughter of a highly respectable tradesman in Plymouth, in whose house Mr. K. lodged. He says, she had suffered from ophthalmia for many years, and that at the period of her introduction to him "had become worse than usual;" she was also "subject to frequent attacks of giddiness, palpitation of the heart, and fainting." He continues, "I saw Miss M. for the first time on the 30th January, 1844. She seemed to be in ill health, looked pale and haggard, her eyelids were ulcerated, and the eyeballs looked red and inflamed. Her sister being called in, I desired her to take her seat in my studio." (Page 25.) Of the Mesmeriser's subsequent proceedings we have the following account. Let the reader especially remark that in the first place the patient was divested of her natural consciousness, and then another consciousness is reported to have supervened.

"Having mentally concentrated all my nervous force, and thrown it, as it were, into the patient's system, I produced the desired effect in about fifteen

\* NOTE.—Topham (W.) Ward (W. S.) Account of a case of successful amputation of the thigh during the mesmeric state, without the knowledge of the patient, read to the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society, on the 22nd November, 1842. 8vo., 1 sheet. London, H. Baillière.

minutes. She became *somnambule*, and in that state manifested the usual mesmeric phenomena, such as *insensibility to pain, catalepsy, attraction, and community of taste and sensation; the activity of the phrenological organs was also developed* to as high a degree of perfection as I have ever witnessed, by *simply pointing at them*; and after a few sittings, the higher and more rare conditions, viz., *prevision in regard to her own case and its necessary treatment*, and subsequently *clairvoyance, spontaneously exhibited themselves.*" (Ibid.)

Let us now turn to Miss M.'s own description (given while *in the mesmeric state*) of the effects of that sleep. "When requested to describe her feelings during the time of going from the waking, into the sleep-waking state, she said, 'Soon after you gaze at me, a new, warm, light and soothing atmosphere gathers around me, so far as you can extend your arms, until it quite encircles me, and isolates me from the outer world.' 'She contemplated with interest her *two existences* when her mind was directed towards the subject. She knew every thing that happened to her in her waking state, as well as, most minutely, what had occurred during her former mesmeric sittings: *but the moment you wake me all this is blank*, it is most droll." (Page 28.) We have also Miss M.'s recollections of the mesmeric state, written after her cure. She writes thus; "Since my recovery I have been permitted to read the notes taken by my sister during my magnetic sleep, and whilst reading, I recognise, though somewhat indistinctly, many of the facts, even as circumstances sometimes recall the recollection of a dream." "I well remember the sweet tranquil feeling which always possessed my mind as I passed into the state of perfect and delicious repose, which is felt the moment that sleep commences. There seemed to be so far as you could extend your arms, a warm, light, soothing atmosphere, encircling and isolating me in idea as completely from the outer world as if I were ever so distantly removed from it; while bright and quickly passing dreams, were constantly flitting through my mind; *induced probably by the phreno-magnetic experiments which I understand were made.*" (pp. 34, 35.)

What those phreno-magnetic experiments were, and with what view they were made, Mr. Kiste thus states, "Having been desirous to ascertain whether I could observe facts which would confirm the opinion of those who attribute these phenomena (those namely of the brain) to *volition* or sympathy, or that of others who assign the cause to *the direct action of the mesmeric influence on the cerebral organs*, I had proceeded with great caution from the beginning. The patient knew my movements *only when her attention was directed to them*. I knew this by the expression of her face. After having *de-mesmerised* an organ, I asked her could she perceive where my hand had been? 'No,' after a little while, 'Yes, you did so,' moving her arm over her head, and declared that *what she had been thinking of* proceeded from my *having done so—she felt it had*. On one occasion after the excitement of Veneration and Ideality, she exclaimed in a most plaintive tone, 'You make me dream such beautiful dreams, and then you *disturb me in them.*'"

This is a remarkable fact enough. The beautiful dreams evidently could have proceeded from Ideality alone, and the subsequent appeal to Veneration, is felt to be of the nature of *disturbance*! Mesmerism indeed does not seem to harmonize with too many appeals to this latter organ, for we find Miss M. complaining of its excitement, and of *its excitement alone*. Mr. K. thus

mentions this singular and ominous fact. "When under the excitement of Veneration, the manifestations were truly sublime." "I was, however, soon compelled to desist from these experiments, for in the first place, it was observed, that the patient became very excitable and uneven in her disposition when in the waking state. I did not at first assign a cause when I was told this, but soon she began to complain of peculiar sensations in her head; she felt 'as if something was moving from one place to another,' and one morning she told me that she had felt during the night for a long time 'as if a worm was crawling on the top of her head.' Upon my requesting her to point out the place, she put her finger on the organ of Veneration, which the day before had been frequently excited, on account of the beautiful effect that was produced. When in the trance again, I drew her attention to the subject, when she declared that those sensations proceeded from my having made her dream too often, and that it would hurt her if I were to persist in it." It seems singular enough that while no complaint is made of the over-excitement of *any other organ*, that which is supposed to emanate *religious ideas*, must be very cautiously dealt with!

We shall now throw together those other manifestations of the clairvoyant state which, if they be facts, place it beyond dispute that the mesmeric influences do indeed confer upon the patient, powers which, as they confessedly do not belong to nature, must needs be ascribed wholly to "*the direct action of the mesmeric influences on the cerebral organs*;" in other words, those manifestations belong *not* to the patient at all, but to Mesmerism *alone*.

"On one occasion, before awaking the patient, I requested her to appoint a different day to the usual one, as I should have to leave Plymouth for a week. *She instantly said, 'You are going on a visit to Mr. —'* looked distressed, but appointed a few days later. After she had been awakened some time, I informed her that the next day I should leave. 'You are going to Mr. —' she said, *(a gentleman she had never seen, but who had been present at one of the sittings.)* 'How do you know this?' I asked. She looked bewildered, and *could not tell*. I broke off the conversation, and this is the first and only time she has ever remembered any circumstance (i. e. which occurred during the trance.) During the period of her mesmeric slumbers, there came upwards of thirty different visitors; she always recognized the same persons again at different sittings *even before they came into the room, or entered the house, and frequently without my knowing that they were coming*. When questioning her about the possibility of seeing without using the eyes, 'I do not see, but *I know, I feel*.' As stated before, she was ignorant of mesmeric phenomena in her waking state; but when in the trance *she spoke on the subject like an experienced Mesmerist, often directed me how to proceed*, and in several instances, pointed out to me a course which, after consideration, I blamed myself for not having followed without her suggestion. I very soon discovered that she could perceive objects *without using the usual organs*. When her eyes were open, which was often the case, the pupils retreated upwards, and were not discernible; otherwise they were tightly closed. I also observed that sometimes *my thoughts were read by the patient*; on the other hand, I soon found that I could also read the patient's thoughts, and not even the most superficial observer could have misinterpreted the various feelings and sentiments as they followed each other in rapid succession like flashes of lightning, by looking at that index of the mind, the



face. Whenever she read my thoughts, there appeared in her face an expression of curiosity, and there was the attitude of listening. On one occasion *I looked mentally* at a skull that was in the room, and merely said, 'How do you like it?' There came first an expression of aversion, which passed off quickly, when she said, 'Why should I dislike it? We are so too.' 'What are you thinking about?' 'That,' pointing to the skull. At other times, *she perceived at a distance; knew who was coming; or what persons were in other parts of the house.*" (pp. 26—29.)

Mr. Kisé proceeds, "I must now relate a fact which will be deemed more striking than any yet told, from the combination of circumstances under which it occurred. One day, before I went home at my appointed hour to mesmerise the patient, I met Dr. T——, who expressed a wish to see her once more. Having induced the trance, I commenced with saying, 'Who is coming here to-day?' After five or six minutes of extreme concentration, with an expression of eagerness of mind on her countenance, she said softly, as if speaking with herself, 'They trouble her; he will not let her go; now she is leaving the house, she is coming.' 'Who is coming?' I asked. 'Miss R., I feel her, I know she is in the street coming here.' I never had heard the name of Miss R., and certainly had expected her to say Dr. T. When turning round I saw her sister look much surprised, 'Who is Miss R.?' I asked the patient. 'My friend; she has just returned from Wales.' 'How long has she been absent?' 'Five months.' 'Describe the house she was in just now.' 'I cannot; it is not clear; it is indistinct.' I wrote on a slip of paper to her sister, to tell the servant to show Miss R. in here the moment she should enter the house. There was a knock at the door, and she knit her brow; it was a gentleman who came to see me; and afterwards the Doctor came in. I did not again recur to Miss R., in fact I forgot it, until I was reminded of it by the patient leaning over her chair with her whole body bent in the direction towards the door, with a smile on her face, and *her eyes tightly closed.* I then heard footsteps on the staircase; the door was opened and a lady entered, who, having passed through the shop, *had given no intimation of her coming.* The details as to her being detained in the house, &c., proved quite correct. I desired Miss R. not to mention the fact to any one, and particularly not to the patient. Some time after she had been awoke, her sister said that Miss R. had been below, but had left again, not being able to wait; at which information she seemed surprised and disappointed, at not having seen her. I then ascertained the fact, that Miss R. had been expected to return to Plymouth in a week or a fortnight. (pp. 30, 31.)

We shall give no more extracts, for if the foregoing are not enough, volumes would fail to convince. Let the reader reflect that it is scarcely possible to imagine an instance in which the true nature of the pretensions of Mesmerism could be more clearly defined; and that it is equally impossible to deny the reality of their occurrence in the case of Miss Martin, without doing violence to every rule by which the truth of any other fact both is and ought to be considered as *established.* Let the reader also reflect, that the phenomena related of Miss M. were so evidently *real*, as to have overpowered the unbelief of two previous sceptics, and finally, that hers is not an isolated case, but that like phenomena have been witnessed in very many other instances, as may be seen in the pages of the *Zoist*, and in those of a host of writers on Mesmerism. If, therefore, the testimony of these persons is to be received, and it would be



a perverseness almost insane, to say it ought not, there can be no sort of doubt that Mesmerism is a reality.

Its manifestations are, as we have seen, of two classes. The first is that of the mere mesmeric sleep, during the continuance of which the natural consciousness of the patient is in *real and total* suspension. The second and far highest manifestation of Mesmerism is the state of Clairvoyance, which is nothing less than the supervention of *another* consciousness, a consciousness with which it is clear the patient (*since his own consciousness is in total suspension*) can have no more to do, than a corpse has to do with the movement of its limbs which is effected by galvanism.

And this affords us a clue to the real nature of this *other* consciousness. It is plain that as Miss Martin had been utterly ignorant of the phenomena of Mesmerism, it was impossible she could simulate them, and that it was one grand object of the Mesmerist to avail himself of this eminently favourable circumstance, to test the truth of one or other of two propositions, viz., whether the phenomena evolved by the brain of a patient in the mesmeric sleep, were attributable to the presence of volition or sympathy; or, whether, on the contrary, *from the palpable absence of volition*, it was not manifest that the phenomena so evolved were attributable *solely to the direct action of the mesmeric influences on the cerebral organs*.

That is what Mr. K. himself states, and we cannot doubt he was convinced that the latter proposition was clearly proved in Miss M.'s case; we also have no sort of doubt that in her instance, and in the instance of every other person in whom Clairvoyance has really been induced, the thoughts, words, and actions which proceeded either from her or them, were the result, not of her or their own will, but of that of the mesmeric influence under which she and they were held for the time being. The thoughts, words, and actions then, of a patient in the mesmeric sleep are not his own, but are those of *mesmeric influences*.

Now, if the thoughts, words, and actions so evolved, were only of a kind similar to those which we know the brain is naturally able to give rise to, it might justly be said that the wonders of Mesmerism begin and end by depriving a person of his own consciousness and investing him with another consciousness, during the continuance of which, he, unknown to himself, still continues to think, talk, and act, as if consciousness (his own) *were* in natural exercise. But if this were so, the grand problem of Phrenologists—that the brain produces its phenomena *without volition*, but by necessity of its structure—could not be considered as *proved*; all that could even then be said, would be, that the mesmeric influences can do with the brain of one in temporary death, that which galvanism can do with the limbs of one wholly dead. There would be no more proof that volition was not requisite to the production of the phenomena of the brain of one in a waking state, and that, therefore, responsibility did not attach to its wrong exercise, than it would be admissible to infer that because galvanism demonstrated the *property* of certain muscles, &c., a man was not answerable for the use he made of them.

In the above *supposed* case, Mesmerism would seem to be but a sort of moral galvanism. **BUT IT IS NOT SO AT ALL.** The mesmeric influences go far beyond the mere calling of suspended faculties into galvanic action; those influences invest the brain with *other* powers than belong to it by nature; with powers far superior to those which can either be claimed for any living man, or which can *by any means* be proved to exist in the brain; powers

too, which *confessedly*, by the shewing, that is, of the Mesmerist himself, belong *not* to the brain, but *to the influences which possess themselves of the brain*. But if the powers with which the brain is invested by the mesmeric influences are beyond nature's own powers, it follows that the influences which confer those powers, must also be above nature; in other words, *supernatural*. Wherefore, Mesmerism has overshot its mark, and exposed itself by proving *too much*.

We therefore conclude, that Mesmerism is not a mere word, of which we can explain the meaning; neither is it the mere name of an art or science which can be defined by the things of which it professes to teach or treat; but it is an influence or power; it is an influence or power which, while apparently wielded by man alone, *is*, and *must be*, (for man cannot impart to his fellow that which he does not himself possess) wielded in fact, by an agency more mighty than that of man.

Let the reader clearly consider the manifestations of one in a state of Clairvoyance, and ask himself, *if they be but true*, if one in that state is enabled to speak, act, and do things so marvellous, the state itself is not clearly the work of a supernatural agency; an agency which, for the time being, takes entire possession of the patient's system, and makes him the apparent actor in a series of manifestations, in which he has no more (as to fact) to do, than has a corpse to do with the experiments of the galvanist. Mesmerism is clearly a supernatural influence.\* There are but two sources of such influence; the powers, namely, of light, and those of darkness. In other words, every such agency is either of God or of Satan.

Mr. Kiste indeed seems to bespeak for Mesmerism the *prestige* that it is of God. He says, "I shall relate a few facts which are worthy the consideration of the philosopher, strictly as they occurred; but my first object is to give a record of Mesmerism in respect of its curative powers, believing that this will be found the surest means of seeing it placed in its legitimate position amongst men, and of having it respected as a *merciful gift of God*." (page 25.)

But can Mesmerism indeed be of God? He has given us tests whereby we are *commanded* to try all such pretensions. The first of these is in the

\* Note.—On this point a Mesmerist (Zoist for April, 1845, p. 113,) writes; "*Experience alone must be appealed to in our investigation of Nature*." Let us make that appeal, and see what it does for Mesmerism. One who has witnessed the phenomena of Clairvoyance, has the testimony of his own experience that *Clairvoyance is a reality*; but that is all; its being a reality does not prove it to be a reality of *Nature's* operation! On the contrary, he knows it to be a reality of *mesmeric* operation; i. e., that the phenomena of Clairvoyance are evolved *only* by one *under the influence of Mesmerism*; that they are not evolved in *any other way*; nor by the same person when *not under the influence of Mesmerism*. A man's own experience, and the experience of all ages, assures him that no such powers as those put forth by the Clairvoyant, either are or ever have been of Nature's operation. No one has ever been endowed with such powers except by inspiration. All who have at any time laid claim to such powers have always professed to owe them to *supernatural* influences. In the heathen oracles, the influences were of Satan; in the Prophets of the Old and in the Apostles of the New Testament, the inspiration was of God. Wherefore the appeal to experience is against the assumption that Nature has any thing to do with the phenomena of Mesmerism, more, that is, than that the system of man is used as the *medium* by which they are evolved. We read (1 Peter i. 10—12,) that the Prophets themselves were often in doubt as to the bearing of the truths they were compelled to utter. This is sped in the phenomena of Clairvoyance.

injunction, "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, *it is because there is no light in them.*" (Isaiah viii. 20.) Tried by this test Mesmerism cannot be of God, because all its phenomena are both calculated to engender, and wrought for the purpose of engendering, the belief that matter is the source of evil; that man is, therefore, not righteously accountable for evil; that he will not meet and need not fear punishment at the hand of God for evil; and that he has no soul; all of which are in express contradiction to the declarations of God Himself; there is, therefore, no light (truth) in them; and it remains that those phenomena are the alone work of the Prince of Darkness. In another place we are commanded to judge of a tree by its fruit; and it is added, "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." Now the tree of Mesmerism seems to bring forth mixed fruit, good and evil; but *can* this be? is it not an evident inconsistency? If we examine the fruits of Mesmerism, we perceive that the evil it aims at is infinite and eternal; the good, limited, doubtful, and temporary. The evil is unmixed, the good is wrought only to *disguise* and *lure into* the evil.

The sole good which can be claimed for Mesmerism is the cure of diseases; and it is in reference to the thought that Satan can have any hand in this, that Dr. Elliotson (the Mesmerist) writes, "As to the Devil, Dr. Stubbe says, I do not remember that ever the Devil did cure a disease, no, not where his glory was concerned in it. There are a set of men (if they were women it were tolerable) that think it not lawful to have recourse to his (*Mr. Greatrake's*) cures." We may observe that the person of whom Dr. Stubbe wrote was *no Mesmerist*, though claimed as such by modern Mesmerists; but Dr. S.'s reasoning is somewhat whimsical. We cannot well imagine how Satan's glory can be concerned in a cure; he would surely not effect cures to prove he *was* Satan! But we can easily imagine he both can and may effect them for *his own purpose*, namely, for the ruin of the soul of man, an object which the Scriptures represent him as unceasingly occupied about. But the cures of modern Mesmerisers are wrought for the purpose, (and are appealed to as doing so,) of suggesting a solution of the miracles of Christ; as if these also were the work, not of an Almighty agency, but of principles identical with those of Mesmerism.\* Can that therefore be in reality *good* which has an end of unmixed and horrible evil alone! Tried, therefore, by this test, it is no less certain that Mesmerism is of Satan alone. The cures are, as it were, but the blossom; the fruit is death eternal to the soul whom they deceive.

It must be added (and it is a most important fact) that it cannot be claimed for Mesmerism that it *may be* of God, only that men have perverted its use by their own reasonings and false inductions from its phenomena. That may be said of Geology; its phenomena are the work of God alone; but men have perverted its use by their reasonings and false inductions so as to make its phenomena appear to contradict, while in fact *they corroborate*, the Scriptures;† but it cannot be so argued of Mesmerism, for, (as we shall see

\* Note.—See an article in the *Zoist* for April, 1845, by Dr. Elliotson, entitled, "On Valentine Greatrakes and Local Mesmerism." Its subtle poison has been pointed out in "The Coming Man," (B. L. Green, 62, Paternoster Row, London.)

† Note.—The reader may find a refutation of the inductions of certain Geologists, in the second part of "The Coming Man," published and sold by B. L. Green, 62, Paternoster Row.

The leading doctrines of Mesmerisers are thus summed up in the *Zoist* for April,

in treating of Electro-Psychology) the *same influences* which produce the phenomena of Mesmerism and its cures, speak by the Clairvoyant (or ecstatic) of Electro-Psychology in direct contradiction to the letter of the Scriptures, and seek to pervert its truths to the utter perdition of the souls of men.

We now proceed to notice the objects of Electro-Psychology. They present, in a leading particular, an entire contrast to those of Mesmerism. The *ultimate* object of the latter is to confirm in their belief those (and they seem to be many) who, from whatever motive, *hope* the soul has no existence, and that therefore the Scripture declarations on the subject of the resurrection of the dead, together with the consequences to the evil of that resurrection, *can* have no foundation. This, however, has been a mere inference from the supposition (confirmed as it seemed to be by the phenomena of Phreno-Magnetism) that the brain has the *property* of evolving evil; whence arose the perception that as the Creator must have endowed it with that property, it is impossible to conceive He will punish for evils which are but the necessary, nay *inevitable*, results of His own act in the constitution of man. Wherefore (and it cannot be too often repeated) the *first* object of Mesmerism is to give prominence to the belief that man is not accountable for evil; and the final step seems necessary to be that since it is not conceivable that God can welcome in a future state, the horrible wretches who have departed this life, stained with every enormity of unrepented crime, there can be no such future state, and of course therefore the soul can have no existence beyond the grave. The curative pretensions of Mesmerism come in also, but by a side wind, to strengthen this belief: they do so by insinuating a solution of the miracles of the Redeemer, and thus strike at the very basis, not only of His claim to be so regarded, but of Revelation itself—the very existence of which turns altogether upon the fact that His miracles were wrought by the immediate hand of Almighty power.

But neither disbelief of the soul's existence, nor of that of a future state, have ever been popular. Such thoughts indeed have (from whatever secret

1845, pp. 5, 6. The writer is speaking of Mr. Newnham; "We were amazed at the author's attempt to prove two gentlemen insane, who have published *similar opinions to those which we enforce in this journal*." "What are the proofs of this presumed insanity? Be it known then, that they are insane because they have asserted—that *mind has only an imaginary existence—that matter does evolve thought*—that, as Physiologists, *we have to do with matter only*,—that the actions and thoughts of man are *the inevitable results of his cerebral organism*, modified by the circumstances which surround him—that criminals should be treated on the principles of reason, benevolence, and justice, and that the *doctrine of vengeance and annihilation* should be banished from our criminal codes," &c. With reference to the non-existence of soul, we quote from the pen of Dr. Elliotson; "Gall coined not a single word, though he might have done so with advantage in one or two instances, rather than have employed old ones—*dme*, for example—which convey a false meaning to the *uninitiated*, unthinking world, such as he never intended for the philosopher and initiated, thereby *perpetuating error*, because the world do not perceive that he wrote *figuratively, poetically*, in order to save himself from the persecution of the bigots of his age." (The term organs of the brain used before Gall; by Dr. Elliotson.) It is rather startling to find this gentleman asserting that he has been careful to shew that "*a materialist may believe in God and a future state*," (page 76). We do not stop to enquire how he reconciles this with the doctrine that man has no soul, but simply observe that such a belief as he has been "*careful to shew*" will, if the Scriptures be true, avail no man; it is not belief in the *abstract truth* that God is, and that there may be a future state, but belief in the *revealed truth*, that "God is in Christ Jesus, reconciling the world unto Himself," which can alone avail any man.

motive) evidently been most welcome to many, but they have never obtained with the masses of mankind. It may be very well for those whose life is felt by themselves to be one determined course of evil ; or for those who having a more than sufficiency of this world's good, prefer the unchecked enjoyment of the present, to the hope of the future ; or those who fear they have more to dread than to hope from the immortality of the soul ; it may be very well for these to take refuge in anything which seems to release them from the terrible prospect of appearing before God ; but there are hundreds of thousands who have not, so far as they can see, any reason to hope the soul has no existence, and they cling to the belief that it *has*, and hope they will find in a future state something at least, of that enjoyment, peace or rest, which have at no time been their portion in this present world. The masses of mankind are shut out from the enjoyments of this life, and they feel that they are so from the very circumstance of their birth and position ; they begin life in hardship and privation, pass through it in toil, sorrow, and disease, and have scarce a hope of the least amelioration in this world. These, constituting the great majority of the human race, *cannot* be content with the heartless belief that the portion they *now* have is all for which they were born ; and they hope both that the soul is immortal, and that the great and gracious Being who created them will judge of their evils with compassionate reference to the terrible and trying difficulties with which they have been compelled to struggle, and, influenced only by His own magnificent attribute of infinite love, will *in some way or other* by and bye compensate them for sufferings and privations which seem to have been theirs by necessity of birth alone.\*

These ideas are fearfully vague and undefined ; but it is because men wish them to be so, and to remain so. They do not desire to close with the realities of revelation ; they fear to do so ; though those realities would, in a moment, change vague hope to joyful expectation. But vague as such ideas are, they present an insurmountable obstacle to the spread of the doctrines of Mesmerists, because these threaten to deprive the many of the sole hope they have, and which must still lie beyond the grave. Wherefore those doctrines will still continue to find acceptance only with certain classes of persons, with those namely who *hope* that there is "neither angel nor spirit," and will be "no resurrection."

But the subtle author of evil never hoped for more from the phenomena of Mesmerism properly so called ; yet has he not designed the evil which he has introduced by its means should stop there. He has designed to envelop the masses in a belief and hope, which, falling in with their own vague thoughts, tends to confirm men in their indisposedness to seek a solution of the mysteries of a future state from the pages of the sacred Scriptures ; or a sure inheritance

\* NOTE.—We are not however to suppose that the illiterate only, desire to rest in hopes so vague—or that they only refuse to go to the Scriptures for the truth. The following passage from one of the first poets of the day corrects that thought.

"Oh yet we trust that somehow good,  
Will be the final goal of ill,  
To pangs of nature, sins of will,  
Defects of doubt, and taints of blood :  
That nothing walks with aimless feet,  
That not one life shall be destroyed,  
Or cast as rubbish to the void,  
When God hath made the pile complete."—TENNYSON.

in that state by the sole way—by faith, namely, in Christ—in which it is attainable.

He has sought to attain this by means of the revelations of Electro-Psychology.

We have elsewhere termed Electro-Psychology the offspring of Mesmerism. It would, however, have been more correctly defined as a further, and perhaps final, development both of its powers and objects. The wonders of Electro-Psychology are produced by precisely the same means as those of Mesmerism. In both arts Somnambulism, i. e., the mesmeric sleep, is first induced, and is attended by the same utter insensibility to pain and to the things which pass around them, in the subjects of both Mesmerism and Electro-Psychology. The Clairvoyance of Electro-Psychology is one and the same with the Clairvoyance of Mesmerism; that is, it is the self-same agency which enables the Clairvoyant of Mesmerism to see with his eyes closely shut; to read the unuttered thoughts of another; to know the whereabouts, and foretell the approach of an absent person, which enables the Clairvoyant of Electro-Psychology; to perform not only such things as these, but others far surpassing them—even to see and hold communion with the powers of the world of spirits, and to reveal things concerning that world, which while they give the lie direct to the Scriptures of God, can emanate only from the powers of darkness.

We are indebted to a Clairvoyant of Mesmerism for a description of the *mode* in which the mesmeric sleep steals over the senses: and we are indebted to a Clairvoyant of Electro-Psychology for the further declaration that it is *not* he who speaks, but that he feels and knows that he is but an instrument in the hands of another—namely of a spirit who calls himself Gabriel—who enters into and takes possession of him, whose also are the words to which the Clairvoyant gives utterance.

And what is the nature of the revelations thus made? They may be summed up to be; 1st. That good and evil are but *words*, having no real or essential distinction. 2nd. That evil, even in the greatest criminals, will not be punished in a future state. 3rd. That there exists no such being as the devil or Satan. 4th. That evil spirits perform only a part which is allotted to them; that they will not be punished for it, but will finally be received into blessedness. 5th. That there will be no resurrection of the dead. 6th. That there is no hell, nor any truth in the Scripture declarations concerning its fire. 7th. That Christ is neither the Son of God, nor the Saviour of the world; but that all religions are alike acceptable to God. 8th. That the souls of all men, without the least reference to the course they may have pursued here below, will be finally happy in the future state, nay, that they *are* happy from the moment they quit this world.

The grand difference between the doctrines of Mesmerists and those of the Electro-Psychologists is in the existence of a soul, which the one affirms and the others deny. But the main object of both is identical, though reached at by opposite ways; that object is to teach men they have *nothing to dread from a future state*; and the chief use and importance of Electro-Psychology is this: namely, it *exposes*, and thereby enables us to pronounce definitively what is the true source of Mesmerism itself.

And upon this point, before proceeding to extract the passages in which the objects of Electro-Psychology are laid bare, we would speak a word, not to

the opponents of Mesmerism, not to those who ridicule its pretensions, but to its supporters,—to those who advocate, defend, and practise Mesmerism. Such can hope to emancipate themselves from the charge of the authorship of the frightful evils of Electro-Psychology only in one of two ways. The first of these lies in pronouncing the phenomena and revelations of the latter art to be altogether delusion. On this point it may be observed; 1st. You cannot take this ground, except by placing yourselves in the very predicament which you have so strongly reprobated in the opponents of your own art. 2nd. There is not one word you have ever advanced to prove your opponents in the wrong, that may not with equal force be urged against you if you reject Electro-Psychology. 3rd. It is not competent to you to say where Mesmerism, evoked by yourselves, should stop: neither can you admit that its influences may, in your own Clairvoyants, produce the decidedly supernatural phenomena to which you *yourselves testify*, and pretend to say those same influences *cannot produce, or have not produced*, the greater wonders of Electro-Psychology. 4th. In the instance of the wonders you relate, and in the instance of the wonders related by Electro-Psychologists, *the proofs of the reality are the same*; you can offer no better testimony than they can; neither is there a word which has been used in the former part of this paper to prove the reality of Mesmerism which does not apply to, and might not be used to prove, the reality of Electro-Psychology.

Neither, in the second place, can you plead that you are not righteously chargeable with the evils of the latter art. 1st. Because your own is the root from which it has sprung; a root which you have cherished, fostered, and sought by every means in your power to fertilize; and you have done this in despite of repeated warnings that you were dealing with the powers of darkness; warnings which you have treated, and do to this day treat, with contempt and derision, all the while that yourselves *cannot* and do not attempt to explain the phenomena of Mesmerism upon any other principles than that which is charged against you, namely, the instrumentality of the powers of darkness. You are therefore as clearly chargeable for the evils of Electro-Psychology as he who cuts a sluice is for the inundation which follows upon his act, though he might not have foreseen or designed *all* the evils which may have ensued. Finally, you are labouring in the same yoke, and for the self-same end as the Electro-Psychologist is labouring for.

We now proceed to the revelations of Electro-Psychology as they appear in the pages of "The Celestial Telegraph" of M. Cahagnet.\*

M. Cahagnet may well be termed the Apostle of Spiritualism. Possessed of no ordinary abilities, of very considerable astuteness, and not unversed in metaphysical lore, he seems also to be a man of the most guileless simplicity, and unfeigned singleness of heart. These latter qualities seldom fail to lead their possessor to follow out truth (or what he may deem to be truth) without the least regard to consequences. They have led M. Cahagnet to feel and to avow that the communications of his Clairvoyants (whom he therefore terms Ecstatics) are of a supernatural character. He saw and knew that their natural faculties, whether of body or mind, were totally suspended by the

\* "The Celestial Telegraph: or Secrets of the Life to Come, revealed through Magnetism, wherein the existence, the form, the occupations of the soul after its separation from the body, are proved by many years' experiments, by the means of eight ecstatic Somnambulists, &c., &c. By L. Alp. Cahagnet. London: George Pierce, 310, Strand."



mesmeric sleep ; that therefore, their thoughts and words *could not* belong to themselves, but must necessarily belong to some *other* influence or power, an influence or power which the word "*mesmerism*" serves only to veil or mystify, but not to explain or account for. In following out this path of induction, M. Cahagnet has evinced a candour which may well put Mesmerists to the blush, for they have not only shrunk from tracing their art to its source, but have repelled with scorn those efforts by which others have long since endeavoured to point out that which M. Cahagnet at once asserts and proves. M. Cahagnet originally practised Mesmerism solely with a view to its curative powers, and was, so he says, at that time a materialist, rejecting with them, all idea of the soul's existence. He therefore paid no attention to the extraordinary effusions of his Clairvoyants ; but having been at length attracted to a consideration of them, the result has been not only conversion from his former error, but the (to him) happy anticipation of the sort of future state revealed by his Ecstatics. His faith is evidently sincere and most profound. He does not permit himself to doubt, though he might well do so ; for instead of being startled at the obviously contradictory statements of some of his Clairvoyants, he only makes them a reason for further inquiries, which terminate, as might be expected, in the explaining away of such contradictions. But M. Cahagnet does not conceal them—on the contrary, he is the first to point them out, and evinces throughout his work a sort of transparency of character which, while it disarms the suspicion that he would *knowingly deceive*, exposes him both to be deceived himself, and to be *used* for the purposes of deception.

And accordingly such—if the Scriptures be of God—is the position held by M. Cahagnet, at once deceived, and the means of deceiving others. "I desire," he writes, "if possible, to say to all beings : This work will offer you proof of a better world than ours, wherein you will live after having left your body in this, and wherein a God, infinitely good, will reward you a hundred-fold for the evils it was profitable for you to suffer in this world of grief. I am about to prove to you that your relations, your friends therein await you with impatience," &c. (Introduction iv, v.)

Premising that the questions which follow are by M. Cahagnet, and the replies by the Clairvoyant, we proceed to extract from various parts of his work.

"Why at times do you answer me almost before I have finished questioning you ; you cannot have time to reproduce my words ?" "That astonishes you, and you will be still more astonished when I tell you that I myself am at times a quiet spectator of the words pronounced by my mouth ; it often happens that I take no part in the discussions carried on between you and Gabriel ; it is he who insinuates himself into my body, answers by my voice, your questions, and I find myself a mere auditor of your discussions." (page 15.) In page 2 it is stated, that this Gabriel is *the guide* of the Ecstatic in question, (Binet Bruno) who was at least a week before he became habituated to Gabriel's voice, "which," M. Cahagnet says, "was hereafter to be the oracle to answer the questions I put to him with respect to the spiritual world."

Concerning good and evil. "Whilst you are about it, say, keep back nothing ; your system does not displease me." "Well, I will tell you that good and evil are what they are, only because we find ourselves in positions wherein we are unable to appreciate their effects ; for according to the position, *evil is good for one, and good is an evil for another.*" (page 18.) "Evil



is useful ; without it there would be no good. We could not appreciate the one without the other. *Evil is the consequence of good ; the good of one is the evil of another, and the latter tends to the good of the former.*" (p. 11.) "Suppose that bad actions cannot be avoided, as we perceive every day, is he who commits the evil punished for it?" "Yes ; for at his death he appears before God, who *reprimands* him by reminding him of all the bad acts of his life, pointing out to him, with mildness, the road he ought to have taken ; recommends him to improve his conduct, and places him in a society suitable to his tastes." (pp. 4, 5.)

"And all great criminals, where are they?" "In similar places (what these are will be presently seen, they are *not* places of any sort of punishment) assembled in society ; but as God is so good he provides for all, prevents evil, and re-establishes good in the hearts of all." "We are then in societies in heaven?" "We seek one another, and assemble together according to our tastes." (p. 54.)

"Have evil spirits a chief whom we term the Devil?" "No." (p. 9.) "Those evil spirits, have they a chief named Satan?" "No." (p. 174.) "You say that there are wicked spirits around the earth ; are there any also in heaven?" "There are no wicked spirits in heaven ; they wander round the earth, to gratify their desire to do evil, which is rather the *accomplishment of a mission* which, *when terminated, restores them to the state of the good*, and then they go to heaven as the rest. *No one is excluded.*" (p. 10, 11.) (No resurrection of the body.) "You are convinced that we never more appear on earth to be again materialized?" "We are born and die but once ; when we are in heaven it is for eternity." (p. 115.) The heathen oracles of old never gave a more deceitful answer, at once *false and true*.\*

"The nature of hell.)" "There is no hell then, or place of punishment?" "I beg your pardon : there are different places where suffering exists, *not as it is presented to us* ; they are places of trial, wherein you are purified, *without suffering*, except that of being deprived of the sight of God. As I have told you, God is so good, he has so great a love for us that he punishes us merely by a reprimand." (p. 5.) "There is no such hell as is depicted on earth ; there are places of purification which are *termed* places of punishment because one is there deprived of the sight of God." (p. 54.) "Is there a hell wherein we are burned?" "No, there is only a purgatory wherein we suffer much at being deprived of the sight of God ; and this is very painful." "Are we burned there?" "No, there is no other suffering but what I have just told you." "Do we remain there eternally?" "No, God is so good that he withdraws us from it." (p. 148.)

We now proceed to the replies of Electro-Psychology on a subject of infinite moment.

"We desire to know whether Christ was God, in the full acceptance of the word, or merely the Son of God?" "Christ was not God ; he was, *like us all*, the Son of God ; he had a special mission to fulfil ; he acquitted himself of it, and returned to heaven, as the rest ; that is all." "How is Christ

\* Note.—Observe the question was "Are the spirits of the dead to be again invested with a material body, i. e. in resurrection." In the reply this is evaded and yet seems to be—and is—answered by a most fearful truth. Men are indeed *born and die but once* ; but what of those who are *raised again*? This is evaded by the shuffling assurance that *when one is in heaven, it is for eternity* !

looked upon in heaven?' 'As a very good spirit; he is dearly loved, that is all.' 'And those who worship him as God, what does he think of them?' 'Those who worship him as God, believe him such; and it is God who receives the homage of those adorations. *I have told you that all religions were equally agreeable to him.* Christ knowing that he is not God, glories not more in that which he taught men, than the other founders in theirs.' 'His disciples declare to us that there is no salvation, but in his name; they teach us errors then?' 'All religions teach them.' ("Secrets of the Future," vol. ii. pp. 24—26.) In another place, M. Cahagnet says of his Clairvoyants, that "*not one of them would admit the hell of the Catholics; not one would have it that Christ was the only true God of heaven; Christian spirits and others have all agreed on this head; not one would have the heaven of the Christians,*" &c., and to this he appends the following note. "It was said to me, 'Confound not the Father with the Son, as Christians do. The sole Creator of the universe never came down on earth to be crucified by men. Christ was the Son of God, as we all are. He accomplished a special mission, and returned to the bosom of the Eternal, as we shall all one day return to it.' When I have made the observation that Christians affirm that there is no salvation, saving in the Divinity of Christ, I have been answered: 'Heaven is open, without distinction of sects, to all who believe in the existence of God, serve him with love and respect; heaven is but an assemblage of an infinity of societies, each of which represents creeds and usages peculiar to itself, each society being able to admit into its bosom only beings of similar persuasions, and thus it is that heaven, or the bosom of these societies, is shut against contrary creeds, and *all have a right to say, Saving Moses, Christ, Mohamet, Luther, Calvin, &c., there is no salvation: that is to say, you will not be admitted into our heaven, our society; the society founded by such or such man, because your persuasions would not accord with it; you would be miserable there yourself, and would trouble others.*'" (p. 155.)

These extracts will suffice to shew the nature of the doctrines and hopes which it is the object of Electro-Psychology to disseminate. We have only to observe, by way of explanation, that the revelations do not come from the Clairvoyants themselves. They on the contrary affirm, that they do but utter that which is, in some instances, given to them by the beings whom they call *their guides*, and who name themselves Gabriel, Raphael, &c., &c., and whom *they see*; and in other instances, their replies are furnished to them by the spirits of deceased persons, whom they also see while in the state of Clairvoyance.

We have elsewhere said that M. Cahagnet not only asserts that these communications are made to his Clairvoyants by supernatural influences, but has *proved it*. We shall endeavour to illustrate the nature of this proof, by propounding the following questions, which the reader must answer according to his own conscience.

1st. Suppose you had a sister, living in a distant part of the country, but with whom you maintained no sort of correspondence. Suppose one, in a state of Clairvoyance, *professed* to behold a spirit of another world, which spirit predicted that your sister would soon be married to a person who *then* was unknown both to her, and to you, but the *name* of the said person was revealed to you, with the additional fact, that when the marriage took place you would be informed of it, not by your sister, but by another person who was also pointed out to you. And now suppose that after the lapse of

two years, during which you had kept the prediction to yourself, every one of its details were to find the most literal fulfilment, would you hesitate to believe, that the Clairvoyant had told you *the truth*, as to its having indeed been revealed to her by a being of another world, and possessed of supernatural intelligence? But the above is but the transcript of a fact reported in M. Cahagnet's work, (page 62) and the proof that his Clairvoyant was in actual communication with beings of another world, is therefore as complete as such circumstances so predicted and so fulfilled can make it.

Again, suppose you resolved to test for yourself the reality of the powers claimed by a Clairvoyant of Electro-Psychology; and that you demanded of her or of him that the spirit of a deceased friend should be evoked. Suppose the Clairvoyant to assert the presence to his or her perceptions of the spirit in question, and to give you a description of the deceased so entirely exact as that you could not *doubt* its presence to the perception of the Clairvoyant, especially where you knew that the deceased friend had never been seen on earth, either by the Clairvoyant or any of those in communication with the Clairvoyant, would you doubt that the spirit itself had been evoked, or that at any rate some supernatural intelligence competent to do so, had simulated the appearance of the deceased friend?

Of this latter proof that the Clairvoyants of M. Cahagnet were in actual communication with the powers of another world, his book presents many instances. We shall present two or three, with the preliminary remark, that they are as well attested as any of the phenomena of Mesmerism are; and that, as it cannot be conceived that Satan can raise again from the dead, it is to be believed the apparitions themselves were either delusions, or realities in *so far* that they presented a fac simile of the deceased; but in either case the work of the powers of darkness alone, which is clear enough from the utter delusion which it is designed to propagate by their means.

Page 72, (116). "M. Duteil, a member of the Magnetological Society of Paris, and a subscriber to the 'Secrets,' desires, like the foregoing persons, to judge by himself of the precious Clairvoyance of Adele; he solicits the appearance of Madame Duteil, his wife, *by her maiden name, without apprising us that it was his wife*. Adele sees a young lady, who may be from about eighteen to twenty years of age, (she was twenty-eight), whose hair is of a deep flaxen, eyes of a dark blue, forehead pretty open, smooth and handsome, nose rather pointed, slight rosy-coloured cheeks, ordinary mouth, thin lips, round chin, hanging down a little and forming the hollow under the lower lip, doleful air; she is not stout, her hand is long and thin. She suffered in the chest, and from violent palpitations of the heart. Her speech is gentle." M. Duteil asks whether she was married? She replies to Adele, 'Yes,' adding, 'You know my husband well enough, and so does the person who tells you to ask the question.' Adele says, 'He may, but I don't.' M. Duteil asks whether she had any children? She answers that she left behind her a little girl. 'Has she been long dead?' 'Yes,' replies she, (she had been dead six years.) Adele again asks her the name of her husband? She repeats, 'You know him well enough, and so does the person present.'" (M. Duteil then unravels the mystery by confessing himself to be the husband of the deceased) and furnishes M. Cahagnet with the following certificate; "I acknowledge the above details as exact, excepting the age. Duteil, Magnetiser, 246, Rue de Saint Denis."

Page 74, (117). "The Prince of Kourakine, Secretary to the Russian Ambassador at Paris, having read the 'Secrets,' presented himself at my house with the Baron Dupotet, M. Hébert de Garnay, and a fourth person, to ask me for an apparition sitting. I sent Adele to sleep, and told her to ask for the Princess K. the sister-in-law of this gentleman. Adele replied, 'I see a tall, dark young lady, about 28 years of age (she was 22) with dark hazel eyes, rather small than large, pale complexion, fine forehead, nose rather thick at the top, but pretty well formed, upper lip thick, eyebrows pretty thick, and arched, a supine carriage, speech mild, air calm and resigned. This lady suffered much from the heart and left side of the bosom. I perceive that that side is quite black; she suffered also in the lower part of the body, in the bladder, and very much in the head. She was not much of a talker. I see beside her a little boy of fair complexion, about 5 years of age; she was surely fond of children.'" Such is the description given of a person deceased, whom neither the Clairvoyant nor M. Cahagnet had ever seen in life. The Prince of Kourakine "acknowledged the truth of these details, apart the colour of the complexion, which in her latter days, was of a violet colour; he does not know the child." The Prince questions the deceased on various points, and obtains satisfactory answers; amongst others, she tells him that *she has already appeared to her sister, (the wife of the Prince) in dreams; of which the Prince acknowledged the truth.* Let the reader reflect upon these details, he will find it impossible to solve them by any idea of *collusion*.

Page 75. "The Baron Dupotet desires in his turn to summon one of his old friends, Dr. Dubois, who had been dead about fifteen months." Adele says, "'I see a man whose hair is quite grey, and very scanty in front; he has an open forehead, prominent near the temples, thus making his head as if square. He may be about sixty. He has a couple of wrinkles on each side of his cheeks, a fold under his chin, making it appear double; neck very short, he is a short, thick set man; eyes small, big nose, mouth rather large, chin flat, hands thin and small. He does not appear to be quite so tall as M. Dupotet; if he is not stouter, he is broader shouldered. He wears a brown riding coat, with pockets at the side. I see him draw out of one a snuff box, and taking a pinch. He has quite a droll gait; he did not stand firm on his legs, he must have suffered from weakness in them. His trousers are rather short. Ah! he did not clean his shoes, for they are covered with mud. He had an asthma, for he breathes with difficulty. I told him that it was M. Dupotet who asked for him. He talks to me of magnetism with incredible volubility; he speaks of every thing at once, mingling all together; I don't understand a word of what he says; he speaks so fast that he even sputters.' M. Dupotet asks certain questions of the deceased, through the Clairvoyante, of which the following is the last; 'Ask him if he liked the Jesuits?' At this name he takes such a leap in the air, extending his arms, and exclaiming, 'The Jesuits?' that Adele quickly moves away, and remains so alarmed that she dares no longer speak to him."

M. Dupotet declares that all these details are so very exact that he cannot retrench from them a syllable. "This man," said he, "was of an inexhaustible conversation, mingling all the sciences, of which he was a great amateur, and so voluble of speech that he actually sputtered, as your Clairvoyante says. He was very careless of his person, and so absent in mind, that he sometimes forgot to take his meals. Whenever any one spoke to him about the Jesuits,

he would jump in the manner Adele has described. He was always very dirty; it is not surprising the Clairvoyante should have seen him in shoes covered with mud. He had indeed promised M. Dupotet that he would *appear to him on a Wednesday or Saturday.*" (N.B. We omitted to extract the question of M. Dupotet; the answer given by the deceased was, that he had promised to appear some Wednesday; a circumstance, in all human probability, known only to the Baron Dupotet). M. Cabagnet adds that "M. Dupotet acknowledged the exactitude of this apparition in No. 75 of the '*Journal du Magnétisme.*'" We shall give but one other instance, in which the querist appears to be the lady of M. Dupotet.

Page 76, (118.) "Madame D——, possessing like every one else, her share of incredulity, wishing to trust to her own judgment in preference to that of her husband, (professionally versed in such matters,) desires in her turn, an apparition. She is accompanied by M. H——, and begs Adele to ask for M. B. Jacques. Adele says, 'I see a man about 36 years of age, of middling stature; black hair, rather long, coming down to the bottom of the ear, but not as is worn in the present day; complexion pale, face thin, hazel eyes, large and hollow, but of a mild expression, nose rather long and sharp, air sad and downcast.' Madame D—— interrupts Adele, to inquire *the malady of which this man died?* The latter replies, 'I don't perceive any grave malady in him; I see only indisposition; but, good gracious! *this man has been killed! by a fire arm, a pistol!* He has blown out his brains! Oh, the wretch! I can understand his sorrowfulness. I told you so, those who commit suicide enter not forthwith, they wander round the earth.' 'What then, is their suffering?' 'That of being unable to enjoy light as the rest.' 'When does he hope to enjoy it?' 'When the time that he should have accomplished on earth is terminated.' 'That is to say that he will thus wander to the age of sixty, were he to have lived to that age naturally?' 'Yes.' Madame D—— inquires whether this gentleman knows her. 'Yes, she is related to him by marriage.' 'This gentleman only knew Madame *by her maiden name*; he could, perhaps, tell you the degree of this relationship.' 'I asked him whether Madame was his cousin, he replied, "She is more than that to me, more than that!" From this exclamation one would say that Madame is his mother, or as much as a mother; at any rate he seems to be as attached to her as if such were the case.' "Tell him she has married the Baron D——, and ask him if she has acted agreeably to his wishes." "Oh my poor wife," said he, "may you be very happy; it is the sole wish of my heart." Adele turns towards Madame D—— with astonishment, 'You were then the wife of this gentleman?' The lady replies in the affirmative. Madame D—— acknowledges *all the details* of the apparition of her husband as quite exact."

---

POSTSCRIPT; which might have been a PREFACE.

The writer of these pages once scouted the ideas both of Phrenology and of Mesmerism. He rejected the former, because it appeared to him, that to admit of the Phrenological theory concerning the organs of the brain, would be to admit, also, the seemingly unavoidable inference, that it must be the *property*, and if so, then *by creation*, of some of those organs to evolve

the excesses of which men are guilty; a conclusion which, while it makes those excesses appear inevitable, renders the punishment of crime an act of fearful injustice, and leads to the ultimate rejection of the Scriptures themselves; for how could that book be of God, which places him in a position of punishing for evils which were in fact traceable to his *own act* in the constitution of man!

But the writer was led to see that this was to *elude* and not to meet the question fairly in the face; that it was very weak to reject *facts*, because of the conclusions to which they might seem to point; that the Phrenological theory might be true, and yet the inferences from it false; that the brain might be truly described as the seat of the Intellectual, Moral, and Animal Perceptions, and yet the induction *false* which ascribes, either to the brain as a whole, or to any one of its organs, the evolving of suggestions which are essentially, or of necessity, of the nature of evil. He therefore reconsidered the question, admitting so much of the theory of Phrenology as seemed to be borne out by fact, and was soon able to perceive that the superstructure which Phrenologists have erected upon their theory, is altogether unsubstantial, hollow, and false.

It was upon quite other grounds he rejected Mesmerism; the writer believed it to be a compound of delusion and imposture. He was however, induced to remember, that they who have reported its phenomena, had in every respect, as good title to be believed as he claims for himself; that many of its supporters are possessed of far greater talents than the writer can pretend to, and are withal of no less moral weight and respectability. He therefore took up the declarations of Mesmerists as so many attestations of competent witnesses; he believed their testimony, and it remained only to account for the things they relate; this he has done by tracing Mesmerism to its source.

If the reader will follow in this plain path, he will see that Mesmerism and Electro-Psychology *must* proceed from the same source, because the phenomena of both are produced by the same means; means which the Clairvoyants of the latter art themselves *declare* to be supernatural, and which the facts related of the former *prove* to be so; for it is, in point of fact, not at all more wonderful that one Clairvoyant should see and converse with the spirits of another world, than that another should know the whereabouts and foretell the approach of a person in another part of the same town; in both instances the thing done is beyond the power of nature; and therefore infers, in both, the actual aid of supernatural agency.

To those who have been accustomed to disregard the assurances of the Scriptures concerning the interference of the Powers of Darkness in the affairs of the human race, or who may have thought of it but as a circumstance which belonged to by-gone days alone, the phenomena of both Mesmerism and Electro-Psychology, afford the most clear proof at once of the truth of those declarations and of the active and energetic influences of those powers in this, the present day. The proof cannot be rejected, excepting upon principles *destructive of belief in every thing* human or divine.

Added to this direct corroboration of the statements of the Scriptures, the so-called "Revelations" of Electro-Psychology have another *especial* value; viz., its declarations concerning the soul's immortality, and the existence of a

future state, bear to those of the Scriptures on the same points, a sort of testimony to the truth of the latter, analogous to that which the counterfeit coin bears to the real existence, and essential value (*which the very act of simulating it proves*) of the sterling gold.

We may rest assured that it would never be from such beings as the Scriptures represent Satan and his angels, that revelations of a state of future bliss would come, unless there was indeed such a state; a state of which he presents the counterfeit *only* in order to deceive as to the *true*.