

*Spiritualism*

# DR. TAYLOR'S LECTURE,

DELIVERED AT

CONSTITUTION HALL,

TOPEKA, KANSAS, NOV. 10, 1872,

*IN REVIEW OF CAPTAIN KING'S EDITORIAL IN  
THE COMMONWEALTH,*

ON THE

## Woodhull-Beecher Ambroglio,

IN WHICH THE DOCTOR SKINS THE CAPTAIN, AND THEN TREATS  
HIM, NOT TO A COAT OF TAR AND FEATHERS,  
BUT SALT AND PEPPER.

---

### A DEFENSE,

NOT OF MRS. WOODHULL NOR OF MR. BEECHER, BUT OF  
THE TRUE DOCTRINE

OF THE

HARMONIAL PHILOSOPHY.

---

PRICE, FIFTEEN CENTS.

---

EDITED BY JOS. FITZIAN.

---

TOPEKA, KANSAS:  
CRANE & BYRON, PUBLISHERS.

1872.

---

---

Entered according to act of Congress, in the year 1872, by  
T. B. TAYLOR,  
In the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

---

---

## PREFACE.

---

THE city dailies of Topeka, on Saturday and Sunday, Nov. 9 and 10, 1872, contained, respectively, the following announcements among the "churchial notices: "

"Dr. Taylor will deliver a *free* lecture in Constitution Hall to-morrow night on the Woodhull-Beecher imbroglio, in which he will critically review Captain King's last Sunday morning's article on that subject. A rich treat may be expected, as the Doctor will show that Spiritualism is no more responsible for Mrs. Woodhull's views or conduct than other religious denominations are for the conduct of licentious clergymen."—*The Capital City News*.

On Sunday morning the *Commonwealth* contained the notice following:

### "CONSTITUTION HALL.

Lyceum, bible class and paper at 10:30 A. M. Lecture in the evening by Dr. Taylor. Subject: 'Review of Captain King's article in last Sunday morning's *Commonwealth*, on the Woodhull-Beecher imbroglio.' Music by the choir and orchestra. Seats free, and all kindly invited. Service begins at 7 P. M. sharp."

At an early hour every seat was taken in the auditorium and gallery; also the steps leading to the gallery, while others sat on the platform, and yet others stood about the door—all eager to hear what the lecturer might dare to say on a question of so much delicacy, and so difficult to handle in the presence of a promiscuous audience of intelligent and refined ladies and gentlemen—such as packed "Old Constitution Hall" on that Sunday evening.

It was an ordeal—a crisis! An attack had been made upon the little band of brave and independent thinkers that had been "marching on" with much peace, harmony and prosperity, for more than twelve months, under the leadership, as a lecturer, of Dr. Taylor. Not a whisper had

been breathed against the moral character of the lecturer or the Society. "Not a dog in all the camp of Isreal had dared to move his tongue," so that when the fearful allegations of the *Commonwealth* were published, though no individual member, nor the Society in Topeka, was charged with wrong conduct, yet many felt that a thunderbolt had been discharged at them, and none felt this perhaps more keenly than the Doctor himself, so he determined to take time, and calmly, yet keenly and critically, review the Captain's article. And to prove to all that he did not intend to take any undue advantage of his antagonist, he handed the following note to Captain King on Friday, the 8th, a copy of which he retained. and after singing by the choir, and a brief invocation, the Doctor proceeded to read to the audience, that all might see the fairness with which he proposed to proceed in the discussion of the subject.

## LETTER TO CAPTAIN KING.

CAPT. KING—*Dear Sir :*

I propose, in a carefully prepared lecture, to review your article in last Sunday morning's *Commonwealth*, on the Woodhull-Beecher imbroglio, and deem it but just to notify you of the fact, so that if you wish, you may be present to hear it for yourself, that no bad misunderstanding may arise between us. Lecture at Constitution Hall next Sunday evening at seven o'clock.

In the mean time, will you be kind enough to state *plainly*—as you so fully *intimated* in your Sunday article—whether you think the First Society of Spiritualists in this city would better be *suppressed*, and their services on Sundays discontinued, and in what way that suppression would better be made—whether by *force*, or by influencing the citizens of Topeka to withhold my support, and thereby starve me and my wife and children?

Now, will you kindly allow me to call your attention to one statement made in your Sunday article, which is true, viz: that the Spiritualists are an immensely large and rapidly growing organization. In view of *this fact*, if there is that corruption in the ranks of the Spiritualists that you say there is, would you not better acquaint yourself with the views held and taught by myself and practiced by the Spiritualists of this city, and then, instead of using your influence to crush us, use that influence to encourage and strengthen us, that we may work for the reformation of that corruption which you say exists in that class of people?

Very respectfully, T. B. TAYLOR.

City, Friday A. M., Nov. 8, 1872.

To this letter the Doctor received on the next day the following

REPLY FROM CAPTAIN KING.

MY DEAR SIR :

Please accept my thanks for the invitation to be present at your lecture. I certainly have no objections to your reviewing my article on the Woodhull-Beecher matter. But I do object to the unfair, unjust and entirely unwarranted construction which you seem inclined to put upon that article. I said nothing about the Spiritualists of this city, many of whom are my personal friends. My assault was upon their *doctrine*, and not upon their reputation as individuals. I indulged in no "intimations;" I said plainly all that I had to say. I did not counsel the "suppression" of your society, or the cutting off of your supplies as an individual. I said, and I honestly maintain, that your system of so-called religion has a tendency to loosen the marital tie, and lower the standard of moral excellence; and I oppose it on that ground, just as I oppose the doctrines of the democratic party because of a belief in their vicious political tendency. I do not say that all Spiritualists are free lovers; but I do say, and you will not deny, that all free lovers are Spiritualists.

I hope I have made myself thoroughly understood, and that you be fair enough to construe me according to what I actually say, and not according to what you would like to have me say.

Very respectfully, &c.,      HENRY KING,  
Editor *Commonwealth*.

On reading the sentence, "my assault was upon their *doctrine*, and not upon their reputation as individuals," the Doctor asked these very pertinent questions: Of what value or importance is a *doctrine* that has no effect on a man's individual reputation? Why raise a hue and cry about a doctrine that amounts to nothing? that does not affect the life of a man? If the individual reputation of men is blameless, as Captain King confesses is true when reference is made to the Spiritualists of Topeka, then why did he erect this man of straw? Was it for the purpose of showing how brave he was in marching up to it, and with his sixty-four pounder to demolish it?

But in another sentence he shows how utterly at fault this statement is, and how much "too thin" is this statement to blind the eyes of clear-minded people; for he says: "I honestly maintain that your system of so-called religion has a tendency to loosen the marital tie, and to lower the standard of moral excellence!" Then, said the Doctor, the Society and its teachings ought to be suppressed.

Again the Doctor quoted from the Captain's letter and commented:

The Captain says again, "I do not say that all Spiritualists are free lovers; but I do say, and you will not deny, that all free lovers are Spiritualists." "I wonder," queried Dr. T., "if Captain King has never heard of the Bible Communists of New York, and other parts of the country where they are located? If not, he would better inform himself. They are all free lovers in *theory* and *practice*, and yet are not and never have been Spiritualists in any sense, but claim to be of the Simon pure—the genuine orthodox stamp of Bible Christians, just what their name indicates. More than that, Captain King must know that the churches are full of practical free lovers of both men and women. If in his innocence he has never found that out, he would better read 'Up Broadway,' by Elenor Kirk, one of Mr. Beecher's old phonographic reporters; or 'The Clergy a Source of Danger to the Republic,' by Jemison, and he will see whether all free lovers are Spiritualists or not."

With these introductory remarks the Doctor proceeded to read, slowly and distinctly, the following lecture.

J. F.

## THE WOODHULL-BEECHER IMBROGLIO.

---

A REVIEW OF THE ARTICLE ON THAT SUBJECT BY THE  
EDITOR OF THE "COMMONWEALTH," IN  
LAST SUNDAY MORNING'S  
ISSUE, NOV. 3, 1872.

---

Mrs. Victoria C. Woodhull, of New York, published in the *Woodhull & Claflin Weekly*, of the 8th inst., a lengthy article, implicating the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, and several other distinguished parties in the cities of New York and Brooklyn, for which she was arrested on last Saturday, a week ago, Nov. 9, and incarcerated in Ludlow street jail for lack of \$8,000 bail.

Theodore Tilton, editor, publisher and proprietor of the *Golden Age*, says that Mrs. Woodhull is a *Spiritualist*, and has been a Spiritual medium of extraordinary powers; that she is the most talented woman of America, and as pure in her personal character as an angel; that he knows her personally, and well, and that he knows whereof he affirms when he speaks of her personal nobility of character. She has never been identified with the Spiritualists until some fifteen months ago, when she was, to the great dissatisfaction of the great body of American Spiritualists, made president of the so-called "National Convention of Spiritualists," that assembled in Troy, New York, and was re-elected this fall to the same office by a vote of 32 out of 53 of the delegates of the so-called National Convention that assembled at Boston in September last.

The convention of Catholic Clergy that assembled in Baltimore, Maryland, some three or four years ago, estimated the number of Spiritualists in America at 11,000,000, and stated that the Catholic church had more to

fear from the Spiritualists than from all the Protestant churches in America. Since that time the number has been largely increased, so that 32 votes would hardly be a fair expression of choice for president of a national convention. The truth is the Spiritualists of America repudiate the "National Convention" almost universally, and consequently repudiate Mrs. Woodhull and her radical views on the social question, for they could have no objection to her on any other score. On last Sunday morning the *Commonwealth* of this city published, editorially, the whole, or nearly so, of her offensive sayings concerning Mr. Beecher, thereby retailing the slander, if slander it is, with a kind of *zest*, that was, no doubt, refreshing to those eyes and ears that delight to read and hear such stuff. But the *Commonwealth* did not do Mrs. Woodhull the justice to give even the salient points in her reasoning for the grounds she occupies on the subject. Did not the editor of the *Commonwealth* know that, while he was giving publicity to the fearful statements of Mrs. Woodhull, concerning Mr. Beecher and others, he was at the same time giving out evidence that would convict Mr. Beecher and others charged with the social crime, in the minds of the thousands of the readers of his paper?

If he had been a true friend of Mr. Beecher, as it seems to me, he would have *suppressed*, as much as possible, the fearful statements made, and treated the whole thing with that silent contempt with which Mr. Beecher is trying to treat the matter. This is a very easy, but very unsatisfactory, manner, to be sure, of quieting the minds of people at the present time. Bishop Onderdonk, of the Episcopal church, tried that same "dodge" some years ago, when accused of the same crime of which Mr. Beecher is accused, but it would not win, and he "came to grief" at last.

So far as I am concerned, if the *Commonwealth* had not contained the following paragraph I should have let the whole matter pass, and allowed Mrs. Woodhull and Mr. Beecher to settle their own quarrels. The paragraph reads as follows:

"It is not merely the woman Woodhull who speaks in



this open indorsement of marital infidelity. She is a representative personage."

Whom does she represent? I have shown you that she does not represent the Spiritualists. Whom, then, does she represent? I will tell you, friends, whom she represents, viz.: A *very* large class of men and women calling themselves "Christians," who *covertly* practice what she openly endorses—according to Captain King—as I will show you before I close this lecture. (Cheers.)

But the editor of the *Commonwealth* proceeds "thusly:" "She shines as a leading light in an extensive and growing organization in this country. She is the most advanced, and certainly the most conspicuous, champion of what is known as the Spiritual doctrine, or the harmonial philosophy."

This last statement is so utterly false, so utterly destitute of even a semblance of truth, that, personally, I am compelled, now and here, to declare that the author of it is either basely ignorant, or willfully dishonest, and he can take whichever horn of the dilemma he chooses, either of which ought to condemn him as a journalist in the eyes of all intelligent and candid people. Mrs. Woodhull has never written a *single article*, or published a single book that has even been *claimed* by herself, or her friends, as an exposition of the "Harmonial Philosophy." If Mrs. Woodhull had been the author of "The Great Harmonia," or "Nature's Divine Revelations," and the other score of books written and published by A. J. Davis, there would have been some ground for the declaration of the *Commonwealth* editor.

Let me tell you, friends, who are, and may be considered, "the most conspicuous champions of the Spiritual Philosophy:"

A. J. Davis, than whom a purer and truer man does not probably live on earth, nor one who wields a more versatile or facile pen.

Prof. Robert Hare, LL.D., the most scientific and learned Chemist that this country has ever produced. He is the author of a number of scientific works on the Phenomena and Philosophy of Spiritualism, which have never been disproved by any infidel in Europe or America.

Hon. Robert Dale Owen, LL.D., author of the "Footfalls on the Boundary of Another World," and also "The Debatable Land," which has been admitted to the halls of science in England as a scientific exposition of the "Harmonial Philosophy."

Hudson Tuttle, whom few Americans or foreigners equal in point of reasoning and delineation. None surpass him.

Prof. Wm. Denton, former Geologist of the State of Massachusetts; author of a number of books and pamphlets of the highest literary and scientific character.

Mrs. Emma Hardinge-Britton, author of an immense work called "American Spiritualism," and is at present editor of one of the ablest monthlies published in this country, called "The Western Star."

The editors of the "Religio Philosophical Journal," "The Banner of Light," "The American Spiritualist," "The Present Age," "The Crucible," etc.

*These are representative men and women, authors in America. These illustrious names may be considered as among "the conspicuous champions of the Spiritual Philosophy,"—every one of whom disagrees with Mrs. Woodhull in her individual views on the marital or social question. (Cheers.)*

Before passing from this point in my lecture, I wish my audience to note one thing, that a great majority of people seem to be ignorant of, viz: that the Spiritualists have learned to do what the most of Christians have failed to do, notwithstanding the Master did plainly enjoin them to do so, and that is to "*Call no man master.*"

The Episcopalians frame a Prayer Book; the Methodists, a Discipline; the Presbyterians, a Confession of Faith; and all who wish to associate themselves with either of those churches, if they should chance to differ on doctrine, &c., must relinquish all right to private judgment and swallow, without chewing, the frightful skeletons they contain in the form of creeds and ceremonies. (Cheers.) Not so with the Spiritualists, however. They claim the right, and enjoy it too, of *thinking for themselves*; taking those characteristic words of Jesus as a motto: "Why not even of yourselves judge ye what is right?" (Cheers.)

Instead, therefore, of taking Mrs. Woodhull as a guide and exponent of their faith, the Spiritualists "Call no man master." (Cheers.)

But to the editor of the *Commonwealth* again. He says: "She carries that doctrine to its legitimate conclusion, and shows the world what it is when fully worked out."

What doctrine does he refer to, do you suppose? If he refers to the doctrine of independent thought, then he is right, but at the same time he virtually relinquishes his own right to think for himself, and voluntarily holds his own nose to the clerical grindstone of his church, or bows his neck to the yoke of superstitious bondage like the imbecile ox to the yoke of his master, and asks no questions, however much it galls. (Cheers.) If he refers to the doctrine of Spirit communion, he flies directly in the face of all sacred and profane history, and assumes that the presence of guardian Spirits, of love and goodness and purity, tends to make men worse instead of better.

See Paul's epistle to the Hebrews, 1st chapter and 11th verse. "Are they not all ministering Spirits sent forth to minister unto them who shall become heirs of salvation?"

I would like to ask Mr. King if *he* has a sainted mother or sister in the world of Spirits, and if so, would a consciousness of their presence be likely to lead him into the haunts of sin? the gambling hell? the drinking saloon? the house of assignation?

I will leave him and you all to answer that question in the deep silence of your own souls. Let every one remember that the eyes of the whole world of invisible spirits are upon them, and the eyes of God as well.

If he means the doctrine of promiscuity in sexual intercourse, he simply misrepresents Mrs. Woodhull, so far as I have seen in print, and all Spiritualists whose intelligence and character are worthy of respect.

Again he says: "We do not mean to insinuate that all Spiritualists believe what Mrs. Woodhull preaches; for we know they do not; but we do mean to assert that they endorse and aim to advance a doctrine which logically leads to

just such a conclusion as is embraced in Mrs. Woodhull's theory." What *does* that sentence mean? Can you tell? In analyzing it I make this of it: All Spiritualists do not believe what Mrs. Woodhull preaches, yet all Spiritualists do believe what Mrs. Woodhull preaches, and in that belief they will reach exactly the same conclusions that are embraced in her theory.

*Shades of Solon overshadow us and breathe on us!*

If you ever saw a man get down on his knees and lick the dust off another man's boots and then rise and spit in his face, and call it a "jewel of consistency," you see it in that sentence.

And this leads me to examine another word employed in this wise, (?) learned and logical (?) sentence. It is the word "theory," as applied to Mrs. Woodhull's views on the marital question. I have read the most that Mrs. Woodhull has published on this subject, and I find her averring, in the *most positive terms*, that by "free love" *she does not mean free lust*, or promiscuity in sexual intercourse. But that there is a love element in human nature that only finds its corresponding element where there are endowments, gifts, graces, beauty, purity and *loveable* traits of character that correspond with those possessed by the other. Let me give one of her own illustrations. A young, beautiful, refined, cultured and accomplished girl, loves a young man who woos and wins her, but soon proves himself to be a miserable rake, a vile deceiver, a drunkard, a gambler and a seducer. And her he beats and starves. And by throwing off the mask that he wore in his cruel advances to woo and win her heart and hand, she sees *absolutely nothing to love, but everything to hate*.

Mrs. Woodhull holds that to compel that pure and noble girl to live with, and become the mother of such a man's children, is a violation of every natural law, and an act of cruelty that is found equaled only in the realm of barbarism. *And so do I.*

The most of people have misunderstood Mrs. Woodhull's sayings on this subject, and therefore have not endorsed her

views as far, perhaps, as they might otherwise. The above is a correct exposition of her views on the *marriage* question in general terms. They are the views of Mrs. Stanton, Mrs. Hooker, Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, Miss Susan B. Anthony, Miss Anna Dickinson, Mr. Ralph Waldo Emerson, Gerrit Smith, and every other sensible man and woman in the land. (Applause.)

But it is contended that in this last article of Mrs. Woodhull, she goes further than that, and justifies Henry Ward Beecher in the course that rumor, for two years, has alleged, and that she says she knows to be true, as to the wife of Theodore Tilton and other women. This would be "promiscuity." If such be the case, her views are not endorsed by the majority of intelligent and spiritually minded people, among the Spiritualists or any other class. But mark you, Mrs. Woodhull has not been incarcerated in Ludlow street jail because of her *views* on this subject, but because she has dared to expose what she says is true in the practice of Mr. Beecher and other notables in the New York and Brooklyn churches.

She has thrown a bomb shell into the camp of Israel. It exploded near the *sanctum sanctorum*, and produced an awful squirming among the sons of Levi and their concubines. (Laughter and applause.)

But to the editor of the *Commonwealth* again: "The spread of this doctrine, with its conjunctive beliefs, endangers the strength and security of the marriage relation, loosens the bonds of social virtue and propriety."

"The spread of this doctrine." What doctrine? Promiscuity? Mrs. Woodhull in no sense endorses such a practice, but repudiates and contemns the very idea, if I understand her. But the sentence quoted above is about as "clear as mud." "This doctrine, with its conjunctive beliefs." What can the man mean by its "conjunctive beliefs?"

Mrs. Woodhull's views on the social question stand out isolated and alone, if Captain King's interpretation of it be correct, with no "conjunctive beliefs," unless he (Mr. King,) holds that the "woman's suffrage movement" is one of its

"conjunctive beliefs," for Mrs. Woodhull is one of the prime leaders in that cause. This I suppose must be the reference, as all the "conjunctive beliefs" in the harmonial philosophy stand, as unsleeping sentinels, to guard the Spiritualist against every wrong, even with sword in hand, flashing at every turn with these terrible words: "*No man can escape the consequences of his own conduct.*" "Be not deceived. God is not mocked, for whatsoever a man sows *that shall he also reap.*" Where, now, are your "conjunctive beliefs," tending to a course of unbelief and infidelity to yourself, your wife or your neighbor? for this is the *central doctrine* of the Spiritual Philosophy. But the editor of the *Commonwealth* insists on arguing the case, and says further. "It is a slow poison, but it is poison nevertheless; and those who are innocently and thoughtlessly drinking of it, should open their eyes and ears to its certain effects, as evidence in the cases of those who have drained the fatal chalice to its dregs." There, now; are you not alarmed, my friends? Is it possible that you can look upon such a scare-crow as that and not be frightened? Maybe you are not "crows," and therefore not easily frightened by this "man of straw," set up by the editor of the *Commonwealth*, in Mr. Beecher's cornfield, or the so-called "vineyard of the Lord."

But did you ever see so frightful a bug-a-boo couched in so many words? It is a real mad-dog cry. The editor, Mr. King, reminds me of the old Quaker who got greatly out of patience with a neighbor's dog that bothered him a good deal, and the old broad-brim said: "I will not kill thee, but I will give thee a bad name." So he got the dog started on the street and ran after him, crying, "*Bad dog! Bad dog! Bad dog!*"

Of course that was sufficient. The villagers thought he cried, "*Mad dog! Mad dog!*" So they out with their guns and clubs and soon dispatched the poor animal. So Captain King, in this sentence, cries, "*Bad dog!*" hoping, no doubt, that the citizens of Topeka will destroy the life of this society in some way.

Do you think that I misjudge the man? Please listen to

his closing words: "We simply invite attention to a given system of moral and social ethics, and *urge good people to deny it their countenance and support.*"

Now what does all that mean? Does he not refer to the moral and social ethics held by the "First Society of Spiritualists" in Topeka? He does, of course, mean you, and nobody else, for in another sentence he says: "*All Spiritualists* endorse and aim to advance a doctrine which leads to" desperate results in social life, and this he reiterates in the note I have just read from him.

Captain King seems to lose his gallantry altogether. In speaking of Mrs. Woodhull, against whose personal moral character there has not been even a whisper, he calls her "the woman Woodhull;" "*this abominable Jezebel,*" etc. Why does he so call her? Because of her personal character? No, not that wholly, but because she has charged one of the leading clergymen of America with illicit intercourse with the wife of another man, and has sent the facts broadcast all over the world. Now let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter.

For the sake of the argument, I will admit, for the present, that Mrs. Woodhull is the "abominable Jesebel" that Captain King says she is—and I stand not for her defense, for I know her not. I will admit, for the sake of the argument, that she is a free lover, and that freeloveism means free lust. But I deny that Captain King has any right to charge Spiritualists or Spiritualism with being responsible for her views, or for her conduct. If so, we will see how that rule will work when applied to other people and other religious organizations.

We will commence close at home. Will Captain King hold the Episcopal church in this city responsible for the conduct of the Rev. Mr. Stewart, who, it is said, was proven to be guilty of a crime more dastardly, a thousand times, than that of which Mr. Beecher is accused, even the crime of "*sodomy,*" for which the angel world burned Sodom, "Gomorraah and the cities of the plain?"

Here was a man who held just as strong a claim upon

the confidence of his congregation as Mr. Beecher does on his, and was as highly esteemed. He was toasted and feasted; and delicate and virtuous females received the sacrament of the Lord's supper from his polluted fingers, if the testimony of credible witnesses is to be believed.

Captain King says Spiritualism works out results disastrous to the morals of a community. So does Episcopalianism by the very same parotry of reasoning. But will the Captain *say so*? Not likely. But it is a poor rule "that won't work both ways." Let the Captain put the shoe on the other foot and see how it will fit. (Applause.)

Again, will Captain King hold the Episcopal church responsible for the conduct of the Right Rev. Bishop Onderdonk, who held a position in that great, wealthy, influential, aristocratic church far above the position held by Mr. Beecher, in his church. When the scandalous rumors began to be circulated about Bishop Onderdonk, he, like Mr. Beecher, treated the stories with silent contempt. Nevertheless, "murder will 'out," it is said, and the Bishop was proved guilty of the very same offense against the laws of society that Mr. Beecher is charged with, and deposed from his bishoprick.

*Psychologically*, I make this statement: Henry Ward Beecher and Bishop Onderdonk were cast in almost the same identical moulds, so far as their passional organizations are concerned.

Again: Will Captain King hold the Episcopal church responsible for the conduct of the Rev. Mr. Eustis, of St. Louis, who has just had a long and tedious trial for lascivious conduct, and concerning whom it is alleged, and that it can be proven by a witness in this city who is a member of the Episcopal church, that he visited a house of assignation in company with the daughter of another clergyman on Sunday, going from the sacrament of the Lord's supper directly to this house of ill-fame for lascivious and lustful purposes? He must do so if Spiritualism is responsible for the conduct of any one of its members.

Again: Will Captain King hold the Methodist church



of this city responsible for the idiosyncracies of five clergymen that at different times officiated in the Methodist church in this city during the past year? One of them was at one time under arrest for stealing, and at another time for violation of the revenue law. Another one of them was under arrest for drunkenness, theft, and licentiousness. A third accused of licentiousness, adultery, drunkenness, and falsehood. The fourth, of adultery and desertion, and the fifth, of taking liberties with ladies in his place of business that no gentleman would ever think of doing, and of visiting places, and keeping company with parties that no man would who regards the sanctity of the marriage vow? If Spiritualism works these results complained of by Captain King, Methodism does the same thing, when we use the same parotry of reasoning.

Take another illustration. A Rev. Mr. Smith, of the M. E. church, near Chicago, is accused before the courts of dispatching two of his wives that he might get the money for which their lives were insured—*accused of murder*. Will Captain King hold the Methodist church responsible for that man's crimes? He must, on the same principles that he holds Spiritualism responsible for Mrs. Woodhull's views and conduct.

Take another illustration. A very devout and pious clergyman among the "Free Methodists,"—so pure, holy, sanctified, that he would not allow Rev. R. H. Winslow, while he was a Methodist clergyman, to preach in his church because, as he said, Mr. Winslow was not sanctified, and was not, consequently, holy enough to occupy his pulpit. Yet this same Reverend scoundrel, this whitewashed moral sepulchre, this "baptised infidel," while traveling the Round Prairie circuit, seduced and ruined no less than six of the young girls of his church.

Is *this* church responsible for that Reverend scoundrel's conduct? Why, with a good deal of propriety, might Captain King say so, when he looks at the central doctrine of all the orthodox churches, viz: That no matter how vile a man may be, he can throw all his villainy off on Jesus; say he is

sorry when caught at it, and then go into heaven on a white horse, with a great flourish of trumpets.

“Long as the lamp holds out to burn,  
The vilest sinner may return.”

This is the doctrine. Who wonders at its results? But the common verdict of the *people* is that these different organizations are not responsible for the individual conduct of their different members; nevertheless Captain King would do well to give these doctrines some attention.

I must cite one or two more beautiful (?) examples of the infidelity of the clergy and then proceed to close. Will Captain King hold the Presbyterian church responsible for the conduct of the Rev. Mr. Lindsley, of Western New York, who whipped his little son to death because he could not, or would not, say the Lord's prayer to suit him, and who is now in the State prison “working out his own salvation” by the “sweat of his brow?” (Applause.)

Only a few weeks ago the Rev. Mr. Robertson, of Louisville, Kentucky, was arraigned and is under trial before the synod of which he is a member, for drunkenness, falsehood and licentiousness. And so we might go on through every religious denomination, from Rome down to Adventism, and they have all of them had their libertines and harlots in the very sanctuary. Will Captain King condemn all christianity, forsooth, because these parties are found within its pails?

Now, if time permitted, and your patience was not exhausted, this catalogue of villainies might be continued almost indefinitely, to say nothing of the sham and bogus christianity of the laity. Read a book called “Up Broadway,” by Ellinor Kirk, (Mr. Ames,) a former reporter in Mr. Beecher's church; or, “Clerical Errors,” by Mr. Jamison, and if you don't get your eyes opened, I will confess that you are utterly and hopelessly *pur blind*.

But according to Mr. King's reasoning all these moral cesspools to which I have referred were dug by the spades, pick-axes, etc., belonging to the orthodox fraternity. Well, he can have it so, if he will. But this, in a measure, is unjust and untrue.

“

A word in solution of this whole problem and I will relieve your patience. When you want to find an answer to the question, "Why all this unfaithfulness?" look not at the man's professions—at his creeds—the church in which he worships—or the position he occupies in society—but look at his *organization*; the *exact status of his spiritual and intellectual development*. There you will see him exactly as he is seen by the Spirit world.