

HUMAN IMMORTALITY PROVED BY FACTS.

# REPORT

OF A

TWO NIGHTS' DEBATE

ON

# MODERN SPIRITUALISM,

BETWEEN

MR. C. BRADLAUGH,

*Editor of the "National Reformer," and*

MR. J. BURNS,

*Editor of the "Medium;"*

WHICH TOOK PLACE ON MONDAY AND TUESDAY EVENINGS,

DECEMBER 16TH AND 17TH, 1872,

*At the New Hall of Science, Old Street, City Road, London.*

REPORTED BY MESSRS. REED AND WOODWARD.

LONDON:

J. BURNS, PROGRESSIVE LIBRARY AND SPIRITUAL  
INSTITUTION,

15, SOUTHAMPTON ROW, HOLBORN, W.C.

THE  
**PROGRESSIVE LIBRARY & SPIRITUAL INSTITUTION**

15, SOUTHAMPTON ROW, LONDON, W.C.,

Has been established for the last nine years, for the purpose of  
affording facilities to Investigators of Spiritualism.

**Information is given *gratis* to all who apply either by letter or personally.**

**Seances are held weekly for the development of mediums and the investigation of the Phenomena.**

**Mediums are appointed, on application, to visit the residences of Investigators in town and country, and hold seances.**

**Lecturers are supplied to address public meetings, on all phases of the question, in London or the provinces. Deputations are available to represent the cause on important occasions.**

**The whole literature of the movement, amounting to several thousand volumes, is lent from the Library as required by readers in any part of the country. Two volumes at a time, one guinea per annum; ten volumes, three guineas per annum; fifteen volumes, five guineas per annum.**

**Subscribers are entitled to use the Reading Rooms. On the table are periodicals from all parts of the world and in all languages in which the investigation is pursued.**

**A Museum of Spirit-Writings, Paintings, &c., is free for the inspection of the public.**

**Local Representatives, in all parts of the country, in connection with the Spiritual Institution, afford all possible means of investigation to Inquirers.**

**Investigators may be introduced to Circles and Spiritualists in their own localities by applying to the Secretary.**

**Publishing Department. Books, publications, and periodicals—British, American, foreign and colonial—are on sale.**

**All communications to be addressed to J. BURNS, 15, Southampton Row, London, W.C.**

---

**"A SOWER WENT FORTH TO SOW."**

**SEED CORN: a New Series of Tracts on Spiritualism.**

**No. 1.—MATHEMATICAL SPIRITUALISM. 4 pp.; 1s. per 100.**

**No. 2.—SPIRITUALISM AND THE GOSPEL OF JESUS. By J. Burns; showing the parallel between the life and teachings of Jesus, and the principles of Spiritualism. 4 pp.; 1s. per 100.**

**No. 3.—THE PRINCIPLES OF MODERN SPIRITUALISM. By A. E. Newton. 4 pp.; 1s. per 100.**

**No. 4.—WHAT IS SPIRITUALISM? Explaining the philosophy of the phenomena, rules and conditions for the spirit-circle; and ample information for investigators desirous of obtaining the manifestations. 4 pp.; 1s. per 100.**

**No. 5.—THE CREED OF THE SPIRITS. The Ten Spiritual Commandments and the Ten Laws of Right, given through Emma Hardinge. 4 pp.; 1s. per 100.**

**No. 6.—DR. SEXTON'S CONVERSION TO SPIRITUALISM. 4 pp.; 1s. per 100.**

**No. 7.—FACTS CONCERNING SPIRITUALISM. 4 pp.; 1s. per 100.**

*Other numbers in preparation.*

London: J. BURNS, 15, Southampton Row, W.C.

## PREFACE.

---

PUBLIC LIBRARY OF VICTORIA

IN publishing this report on behalf of Modern Spiritualism, a few words of comment seem necessary in respect to the anomalous character of the debate, in which the disputants, instead of having a definite proposition stated, each took his own course in treating the very general subject presented. As expressed in the words of Mr. Bradlaugh, the debate was "purposely left open in its wording to afford each disputant the fullest facility for stating his views on modern Spiritualism;" and yet in the face of such a declaration, the burden of Mr. Bradlaugh's argument against Mr. Burns was that the latter availed himself of that which was the only condition imposed in the whole arrangement. If Mr. Burns had been equally fastidious and exacting, he might have got up at the conclusion of Mr. Bradlaugh's opening and protested against that gentleman's propositions and treatment of them as not embracing the sub-  
allotted for discussion at all. It would be perhaps difficult to find a parallel to this case, in which the opener led off with a negative proposition altogether outside of, and entirely ignoring, the very subject matter announced. Mr. Burns, indeed, was a young debater, or he would never have accepted such a preposterous position; and the results of the debate under such disadvantageous circumstances speak unmistakably of the great—it may be said impregnable force of truth embodied in Mr. Burns's principles. Having heard Mr. Bradlaugh's opening, there were two courses open to his opponent—the one, to enter into the word-play contest, and waste the precious time without touching the topic at all; the other, to state propositions embodying the essentials of Modern Spiritualism, and establish them by facts and such reasoning as time and circumstances might permit. Mr. Burns, in accordance with the only condition expressed, on the spur of the moment accepted the latter course, and though in very ill health, he endeavoured to establish

his first proposition during the first evening. On the last evening, the concluding proposition, and that which embodies the gist of Spiritualism, was abundantly substantiated by facts and illustrations which may be scientifically tested and verified any number of times.

It will be observed that the speakers do not characterise the course adopted by each other in very complimentary terms. The method pursued by Mr. Burns is estimated at a very low figure by Mr. Bradlaugh, who desired to settle the matter in what he calls "logical fashion." It might be worth while for the reader to take into consideration what this logical method consists in. Logic is understood to be the right use of reason; or, in more popular language, the power to understand clearly, and to express yourself lucidly on the subject under treatment, whatever that may be. It may be further defined as the ability to understand the nature and import of facts; for it is unreasonable to suppose that man could at all exercise reason unless he had some acquaintance with facts or the conditions of existence; it follows, then, that the more knowledge a man has the sounder will his reasoning be. Mr. Bradlaugh insulted logic and defied reason by endeavouring to reason by ignoring the facts—as well try to pay a debt without money. Previous to the advent of modern science all subjects were discussed in the "logical method"; that is, men set up their imperfect notions as a basis instead of exact knowledge, and while

"The jargon of the schools"

filled the heads of an ignorant world with admiration of the mental prowess of the word-warriors, the progress of human knowledge was not promoted one inch. This "logical method" has now been entirely superseded by the acquisition of knowledge; and it is only on such questions as the soul and immortality, concerning which some men have no facts, that the employment of the old style of treatment is either necessary or possible.

Mr. Burns, in his closing speech, demanded opportunity for further discussion. By lengthening his time his position improved in geometrical ratio. The basis of Mr. Bradlaugh's propositions did not require to be stated. They were assumed as being that with which intelligent men are already familiar. On the contrary, the facts on which Mr. Burns's propositions were based, had

to be fully and minutely stated, and their bearings to acknowledged facts traced, before he could obtain a foothold to grapple with the sweeping generalisations propounded by his antagonist. Time did not permit the accomplishment of all that was required in this direction. The material is, however, furnished which will enable the intelligent reader to determine the bearings of the argument for himself.

As an instance of the treacherous nature of Mr. Bradlaugh's "logical method," the thinking reader will perceive that his propositions are philosophically absurd, and could be easily refuted on philosophical grounds. But this refutation might be satisfactorily accomplished, and yet the proof of what is known by the term "Modern Spiritualism," would not thereby be established. Each side might continue to think that their champion was right; for if such an able man as Mr. Bradlaugh outwits himself in this word-game, what are we to expect from his audience? No, the age of opinion is passed, and a man's individual views, however ably sustained, no longer satisfy the demands of another mind, any more than the digestion of one man's dinner can nourish another. It is every man's birthright to have facts, with full liberty to decide their import to his own satisfaction. And in providing this glorious privilege on the newest ground which the intellect of man has dared to assail, the Spiritualists establish their claim to be at the head of all shades and degrees of reformers and teachers, and therefore the greatest benefactors of man, and the foremost pleaders for human liberty, enlightenment, and progress.

Mr. Bradlaugh deserves the warm thanks of all friends of Spiritualism for the opportunity afforded by this debate for the ventilation of the subject. It has promoted inquiry into Spiritualism more than any event in connection with the movement which has occurred for a long time. Nor should this preface close without reference to the decided ability with which Mr. Bradlaugh occupied his time for an hour and a half after his first speech without having anything particular to say. In his weekly paper he has observed that it was not his business to explain psychological phenomena, or, indeed, to bring forward instances of any kind in that direction. Had it been founded on knowledge and fact, instead of a negation of them, how much more telling his position would have been!

It should have been his duty, however, either to show that psychological phenomena did not occur, or that there were no grounds for the induction that spirits communicated thereby. The reader will not require to be told that he failed in this. As a debate the whole question consisted in the admission of the facts and their proper interpretation—a task which was attempted only by one of the speakers.

There are verbal and phraseological faults apparent in Mr. Burns's remarks, but seeing that they were necessarily impromptu, as suggested by the course adopted by the opener, and also taking into consideration that the speaker was very unwell, especially on the first evening, it says much for Spiritualism that it is capable of such a consistent and demonstrable defence. After all, it may occur to many that there is sometimes more logic in the lucid statement of the truth than in the mechanism of abstruse propositions. Indeed, as it has been already observed, logic is simply telling the truth so as to be unmistakably understood. The chief charm of the defence of Spiritualism is, however, the paramount consideration that all the statements advanced are undeniable facts, and may be verified by all who care to take the trouble to do so. This may be done in private by means instituted by the investigators, rendering unnecessary any aid either from Spiritualists or professional mediums. That the accomplishment of this may be placed within the reach of all, a series of instructions are given in the appendix.

At the end are ample rules for the investigator, thus rendering the work unique, and useful for the purpose of introducing the question to the attention of the sceptical.

# DEBATE

ON

## MODERN SPIRITUALISM,

BETWEEN

### MR. BRADLAUGH AND MR. BURNS,

AT THE  
NEW HALL OF SCIENCE, 142, OLD STREET, CITY ROAD,

*On Monday and Tuesday Evenings, Dec. 16th and 17th, 1872.*

#### FIRST NIGHT.

THE CHAIRMAN: Having been requested by the committee and the debaters to occupy the chair this evening, I may say that I comply with the request with some pleasure. The subject to be brought before you is exciting considerable interest, and it is in the hands of gentlemen who, I am sure, whichever side they take, will endeavour to do it justice. Of course, as chairman, my duty is simply to know nothing whatever about the matter to be brought before you; and I shall try to keep my mind a perfect blank, and know nothing until I hear what these gentlemen have to say. The rules that have been laid down for the conduct of the debate are very few and simple. It is to occupy two evenings—this evening and to-morrow, and each evening it is to last two hours, Mr. Bradlaugh and Mr. Burns occupying that time in strict and equal alternation, the first hour being divided into halves, and the second into quarters. The right of addressing the meeting is to be confined strictly to Messrs. Bradlaugh and Burns, the debaters, and to the chairman on points of order. The decision of the chairman to be final on any question of order that may arise. In calling on Mr. Bradlaugh to open the debate, I need hardly go through the form of introducing him to you. He is far better known to you than he is to myself, and I am sure you will accord him that attention and courtesy that you are so often in the habit of doing. I may add, on behalf of Mr. Burns, that he appears here before you almost as a stranger; and perhaps even a larger measure of courtesy and attention is due to him on that account. Mr. Bradlaugh will now address you for half an hour.

#### MR. BRADLAUGH'S FIRST SPEECH.

MR. BRADLAUGH: In this debate, purposely left open in its wording to afford each disputant the fullest facility for stating his views on modern Spiritualism, I shall seek to raise, so far as is possible in a brief controversy like the present, two questions for consideration—one, Is

there more than one existence? and second, What do we know of the laws of life? My object will be to show that there is only one substance. That we only know this substance in its phenomena. That for the phenomenon human being, as for the phenomena mountain, tree, river, chair, book, it is illogical to maintain the existence of the attributes or qualities by which we distinguish the one from the other, after the cessation of the particular phenomenon distinguished by such attributes. If I understand modern Spiritism, or Spiritualism, rightly, its advocates contend for the continued existence, with consciousness of identity, of the spirit of every individual after everything by which we have been used to recognise the individual has clearly ceased, and the substance of which that individual was a mode is either entirely incognisable, or is cognised under conditions—as, for example, of decomposition into the inorganic, or entire, or partial, absorption by other animals—which preclude the possibility of any admission of continued existence on the part of the individual. If I am in error here, I shall be pleased to be corrected by Mr. Burns. And I maintain that the burden of explaining any alleged extraordinary psychological phenomena does not rest upon me. It is for those who—denying the physiological mechanism of psychological phenomena—choose to describe some phenomenon as spiritual, to present the proofs entitling them to so describe it. I assume for this debate that the Spiritualist affirms the existence of a distinct immaterial entity, uninfluenced and uninfluenceable by the conditions which affect the human body. Here, too, I shall be glad to be corrected, if in error. Whether or not this alleged entity, which, instead of calling spirit, I will for a moment call *x*, is affirmed by Spiritualists for all animals, or only for mankind, I am unaware. If it be limited to human kind, I shall be pleased to hear the reasons, if any, determining this limitation. In speaking of the laws of life, I meant by “law” observed order. The science of life would be the record of such observed order of phenomena in their invariable coexistence or sequence. By “life” I mean “that state of an organised body in which all the organs perform their individual and collective functions. Health is that state of an organised body in which all the organs perform their individual and collective functions, and perform them well. Disease is that state of an organised body in which one or more of the organs fails, or fail, to perform its function or their functions, or to perform well. Death is that state of an organised body in which all the organs have ceased to perform their functions.” That is, I mean by life the totality of individual functional activity. There is, of course, under this definition, vegetable and animal life. One feature to which I desire to draw the attention of my antagonist is, that the quantity and quality of life in each individual, plant, or animal is variable at different stages of its existence; is, in truth, subject to augmentation and diminution. I submit that the recognition of this mutability is utterly opposed to any conception of immortality. I contend that life is not an entity or a special principle, but a result; that life—that is, living organism—is not the opposite of what is called non-living substance, but is a development of it, and is again resolvable into it by deterioration; that the life of any given organism is the sum of the life of its individual parts; that there was a period of the earth's existence when there was no life, and that life is found constantly increasing in

growth or development. I make no pretension to advance positive opinions as to the nature of life-force. I am not aware whether any claim will be made in this debate for supernatural phenomena, but I desire at once to say that the word "supernatural," as applied to any phenomenon, is to me entirely without meaning. To me "nature" is another word for all possible conditioned existence. Should it happen that my antagonist adopts the word supernatural, I shall be pleased to be favoured with the sense he intends to convey in its use. One living modern Spiritualist, of no mean reputation, maintains that "man is composed—1st. Of an earthly or natural body, visible to us, and which, subject immediately after the death-change to the laws which govern inanimate matter, rapidly decays. 2nd. Of a spiritual body, which pervades during earth-life the entire natural body, and issues from it at the moment of death. 3rd. Of a soul." If this is the opinion of Mr. Burns, I am prepared utterly to deny it; if, however, his view as a Spiritualist is different, I shall be obliged by his clearly and distinctly explaining it, so that I may know what it is that he submits to us for discussion. I will not dwell at present upon the phenomena of vitality in plants, except to remark upon the extreme difficulty in drawing the line where the animal begins and the vegetable ends. We find instances of sexual vitality in plants, and we also find examples of ability in plants to capture, destroy, and feed upon animal life. I will take the forms of conscious vitality. Here I allege that it is utterly impossible to distinguish, except as to degree of quantity and quality of intelligence, between one animal and another. By "intelligence" I mean the totality of mental ability, and the results of the exercise of that ability. I allege that the quantity and quality of the intelligence of each animal is variable at different stages of its existence, is subject to growth and decay; and I ask, if "spirit" should be pretended to be identical with "intelligence," whether it too is admitted to be subject to mutation, and if not, where the distinction is to be drawn? Perception, sensation, is the foundation of intelligence in all animals. Memory of perception also, common to all animals, is necessary to the building up this intelligence. The ability to perceive, the ability to recollect perceptions, varies, not only in different animals and amongst different races of mankind, but also amongst different individuals of the same race, and in the same individual at different periods of his life. On what authority is it pretended that these continually-changing abilities, changing with the character and state of the animal, can be traced and identified as a continued and permanent existence after the animal has actually ceased to exist? The same argument might be applied to every other function of the mind. I would submit that animal vitality is a condition precedent and necessary to intellectual ability in the animal. That with the cessation of animal vitality you have also not only the cessation of intellectual activity, but the cessation of intellectual ability, so far as the dead individual is concerned. Ordinarily it is impossible to conceive the possibility of memory except as connected with the brain. Pressure on the brain temporarily destroys the ability to recollect. In old age, with an enfeebled brain, the memory is treacherous; yet, if I understand modern Spiritualism rightly, while it admits that the memory-  
-ing ability of a diseased brain is lessened, it actually claims

that the individual memory may continue ages after the brain of the individual has not only utterly ceased to exist as that brain, but may have possibly become in part combined with some other brain, engaged in memorying other sensations. Reverting now to the first point, I contend that there is only one substance. With me the word "substance" is equivalent to the word "existence." We only know "substance" in its modes or phenomena. We know—that is, we distinguish—these phenomena from each other by their attributes. Attribute or property is that characteristic—as hardness, redness, brightness, vitality, &c.—by which, or by more than one of which, we conceive or perceive any given mode. This glass is distinguishable by means of its hardness, brightness, coldness, whiteness, &c. This man, by some similar properties, and by others as life, intelligence, &c., not common to the mode I call glass. The horse has life, intelligence, distinguishing it from the glass, and specially of extension and other qualities distinguishing it from the man. The tree has life, but is distinguished from man, horse, and glass by other qualities or attributes—property, quality, attribute being used in the same sense. Modes are temporary, commence and finish. To us the duration of substance is eternal, that is, is illimitable. You can destroy the condition, or mode you call glass, man, horse, tree, &c., but science affirms that you do not, and cannot, destroy the substance; you only resolve it into other modes, which are cognisable by you. I shall wait on this head to hear the views of my opponent before troubling you further. It may have been noticed that I have hitherto refrained from uttering the word "matter." With me the word "matter" is identical with the word "existence." I have not used it, because, unfortunately, some persons associate it, as they do such words as "dragon," "witch," "fairy," with notions which seem to me the very reverse of correct. I have no objection to being called a Materialist, but I have a great objection when matter is assumed to exist destitute of all force. I cannot conceive force except as property of matter. Matter is to me indestructible; its conditions change, not the substance. Permit me to quote here, with slight change, the words of Dr. Maudsley, which certainly deserve consideration from Materialist and Spiritualist alike: "What an unnecessary horror hangs over the word 'Materialism'! It has an ugly sound, and an indefinite meaning, and is well suited, therefore, to be set up as a sort of moral scarecrow; but if it be closely examined, it will be found to have the semblance of something terrible, and to be empty of any real harm. In the assertion that mind is altogether a function of matter, there is no more actual irreverence than in asserting that matter is the realisation of mind; the one and the other proposition being equally meaningless so far as they postulate a knowledge of anything more than phenomena. Whether extension be visible thought, or thought invisible extension, is a question of choice of words, and not a choice of conceptions. To those who cannot conceive that any organisation of matter, however complex, should be capable of such exalted functions as those which are called mental, is it really more conceivable that any organisation of matter can be the mechanical instrument of the complex manifestations of an immaterial mind? It is strangely overlooked by many who write on this matter, that the brain is not a dead instrument, but a living organ, with functions of a higher kind than those of any other

bodily organ, insomuch as its organic nature and structure far surpass those of any other organ. What, then, are those functions if they are not mental? No one thinks it necessary to assume an immaterial liver behind the hepatic structure, in order to account for its functions. But so far as the nature of nerve and the complex structure of the cerebral convolutions exceed in dignity the hepatic elements and structure, so far must the material functions of the brain exceed those of the liver. Men are not sufficiently careful to ponder the wonderful operations of which matter is capable, or to reflect on the changes effected by it which are continually before their eyes. Are the properties of a chemical compound less mysterious essentially because of the familiarity with which we handle them? Consider the seed dropped into the ground: it swells with germinating energy, bursts its integuments, sends upwards a delicate shoot, which grows into a stem, putting forth in due season its leaves and flowers. And yet all these processes are operations of matter, for it is not thought necessary to assume an immaterial or spiritual plant which effects its purposes through the agency of the material structure which we observe. Surely there are here exhibited properties of matter wonderful enough to satisfy anyone of the powers that may be inherent in it. Are we, then, to believe that the highest and most complex development of organic structure is not capable of even more wonderful operations? Would you have the human body, which is a microcosm containing all the forms and powers of matter, organised in the most delicate and complex manner, to possess lower powers than those forms of matter exhibit separately in nature? Trace the gradual development of the nervous system through the animal series, from its first germ to its most complex evolution, and let it be declared at what point it suddenly loses all its inherent properties as living structure, and becomes the mere mechanical instrument of a spiritual entity. In what animal or in what class of animals does the immaterial principle abruptly intervene and supersede the agency of matter, becoming the entirely distinct cause of a similar, though more exalted, order of phenomena? The burden of proving that the *Deus ex machinâ* of a spiritual entity intervenes somewhere, and where it intervenes, clearly lies upon those who make the assertion or who need the hypothesis. They are not justified in arbitrarily fabricating an hypothesis entirely inconsistent with experience of the orderly development of nature, which even postulates a domain of nature that human senses cannot take any cognisance of, and in then calling upon those who reject their assumption to disprove it." I shall in this opening entirely refrain from denying or admitting any of the alleged phenomena sometimes put forward by Spiritualists. I leave it to the advocate of Spiritualism to put forward any matters of fact he may think wise, reserving to myself the right of dealing with these as they are advanced.

#### MR. BURNS'S FIRST SPEECH.

MR. BURNS: I have to crave from our friend who has just opened the debate, and also from yourselves, some little indulgence, because of the fact that this is the first time I have ever stood in a similar position to that which I occupy on the present occasion. I have had no experience

in debate, and what is more to the purpose as regards my inefficiency on the present occasion, I am a hard-working man. Day in and day out, there is a certain amount expected from me, and that I must do, come what will. Under these circumstances I come to speak to you not as a philosopher, not as a man with a system, but as a man who has been observing facts. I am going to relate those facts to you, and I would say also at the beginning, that it is from no spirit of personal antagonism to Mr. Bradlaugh that I am here—it is simply because of the truth; and even though he should prove to be the best man by far, I should yet feel it my duty to come here, not for my own sake, not as it were to stand upon his neck to elevate myself, but simply for the purpose of advancing the truth; and if I do advance that truth in ever such a little degree, I shall feel recompensed for any indignity, for any trouble, or for any overthrow that may befall me in this debate. Now, if we are going to speak of a spiritual state of existence, we must have some facts respecting it. We cannot gather the evidences of this spiritual state of existence from the ground which our friend has gone over. If we wish to understand the natural history of the vertebrates we should never find it by going down amongst the molluscs; we must go into that development of nature where the phenomena are to be met with that are to prove our position. Now it will be in order for me to introduce to your notice some of those discoveries which have been made by Spiritualists, to tell you some of the methods which they have adopted for the purpose of getting at the results; but in the first place it might be well to tell you some of those results, for the purpose of establishing three propositions, these three propositions being in accordance with the already ascertained nature of man and of the material universe in which he is placed. The first proposition is that man has two conditions of life; he has a physical condition of life and a psychical condition of life. The second proposition grows out of it—namely, that death is a sunderance of those conditions of life. The third proposition is, that under certain conditions those who have sundered themselves from the physical condition of life are capable of communicating with those yet in the physical condition. Now I think the great bulk of what is demanded by Spiritualists in their investigations is incorporated in those three propositions. It may be a very long way on in the debate before I pretend to follow them up logically in every respect, and it may be that I may leave this platform failing to do so; and yet, who knows but that those propositions may be true notwithstanding my inability? I will not profess anything, but in the first place I will begin by introducing to you some of those ideas that will tend to show that there is a border-land. Our friend in his remarks has spoken of the fact that the grades of life run into each other, and so you may expect that if there is a grade of life above the physical grade, if there is a psychical mode of life, there must be some common ground upon which the physical and the psychical unite. Just as our friend has pointed out that it is impossible to say where vegetable life ends and animal life begins, that it is impossible to say where intelligence begins to dawn in the animate world, so it may be also impossible to say where the line is to be drawn between the physical and the psychical. As the great stock-in-trade with all talkers upon Spiritualism is the spiritual manifestations, the

kicking and the knocking of tables, it will therefore be my business to call your attention to those matters; because we must have facts to begin upon, and after we have got the facts we shall try to account for them. It would perhaps not be credited by you if I were to give you some of my own experiences as a commencement, but I may refer to some of the findings of others who have investigated this matter. I hold in my hand the Report on Spiritualism of the Dialectical Society, undertaken by a committee of some three dozen ladies and gentlemen, of whom Mr. Bradlaugh was one. The fact I would call your attention to is that of the moving of a heavy table around which eleven persons could comfortably sit, that table being moved without physical contact of any kind. The parties present knelt upon their chairs, which were placed nine inches from the table, with the backs of the chairs between themselves and the table. In that position they placed their hands over the table four inches from the surface, and thus in the full light of gas the table moved several times. Then they removed their chairs three inches farther, and put their hands behind their backs, and they had the movements of the table in the same way. Here they had a table moved without any physical contact whatever. There was no "matter," as our friend would understand it, or as our friend's notions of matter are capable of defining it; there was no "matter" between any volitional power and that table for the purpose of moving it, and yet most decidedly this took place; the table belonging to the parties, no Spiritualist being present, no professional mediums being present, but only those who were there for the purpose of investigating the subject on its own merits. I might call attention to a short experiment by Mr. Crooks, who is not accounted a Spiritualist either; at least, whatever his private convictions may be, he does not write as a Spiritualist in his books. We have nothing to do with his convictions; we have only to do with his facts. He says on one occasion a small party, of whom Mr. Home, the celebrated medium, was one, with himself, sat round a table in the light. "Mr. Home took an accordion between the thumb and middle finger of one hand at the opposite end to the keys, Mr. Crooks having previously opened the bass key." They had a cage put under the table of wicker work, to keep the accordion from being acted on by any extraneous influence while it was under the table, "the cage being drawn from under the table so as just to allow the accordion to be passed in with its keys downwards, it was pushed back as close as Mr. Home's arm would permit, but without hiding his hand from those next to him (as shown in the engraving). Very soon the accordion was seen by those on each side to be waving about in a somewhat curious manner; then sounds came from it, and finally, several notes were played in succession. Whilst this was going on, my assistant went under the table, and reported that the accordion was expanding and contracting. At the same time it was seen that the hand of Mr. Home, by which it was held, was quite still, his other hand resting on the table. Presently the accordion was seen by those on either side of Mr. Home to move about, oscillating and going round and round the cage, and playing at the same time. Dr. A. B. now looked under the table, and said that Mr. Home's hand appeared quite still, whilst the accordion was moving about, emitting distinct sounds. Mr. Home still holding the accordion in the usual manner in the cage, his

feet being held by those next to him, and his other hand resting on the table, we heard distinct and separate notes sounded in succession, and then a simple air was played. As such a result could only have been produced by the various keys of the instrument being acted upon in harmonious succession, this was considered by those present to be a crucial experiment. But the sequel was still more striking, for Mr. Home then removed his hand altogether from the accordion, taking it quite out of the cage, and placed it in the hand of the person next to him. The instrument then continued to play, no person touching it, and no hand being near it." I have here a small work by Serjeant Cox, from which I will read a few words. He says, referring to the Spiritual phenomena: "If they are not facts, but delusions and impostures, how comes it that not a single investigator of repute, after patient and honest examination, has failed to be convinced that the phenomena are real, or volunteered to assert that he has discovered a trick, and shown us how it was effected?" Well, having stated the phenomena, and substantiated them in this way, I suppose you will credit me if I venture to build an argument upon their existence, and in bringing forth this argument I will carry the investigation into another domain of life than that which has been included in the category advanced by my antagonist. Now, how are those manifestations produced? We have a vague notion that Spiritualists form circles, and that they use mediums. But what is a spirit-circle, and what is a medium? What is the function of the one, and what is the philosophy of the other? A spirit-circle consists of a small number of persons sitting round a table; it may be a large table with a large number of persons, or it may be a small table with a small number of persons. They place their hands lightly upon the top of the table; they remain there chatting, it may be, or singing, or laughing, or silent, just as they please, for a certain number of minutes; it may be for hours, it may be for evenings; it may extend over weeks or months; but sooner or later these manifestations commence. Those who are highly mediumistic have the manifestations right away; those who are not so mediumistic sometimes find it necessary to change their sitters until they get a proper combination of temperaments into the circle, in order that the manifestations may take place. I have read to you what those manifestations are, I have read to you the fact of tables being elevated, and of accordions being played without physical contact of any kind whatever. In the one case we see the exercise of force; in the other case we see the exhibition of intelligence, because I think it will be granted that intelligence is necessary to play a tune even upon an accordion. Now we also discover that in sitting at this table the will-power of the sitters has a great deal of influence upon the movements of the table. I have met quite a number of persons who have said that they were able to control the movements of the table by their will-power. Again, you ask questions of the spirit that is supposed to be moving the table, and you decide that the question will be answered in a certain way, and to be sure the table answers the question as you decided. In the extract from the Dialectical Society's Report, to which I have alluded, we find that the committee desired that the table should move in certain directions, and the table did move as desired. Here, then, is a very curious fact, namely, that eleven gentlemen, and I suppose there were ladies among them, stood round a table, not one of them touching it, and yet that

table moved according to their expressed wish. What have we got here? We have the existence of the psychical power that I claim. It is not a physical power, but a psychical power. If I put my hands under the table and lift it in a mechanical way, it is physical power; you see the bone and muscle, and all that kind of thing. But if I stand away from the table, and *will* that the table shall move, or if any number of men and women stand round the table and will that it shall move or shall not move, or shall move so many times and stop at a certain point, what is it that moves the table, granting that it is my will-power? Have I not in that experiment discovered new functions that are entirely beyond anything that my antagonist recognises? This is the first point, then, that we have to establish—the existence of one psychical function. We see here another kind of man at work. But then what is it that moves the table? How can we understand it? How can we explain it? I hold a little magnet in my hand, and I would ask any gentleman what it is that causes the magnet to suspend its armature; and to this armature, by means of a book, I can sustain three pounds' weight. What is it that suspends the three pounds' weight? I have perused many lectures on magnetism, but I have not found any professor able to explain to me how that armature is suspended. It will be said that it is the magnetic current; but what is the magnetic current? The lecturer says it is something that causes a needle to move in a certain way towards a certain point near to the north pole. Then, I ask him, did he ever see that magnetism? I call the attention of my antagonist to the fact that here is an exhibition of force without "matter." There is no agency visible. If you bring the armature in contact with the book, there is no cohesion. Why is it, then, that it will stick to the magnet, and will not stick to the book? The one is matter, as well as the other. And why is it that a table will move with certain people sitting round it, and will not move with certain other people sitting round it? In other words, why is it that the magnet is magnetic, and that the book is not magnetic? Why is it that certain people sitting round the table are magnetic, and that certain other people are not magnetic? This is the open question, and without affirming anything respecting it, I have stated it for you. The next thing I shall call attention to is a simple experiment respecting the nature of the force which sustains the magnet. Supposing I put a magnet against a book, or any other object, and place it in a dark room—a densely dark room; and supposing I take into that room what Baron Reichenbach calls a sensitive, but what the Spiritualist calls a seeing medium or a clairvoyant. Introduce any of those sensitives, or seeing mediums, or clairvoyants into the room where the magnet is, and they will go right up to it, and put a finger on each pole of the magnet. Why is that? Have they cats' eyes? Do they see in the dark? It is a fable that cats do see in the dark, and I should not wonder if they did, for we find that other animals can see in the dark likewise. The clairvoyant can see in the dark, can see columns of magnetism coming and going from the poles of the magnet. Hence there is a phenomenal verification of the power which causes the magnet to suspend this armature, and a certain amount of weight at the end of it. Now, let us ask the clairvoyant what information he or she can give us respecting the spirit-circle.

Supposing we hold our spirit-circle in the dark, what information will the clairvoyant afford us? Perhaps you will say, "Why go into the dark?" Why, I may, by going into the dark, get a fact respecting the magnet that I cannot get without going into the dark. So, then, let us go into the dark with our spirit-circle, if we can gain any knowledge by so doing. Well, our circle is in the dark; the sitters sit round the table with their hands upon it, and the clairvoyant is there to make observations. What does the clairvoyant observe? That there is a peculiar light arising from each of the sitters, similar to that which rises from the poles of the magnet. The light is coming from the various organs of the head. It is coming out from the tips of the fingers, from the eyes, from the lips, and forming in a halo round each sitter. Well, if the circle is what is called a harmonious circle, if there is temperamental compatibility among the sitters, these various lights will coalesce; one cloud will touch the other, until there is a chain of light connecting the heads of all the sitters. What have you then? Why, you have a living magnet; you have all the various members of that circle joined together in magnetic relationship, and you have the medium—the poles of the magnet, the most sensitive part of the magnetic chain—at the one end, just as I have the armature here. Suppose this magnet to represent the top of a table, then you have the spiritual circle: two sitters here, two sitters here, one here, and the medium placed here. If they are of the proper temperaments, then you will assuredly have spiritual manifestations, spiritual phenomena. So much, then, for the appliances by which these manifestations are produced. The next thing is, where does this force come from? We read in the Report of the Dialectical Society that a force sufficient to lift 90 lbs. was calculated as being in operation for the purpose of keeping a table standing upon its edge and a heavy claw, suspended out into the air, without anything apparently keeping it from going to the ground again. Where did this 90 lbs. of force come from? Now, there is always force in operation where there is a living human body or any other living body, and this force is capable, under certain conditions, of being given off. In fact, it is continually being given off, and it depends upon certain excitements of the nervous system as to how it shall be given off, and as to the amount in which it shall be given off. The force which comes from the various sitters is capable of producing a fulcrum that is sufficiently powerful to move the table, as this movement is seen and proved to take place by the observation of those who are capable of seeing the operation, just in the very same way as you are able to stand and look at an engine at work. Let us ask how it is that the human body itself is moved? Our friend has called attention to matter, and he tells you that force is in matter. Now I want to know what part of the matter of the human body force is in that enables my hand to lift that magnet? If I take the bone as the basic part of the organism, what part of the bone is the force in? I do not see that the bone of my arm has any power whatever to lift that magnet. Well, but you will say there are tendons attached to the bones and, muscles which contract, and so form a lever to lift the arm. Then I say what power has the muscle got to operate in that way? What force is there in the muscle? If you had a basketful of it, how much force could you get out of it? You will reply,

"There is the nerve operating upon the muscle; these bundles of muscle have got little filaments and nerves coming from the centre of the nervous system, and diffusing themselves all over those bundles, and they give the power of contractility." Then I say, What is there in the nerve to enable it to cause the muscle to contract and to move the bone, so as to enable it to lift a weight? "Oh," it will be replied, "there is in the nerve a peculiar fluid called nerve aura. This fluid is an invisible ether which flows from the brain, goes along the nerves of sensation from the points of the fingers, where I feel objects, and then goes back along other nerves to the organs that are to be moved, in order to accomplish different actions." Then what is this fluid, this nerve ether? What is this something which the clairvoyant sees as a halo hovering round a spirit-circle? Has this almost immaterial something got all the force, and have the more material parts of the organism got no force whatever? For we find that those palpable, material parts of the body—any physiologist will tell you that what I say is true—have no power to move themselves any more than this hall has power to move itself, any more than a locomotive engine has power to move itself unless there is the propelling influence of steam. It is true that this organism has the power of developing a certain amount of steam, a certain amount of force, a certain amount of that which adapts it to move; but then, even granting that this force which moves the table is got from the bodies of the sitters, and granting that it is sufficient to move the table, is it also sufficient to manifest intelligence? We saw in the case of the accordion playing under the table without any hand touching it, that there was intelligence. An accordion was played to the strain of a well-known tune, and played very perfectly. Now, what would our clairvoyant say to that matter? Supposing we had a clairvoyant there, what would be observed? There would be a psychical organism seen manipulating that accordion, an organism just as perfect as the one you see now, made up of those elements that you do not see, and yet which are the elements which move this hand according to the well-ascertained laws of physiology. I have nothing whatever to say about matter and non-matter. I have nothing whatever to say about one existence or more existences. According to our friend, there is not even one existence; there is only a bit of an existence, for it stops at death. But I believe in a continuous existence; and as to matter, how can we say that an organism is at an end when it goes out of our view? Do we not all know that the most palpable matter, that the most solid, the most opaque matter, is capable of being reduced to the most ethereal conditions? The fact that matter is invisible to us is no argument against its continuance. We find that when matter is invisible, it is more potential. The wind is invisible; steam is invisible. (A laugh.) Vapour, my friend, is visible, but steam is invisible. Hence, although I should not like to dogmatise upon it, I should like to speculate thus far—that matter has got no power or force whatever in it. Instead of matter containing force, and instead of force being the result of matter, matter (phenomena) is the result of force. Force is the active principle; force is the positive side of existence, and matter is the negative side of existence. Matter is the piston-rod, and force is the steam. You have an invisible force here; you have an illustration of it in this magnet.

Here is an invisible force doing a visible act. Here you have an illustration of the whole scheme of existence before you. The growth of a plant, the moving of my body, and every phenomenon that takes place on the face of the earth, or that can take place upon this earth, takes place in accordance with the law that you see manifested before you now, namely, a visible phenomenon proceeding from an invisible cause, and—find that out at your leisure.

### MR. BRADLAUGH'S SECOND SPEECH.

MR. BRADLAUGH: My friend has been in his opening a little too modest. While I have no doubt that it is perfectly true that he is a very hard-working man, no man in this country ought to be more capable, and probably no man is more capable, of speaking for Spiritualism than Mr. Burns, who edits *Human Nature* and the *Medium*, the most prominent if not the only spiritual journals in this country (no, no). Well, those who think themselves more able can try me when I have done with Mr. Burns. In the course of his speech which he has delivered to you, Mr. Burns has placed me in a considerable difficulty, because it appears that we use English words attaching precisely opposite meanings to them; and I confess that I shall either have to unlearn some of the meanings I attach to English words, and shall have to abandon every classical guide in doing so, or, if I adhere to my own, I shall be utterly incapable of comprehending, as I shall show you presently, some language which has fallen from my antagonist. I regret that there was no part of my opening speech that was thought worthy of any reply, and that the only two portions of it that were noticed were noticed utterly incorrectly. I never pretended that existence stopped at death. I never said anything so manifestly absurd or manifestly ridiculous. I never said that there was not only not one existence but only a bit of an existence; and I never said anything that ought to have been construed into that. I took express pains to explain what I did mean, and how I meant it. It would be undignified to repeat that till it is replied to; but I confess I am still of opinion that there was enough in that to demand a reply. Mr. Burns has been good enough to tell you, without giving the slightest argument in support of his position (whether I was right or wrong, at any rate, I tried to give some reasons as I went on, and will not pretend to say that they were effective or efficient, but they were the best I could give)—Mr. Burns, without giving the slightest reason at all, has told you that man has two conditions of life, one physical and one psychical. I thought I took some pains to explain the difference between animal life and vegetable life, and the further phase of intelligence; and I should have thought it not unworthy the notice of a gentleman who knew the points we had to debate to explain whether he meant the same as I did, and if not, where he differed from me in the meaning attaching to those words. I am left in the utter dilemma that I do not know at present whether Mr. Burns accepts everyone of those definitions. If he did, he has talked utter nonsense ever since. I use the words in no unfair sense, it is the only phrase which can characterise it; or, if he has talked what to him was sense, then he has done me the injustice to leave me to be misled by not showing me where his words differed in the meaning he intended to convey from that which I intended.

to express. I might have given the wrong meanings, but at any rate I gave some. He has used words, and has given us no meanings to guide us as to the sense in which he has used them. Mr. Burns says that man's second life is divided into physical life and psychical life, and that death is the sunderance of these two lives. I explained what I meant by death—a sunderance, not a cessation of either. If of either, why of one more than the other? But he did not pretend it was a cessation of either, and yet he only contended for the continued existence of one. Why? And if death be the sunderance, is birth the union of them? and what do sunderance and union mean used in that sense? It does not do to bandy words about as if they were shuttlecocks; we must try at any rate to show that there is some sense intended to be conveyed behind the words we use. Then Mr. Burns said we must have facts. It does not follow that men are capable of comprehending facts (a laugh), and the gentleman who laughs shows that he is one of those. The Indian prince could not comprehend the fact of the ice. The juries who convicted men of witchcraft and wizardry, for which they were burnt, comprehended them very inaccurately; and the people who laugh before they listen, sometimes have no comprehension at all. Now permit me to say, that with reference to these facts I have done my best to understand them, and I hope that those who listen to this debate desire that it should be—prefer that it should be—conducted in the spirit in which I commenced it; because I would strive if it were possible to eliminate from this debate anything except the endeavour to gain the truth. I am skilful enough in mere word-play, without any boast, to indulge in that whenever it pleases me; but I would prefer simply to try to think out and find out what was the truth in relation to this matter. If people prefer conjuring, I am quite content, regretting that those on the other side should think that the best way of arriving at the truth about it. Let us examine these questions as to the facts. I am told that a committee of the Dialectical Society have reported, and that I was one of that committee. Probably it escaped my friend, or he would have told you, that it was my misfortune, as one of that committee, never to have had the opportunity of witnessing any of those wonders. I sat with their best man, Mr. Home; I heard not a rap, save some such as I produced by mechanical means. I do not mean to say that Mr. Home's raps were so produced. I do not express an opinion about it. I only say that when I heard raps I got under the table, and with my thumb against the hard wood precisely similar raps were produced. I do not think Mr. Home's were produced in that way. I want to make my statement as frank as I can, but what I do say is, that I did produce similar raps; and that beyond those one or two raps, and a tinkling sound in the glass such as I have often heard when sitting in a room by myself where there are lamps, and one evening a slight wave of the table, not more than half an inch, which Dr. Edmunds and I repeatedly produced afterwards; at all the sittings we had not the semblance of a manifestation. But this is not my only experience. I never attack any point without doing my best to learn something about it, and I have investigated more or less the phenomena of Spiritualism, as they are called, for the last twenty years, and it has been either my misfortune or my fault never to have been able to obtain any of these manifestations. But I ask you to look at the illustration given. What is the illustration Mr. Burns has given us

in the magnet? I submit that there could be no illustration, if my friend had comprehended the value of his argument, more fatal than this. He says: "You have here a magnet, and you have this magnet lifting and capable of holding a weight of some two or three pounds." I do not trouble as to the exact weight, because when once you have one weight, with an additional magnetic force you may increase it. Suppose a person knowing nothing of magnetism was told that that weight was held by a spirit! It is not my purpose either to deny or to admit that tables move. When I see one moved, I will try to inquire how it is moved and why it is moved. The why I may never find out, but the how I will do my best to ascertain. It is no portion of my purpose to deny the whole of the phenomena alleged to have taken place in the presence of Mr. Home. I will characterise them presently; but I ask you to read, as I have read, the trials which took place for witchcraft more than one hundred years ago, and the sworn evidence of much more wonderful things than these that have been related to you to-night, upon which people were burnt, society having since heartily rejected the whole of it. What becomes then of the appeal of my friend, "Are you not to rely upon such evidence?" If our friend will make this table move, that would not convince me of Spiritualism. I should then want to try and find out in what manner the table had been raised; and just as I have never been mad enough to deny that you might find a magnet with power to raise ten tons of steel, so I shall never be mad enough to deny that there is a magnetic force which may attract and repulse wood or any other particular modes of substance (a hiss). The gentleman probably means something by the hiss; his power of repulsion is greater than his attraction. Let us follow the line of argument addressed to us by our friend. He says: "How do you explain magnetism?" It is not my business to explain it; it is your business, when you assert that it is a devil that does it, or a spirit that does it, or something out of the range of our experience that does it; it is for you to explain, and my ignorance is no argument in your favour. Our friend did not give you the strongest illustrations that he might have given in favour of Spiritualism. In Robert Dale Owen's book, and in a book recently published, I find that they go to the extent of a very stout lady coming through the roof of a room without destroying the roof. Now I have never had the advantage of witnessing such a phenomenon. To me at present—oh! I am not denying it. I do not trouble to deny matters of which I have had no opportunity of judging; nor is it any portion of my business to deny them. It is for you, who say they have taken place by spiritual means, not to say, "They have taken place, and how do you account for them?" but to say they have taken place, and to show us how you account for them. I have my impression that probably the people who thought they saw the lady coming through the roof were not in a condition to enable them to form an accurate judgment upon the phenomenon which they supposed they had witnessed; but that is only my opinion, and I put it forward with a great degree of submission. For example, when a man who has taken a considerable amount of whisky says that he sees a red dog in the corner of the room, I do not deny that that man sees a red dog, but what I deny is that he is in a state which enables him to sense accurately and to represent his sensations fairly; and it is quite possible that seven or eight different

persons may have very different impressions from what I would have. Now a number of things that fell from our friend induced me to suppose that he had not paid the smallest attention to any of the scientific discoveries of the last fifty years. But I find my time has expired. I shall have an opportunity of continuing the argument.

#### MR. BURNS'S SECOND SPEECH.

MR. BURNS: Ladies and Gentlemen,—When I sat down I was just about to observe that I had proved my first proposition, namely,—That man had got psychical functions as well as physical functions; and that all my propositions were in accordance with the already-ascertained laws of nature. I am very sorry indeed that I should cause my friend any inconvenience by introducing to him matters that he has not got phraseology for—however, that is a matter that can easily be remedied. When once we get hold of more knowledge it is very easy for us to be able to designate it according as our intelligence and our powers of expression enable us; but that is not my business, that is his. I will content myself with going on with my argument. We all know that there is a physical world around us, and we know that we have a physical body which is in harmony with that physical world. We know that if the physical body is dropped down, it will break like any other body; we know that if it is put into the fire, it will burn like any other body; we know that the body is subject to all the conditions of matter: but not so the mind. There is an imponderable realm throughout all nature, and man participates in that realm. As I observed to you, the magnet itself is an incontrovertible instance of that realm, showing that physical effects are produced by invisible causes; indeed, as I was remarking, if you will look at the whole theatre of existence you will find that it is simply a repetition of that which we observe in the magnet—a physical effect produced by an invisible cause. By an analysis of the functions by which the body is able to perform any one action, I showed you that the material structure of the body and the great labour which it is called upon to do were due to an invisible fluid. We do not know how many other fluids there are of a more attenuated nature behind that one; the only thing we know is, that the last agent that we are capable of getting under our scrutiny is not material and tangible, as we understand those words. My friend spoke of matter; what is it that is material or tangible? These solid bodies that are in this hall, before they were solid bodies had to be in a gaseous or semi-gaseous or magnetic condition. You will observe it is not bread and butter and beef and solid matter that goes to build up your body mechanically in the same way as this platform was built up. Every atom of your body has to be mediated by digestion; it has to be entirely changed from what it was before it becomes another structure, and in going through that change it has to pass by exosmosis through a membrane in which there is no hole—why, there is a spiritual manifestation at once: bone and muscle going through a membrane without any hole. We begin to look at matter, and we find that matter is all porous, that there are no two atoms of matter touching each other. How is it with the clairvoyant? The clairvoyant can just see through a brick wall the same as you can see through glass. I have sat with a clairvoyant, and I have been learning every-

thing that was taking place at home. An eminent West-End physician sat with Lottie Fowler one evening to inquire about some missing person; he did not know where this missing person was. Lottie Fowler, in a trance, assisted by her controlling intelligence, told him the place where the missing person was, and he marked it down. That very evening, at the same hour, there was another party interested in the case consulting a similar clairvoyant in Paris, and they got the very same information. They went to the place indicated, and found that the person had just left, and was there at the time of the interviews. Now where could there be anything more scientific than that? At the same hour two persons are consulting two different clairvoyants, one in London, the other in Paris, and with the same result. We see, then, that man has a power of sight altogether unlike the physical power of sight, and we find that matter is really nothing to that psychical power; that the psychical and physical can be mixed and interchanged with each other in such a way as absolutely to do away with each other. As to the passing of matter through matter, that our friend makes so light of, I do not wish to bring it forward as anything that should irritate his feelings; I do not wish to bring it forward as any objection to any particular creed he may have. I think, that seeing he is so deeply interested in existence, seeing that matter to him represents existence, if he really can know what matter is, he will know more about existence than he does already; and if I can tell him anything new and startling about matter, if I can tell him anything that will challenge his powers of investigation or understanding in respect to matter, I hope he will receive it from me with due gratitude. I am not going to tell you all I know about matter thus early in the debate; I am rather afraid of running dry, and I am going to keep a little till to-morrow night; it may be that there will be no rain then, and I shall require to have something to scatter down amongst you; so that I am not going to tell you all I know about matter on the present occasion. We see, however, that it is possible to look through matter. A friend of mine consulted this same Lottie Fowler in London. He lived in Glasgow, and she told him what was doing at his own fireside at that hour. He wrote it down, and when he went down by train the next night he found it exactly as was said. This is an illustration of the fact that man has powers which are not included in our ordinary estimate of human powers. And now as to matter and the relations of matter. I have seen objects come through solid walls; I have seen objects come into rooms where the doors were shut, where the windows were shut, and where the chimneys were shut. There are dozens of persons in this hall now who know experimentally that matter can pass through matter; there is no doubt about it. Now, how is this effected? I have explained the manifestations that I have brought before you as well as I was able, and I will try to explain this manifestation, and I think you will see that it is in accordance with the laws of matter. We see that material objects hold together; we also see that material objects may be dissipated. Look at that light, it once was solid coal; what a metamorphosis! Why, there is matter passing through matter now in the various gases intermingling with each other. This process of disintegration is carried on by a chemical force, and if we had knowledge enough, if we knew enough of the atomic relations of matter, could we not disannul this cohesion by a

different process from the clumsy one of using a retort and all that dirty, grimy, unpleasant process to which we are accustomed? If we had intelligence and power commensurate with that intelligence, could we not do it by another process? Here is an argument for Spiritualism at once; if it transcends our chemistry, if it transcends all our intellect in its highest and most cultivated form to explain how matter passes through matter, how much wiser must those intelligences be that effect that result! You may not believe it, but that does not alter the fact: I know it to be true. I know it can be done, and it must be done by intelligence, and by intelligence having the highest amount of knowledge of chemistry and the laws of matter. But I find my time is up.

The CHAIRMAN: You have four or five minutes yet.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Would you mind saying, as the conclusion of your argument—it would interest me very much to know—why it must be done by intelligence?

Mr. BURNS: I cannot conceive of anything but intelligence acting. When I look abroad in the universe, I see nothing more nor less than the results of intelligent action. I find that I have got what is called intelligence; I suppose our friend thinks he has got intelligence, and if he has it he will grant that I have it. Now, when I use my intelligence—when I get to the very acme of the action of my intelligence—I find that I have not been able to overstep the intelligence that is manifested all around me. Now if it takes intelligence on my part to estimate that which is already done around me, must it not have taken intelligence to produce those phenomena that I see, and that I have to exercise my intelligence upon, often fruitlessly, so that I cannot achieve the result I desire? That is as plain as A B C. If any man will say that the universe around him does not give unmistakable indications of intelligence, I cannot understand that man: he is a man entirely beyond my power of comprehension. I see nothing more nor less than intelligence. Then there is another thing. Granting that I am a product of matter—granting that my intelligence is the result of material formation—that intelligence must be in the globe, and in the universe from whence I was extracted. It will not do merely to say that I can have an effect; we must have a cause also, and in that cause we must have everything that is possible of the effect; and thus there must be intelligence in the world around us, and there must be nothing performed but what is performed by intelligence. I cannot conceive of any action taking place unless it is in accordance with law, which is the mode in which the intelligence manifests itself. Now, as to the passing of objects through each other, we have had it illustrated by the observations of clairvoyants. The way in which it is done is this. You find in the human body a solvent power—a transmutative power: I refer to the food becoming flesh. You put that food into the body; it is transformed into blood and into flesh, and our friend would even say into intelligence. But what a wonderful solvent power that must be which can turn so many things out of simple bread and butter! Now suppose we had the power of taking this solvent principle and applying it volitionally as a solvent in the same way as they apply acids to various substances around us, what wonderful manifestations of power

we might witness! This is exactly what is done in those manifestations of one object passing through another. The intelligences which superintend those learned processes use the solvents which are in the human body. They have a peculiar way of getting at those solvents through the presence of certain people from whom they gather them—persons called mediums. Through these the solvents are obtained and manipulated by the superintending intelligences, and thus it is that what is called attraction becomes repulsion, and the object passes through. Then attraction asserts its sway, and the parts come together again, and you do not see where the operation has occurred. These things have even taken place in daylight.

### MR. BRADLAUGH'S THIRD SPEECH.

MR. BRADLAUGH: I think I am entitled still more strongly to complain. Other words have been used which, when used by me, were given with definitions. Mr. Burns has used the same words in a sense which, if any sense was intended to be conveyed, must have been entirely different from the definition I gave; and he did not take the trouble to explain in what sense he used them. That is especially the case with regard to the word "intelligence," because the definition I gave would preclude the applicability of the word in the way in which Mr. Burns has applied it. I do not pretend that my definition is to be taken to bind Mr. Burns, but I do pretend that having heard my definition, if he used the word in any other sense he ought to have had the courtesy to say in what sense he used it. Mr. Burns says he regrets to puzzle me; but it is not so much puzzling me as it is damaging his own case by not making it clearer to the audience he addresses. The puzzling me is the smallest matter about it. Supposing it were successful, it would not be any particular matter of boasting in a debate of this kind. I endeavoured, rightly or wrongly, to commence this debate in a purely reasonable and philosophical fashion. It may be that I did not succeed, but I think I have fair grounds of complaint that not one of the points, not one of the definitions, not one of the explanations, has been taken where words have not been used in a manner entirely contrary to the sense in which I used them, without anything being given to guide us as to what was the meaning intended to be conveyed. Now, let us take Mr. Burns's argument for the best. When he first sat down, under a mistake as to the time, he said that what was happening around him must be done by intelligence. I rather rejoiced at the break, because I thought that a little suggestion might at any rate lead to an argument there. I asked him why he said so, and his answer was, "I cannot conceive of it being done in any other way." Then his inability to conceive is to be the sole argument upon which I am asked to accept his statement. What does that amount to? "Spirit lifts table." Does it? Why do you say so? "Oh, because I don't understand it being lifted in any other way." That is Mr. Burns's argument reduced into simple words. He has talked of matter going through matter. I have never said it did not. You may have an illustration of it by pouring water on this cloth, for you will see that the water will run through. But what has that to do with spirit? Mr. Burns says, "Oh, but some clairvoyant saw something a

long way off." Well, if before Rosse's telescope had been invented somebody had said that it was possible to see into the moon and measure mountains, men would have laughed at him. Does the ability to see into the moon and measure the mountains prove spirit? It only proves that there was a possibility of developing the visual ability to a far greater extent than people more ignorant thought. Then the measure of the proof of Spiritualism is to be the ignorance of the people who are to measure. Well, I confess that is an astounding sort of proposition to come before an audience. Then the mere point, as it is put to you, is still, I submit, put in a fashion (I say it with all respect) which shows the utter inability of Mr. Burns to comprehend the language I have addressed to him. He says I would say that food is transformed into intelligence. Where have I said anything like it? On the contrary, I have specially guarded against the possibility of its being conceived that I regarded intelligence as entity at all. I do not say that you can transform it into hardness, or brightness, or colour. What I do say is that hardness, brightness, colour, specialty of extension, are characteristics by which you distinguish different conditions of existence. And so I put for vitality, and so I put for intelligence, and there has not been one attempt even to grapple with the argument, whether they were effective or ineffective. Our friend felt this; and what was the excuse he gave? "Oh," he said, "I could tell you more about matter, but I am not going to run myself dry to-night." Well, if we have met here to joke I can understand it; but if we have met here to understand what each means, then I say that is not the way in which I should be met. Our friend was bound to tell us all he could tell us about it. Lottie Fowler may be, and I have no doubt is, a very interesting person, but I want to know what sort of argument has been addressed to you to prove that what Lottie Fowler said or did resulted from Spiritualism? There are many facts connected with psychological phenomena which are within the range of ordinary experience. Any medical book of any ability at all will tell you that. Dr. Maudsley, from whom I quoted, has collected far stronger illustrations (some of which I should have been prepared to grapple with) than such ridiculous things as accordions wagging and tables moving. I do not want to use unfair language, but I do think that I have a right to require greater dignity of treatment from the other side. I carefully refrained, in my opening speech, from any phrase that ought to have been met with any sort of jocularly. Our friend talks of my being irritated. I have had too much platform experience to grow irritated unless I want to, and certainly I do not think I am likely to want to in the course of this debate. But I ask, What need for putting that in at all? Let us see what sort of language we have been treated to. We were told—and this shows how utterly our friend either misunderstood me, or was incapable of comprehending the language I used—we were told of "what is material or tangible," as though the one word were the correlative of the other. Then that assumes that what is intangible—you yourself making the measure of what is intangible—is immaterial. But how do you justify the assumption? It is an assumption that you have no right to make. Then, in order to show what our friend meant by tangible, he gave the funniest illustration: he said that solid bodies were gaseous. Then the gaseous

is intangible in your notion. If so, you and I have different notions. "Attenuated fluids." What does this mean? This is the merest verbiage without sense behind it that it is possible to indulge in. But let us try it by your own standard. All that is tangible is material. How can you measure tangibility? By touch—resistance. Then what becomes of that which exhibited a resisting force of ninety pounds? Is it tangible according to your own view of it? Probably you have some different way of explaining what you mean by the word. I confess I am utterly beside the whole meaning—if any meaning you intended to convey; and I ask whether it is not the fact that you have got so used to repeating phrases—"imponderable realm," "matter passing through matter," and phrases of that kind—that you do not trouble to weigh the thoughts that are behind. As you say that these manifestations—and I confine you, for this evening, at any rate, to those which you have given—are proofs of intelligence, permit me to ask you what sort of intelligence is that which is measured by a table that rises and by an accordion that plays "Home, sweet home" or "Pop goes the weasel?" Why, really, if we are to measure intelligence in that fashion, the estimate that you would get would be one of the most ridiculous character! Then our friend says, this must be, and that must be. Permit me to observe that it is quite as well, when you say "must," to explain why you think it must. I do not pretend to say that your dicta may not be accurate, but for each separate assertion I should like to have some measure of argument. Let us not disguise from one another that there are two ways of addressing oneself to a subject: one is with the thoughtful purpose of endeavouring to find out what is true; and the other, with the purpose of merely talking round about it in reckless extravagant word-play without ever touching it at all. I do not say that I succeeded in reaching the truth in my first speech, but I do pretend that if it had been followed in the same fashion we should undoubtedly have been much nearer to understanding what we meant by the truth than we are at the present moment. What did our friend say? Our friend said, in his first speech, that matter is the result of force; and he was not content to tell us that, but he gave us an illustration to explain it. "Force is steam; matter is the piston-rod." That is a very funny way of putting it. Force is steam, is it? But your steam is manufactured. Then that which is manufactured is the manufacturer. Force is the producer of matter, according to you. Force of what? When I used the word "matter," which I did but very late in my speech, I took express pains to define precisely what I meant by it. Give me as clear a definition of force as I gave you of matter. I showed you that exhibitions of force which we judge of to-day were not possible to have been judged of in precedent time. I ask you to give me the same sort of illustration in favour of your argument. Our friend is utterly oblivious of the statement made by myself in the beginning, that for the man who alleged another cause it was necessary to give some evidence, for that the burden of proof lies upon him. He puts to me repeatedly the questions, How do you account for this? How was this done? What did that? Where is the muscle force? Why, that is no way of proving his case. Suppose I simply say, in answer to each, "I know nothing about it," he stands with not the slightest evidence. Then he talked about a

"bushel of muscle." Well, cannot I talk of a bushel of spirit? There is this difference, that your bushel is empty and mine is full. I shall not trespass upon your attention for many more minutes; I shall have the opportunity of addressing you at some length to-morrow evening in opening; and in order not to afford my antagonist any excuse, although I regret the sort of stuff (I use the word advisedly) which he has put before me to deal with, I shall feel it my duty, in my opening speech, to follow him in the line he has taken. But that does not release him from the duty of disposing of what I put before you. Even if he has to pump himself dry to-night, I ask him to do it, and I will take care to give him a damper to-morrow evening.

#### MR. BURNS'S THIRD SPEECH.

MR. BURNS: My friend and I seem to be quite at cross sticks with each other. I have come here for the purpose of discussing Modern Spiritualism, and he fancies that I have come here for the purpose of discussing his essay on Zoology. Now, that is very unfortunate. Many of the very excellent things that our friend put forward might be disputed at the right time; they may or may not be true, and yet Spiritualism be a fact. We have had no end of "philosophy;" we have had no end of definite ideas and words about "phenomena," and so on; but all those definitions and all this learning have never been able to keep new facts from coming into the world of human consciousness. And so it is with Spiritualism. Indeed, what is the use of our definitions unless they cover the whole ground? Our friend talks about life, and yet he does not know all the phenomena of life; he only knows a very little bit of the phenomena of life, and there he is with his theory. Now, I prefer to look at phenomena, and then seek for a theory afterwards. It is time enough for us to get a theory of life within the next thirty or forty or fifty years, if in the meantime we can know the facts—if we can know the modes in which that thing called life is manifested. I think our friend confounds life with the manifestations of life. He hears a sound coming from a bell or a pot: he does not call that sound an entity; he says there is no correlate to that sound, therefore there is no entity. But there must be a great deal more than what he sees or what he hears, or else there would be nothing to hear and there would be nothing to see. But to come back to the question of phenomena. It is only by getting a thorough idea of phenomena, or as large a grasp of phenomena as possible, that we are able to generalise at all successfully on any subject. If we have only a part of the phenomena of life, we must be false in our generalisations. The more of those phenomena we get, the more must we understand of them. Now, let me describe a seance to you, and tell you what I mean by a spirit. Our friend will have it to think over for to-morrow night. The last seance I attended was on Saturday evening. Spiritualists look upon a seance much as an anatomist does upon the dissecting-table, as a chemist does upon his laboratory, or a mechanic his workshop. It is the place where facts are elucidated—it is the school-house. This talking is of very little account, but the investigation of the phenomena by seances is of very great account. It is there that we get all our knowledge. The seance to which I refer was held on Saturday evening at 16, Old Quebec Street. The mediums

were Mr. and Mrs. Holmes and Miss Cook. There were a number of ladies and gentlemen present; one of whom was a master of arts, who signs himself M.A., who has given an account of certain manifestations in the *Liverpool Mercury* a few months ago. Another gentleman was Mr. Serjeant Cox; and another, the editor of the *Spiritualist*, Mr. Harrison; besides Mr. Cook's family. The first thing done was for a stranger and a sceptical observer—this master of arts investigating the subject—to thoroughly tie the medium in such a way that all the knots were recognised: they were test-knots, and were examined by those present. The next thing was for those present to hold hands, the persons at the ends of the circle passing both hands into the hand of the person next to them. After the doors were locked and the room was searched, the lights were put out. Then the musical instruments that were upon the table were lifted up and carried about the room, and were played—four or five at once. Then immediately you heard the medium (who was tied, and sitting two or three yards away) speaking and breathing. Then there was a person speaking to you close to your face, touching your hands and your brow, slapping you, laying instruments upon your head and various parts of the body. Then other persons came. One was a male and the other a female. One called himself "Richard," and the other called herself "Rosie." Rosie was a little girl, who went round and kissed everybody. I will tell you what she did to me. She took hold of my ear with her hand, put her little, soft, moist mouth upon my cheek, and kissed me with an audible intonation. Our friend wants to know why we say there was a spirit present. Simply because we have an organism there belonging to an intelligent being. We use the term "spirit" conventionally. Spirit signifies a human being after he has laid aside the physical body and exists in the psychical body. Human beings that have laid aside the physical body, and have the proper intelligence, and conditions to exercise that intelligence, can absorb into the periphery of their psychical bodies those materials, as we call them. I use the term "material" in a conventional sense, because spirits are material just the same as we are material. I do not know what idea our friend has about the immateriality of spirits. Perhaps he does not know anything about them; hence the necessity for me to tell him something about them. In generalising upon life, it is necessary that he should know the various phases of life, and hence the necessity for this discussion. You see I am noticing new phases of life which seem to be entirely beyond his experience—phases of life in which intelligent individuality can manifest itself without the various appliances existing in the condition in which we understand the human body to exist. After these instruments went round, something took the ropes off, and threw them at the man that tied them. Sometimes the lady is tied up by the same power much more tightly than her visitors can tie her. A visitor was asked to go and hold the lady's hands. In the first place he was told to be careful to feel all down the arms to see that there was nothing upon them, and having done so, to hold the hands. Well, there were hoops—a tambourine hoop (with cymbals, so that it could be easily heard when moved), a wooden hoop with an iron hoop upon it. The visitor felt that those objects were there; then, holding the medium's hands tightly, that tambourine hoop with an iron hoop upon it came upon his arm, without his hand being disengaged from hers.

There was a demonstration of the fact that matter was severed and continued again without break or interruption by some process that was not understood by those who were present. That terminated the dark seance. Then we had a light seance, which was arranged in this way. There were two rooms, with a door leading from one into the other. A temporary door was placed therein, with an aperture in it. The inner room was thoroughly searched, and then the door was locked. One candle was allowed to be burning in the room where the company was sitting; a hat was placed before it to prevent the rays falling upon the aperture. Mr. and Mrs. Holmes sat at each side of a little table just under the aperture. Miss Cook sat at the table facing the aperture. We all sat round in a semi-circle; Mr. Serjeant Cox immediately behind Miss Cook and opposite the aperture, and M.A. beside Mr. Serjeant Cox. In a little while a face came to the aperture; M.A. recognised it as the likeness of a departed friend. He said, "Are you A. W.?" and the face nodded affirmatively. It went away and came again. Another face then came—a masculine face with strong features. I recognised it at once; I had seen it shown in a similar way at two previous seances. I can tell you a curious circumstance of the same face being seen in the psychical form. I was at a meeting at St. John's Temperance Hall one evening; a lady who was present, a clairvoyante, said to me last week, before this occurred, "When you were here before, I saw a spiritual individual standing beside you." She described his features—peculiar shaggy and prominent eyebrows, a long face, piercing eyes, a large nose, and a very pronounced chin—such a description as would enable anyone to recognise the face; and that face so described by the clairvoyante is exactly the same face as I have seen three times in the material form by candlelight. There is a curious fact, showing that a face was seen at Clerkenwell psychically; it was reproduced at Mrs. Holmes's seance physically, made literally out of nothing before my eyes. After this face went away, two others were seen imperfectly. Then came another face, with gray hair, and a fine intelligent expression of countenance. It showed itself with a great deal of clearness. Mr. Serjeant Cox recognised it as the likeness of his deceased uncle. I do not say it was his deceased uncle; I say it was his likeness. He said, "Do you represent Robert Cox?" The face bowed. It showed itself five or six times, twenty or thirty seconds each time. Then the door was opened, and Miss Cook and Mr. Holmes went inside beyond the aperture, and sat for another development of the faces. Then the same head came again, not from below but from the ceiling, and showed itself a number of times in various positions, so that Mr. Serjeant Cox was absolutely certain that it represented his deceased uncle. Then in a short time the hat was taken away so as to allow the light of the candle to fall full upon the aperture, and there was seen in drapery, able to speak—so that we could talk to it—the face of a lady, said to be the spirit "Katey"—so she calls herself—manifested through the mediumship of Miss Cook. The spirit had to apologise for the fact that because of certain conditions it could only represent itself in the peculiar features of the lady who was sitting in trance in a chair at some distance from the opening. Here I shall leave the subject till to-morrow night, when I shall be prepared to bring forward some more facts derived from an investigation of Spiritualism; because what does it matter what I think or what Mr. Bradlaugh thinks? We must succumb to FACTS.

## SECOND NIGHT.

THE CHAIRMAN briefly alluded to the conditions of debate, and called on Mr. Bradlaugh to open for the evening.

## MR. BRADLAUGH'S FIRST SPEECH.

MR. BRADLAUGH: Instead of any attempt to prove the proposition upon which I understand Mr. Burns to base the whole of his line of thought, namely, that man is divided into two natures, animal and spiritual, or, as he put it, that man has two lives, physical life and psychical life, Mr. Burns confined himself to relating a number of anecdotes, more or less interesting, which did not seem to me to be connected in any way with those propositions. There was, towards the close of his address, a statement which, if accurate, seems to me to finish the discussion, namely, that all his propositions are in accordance with known laws of nature. He did not tell us what he meant by "laws of nature;" but, presuming that he meant by "nature" what I said I meant by it in my opening speech, and presuming that he meant by "law" what I said I meant by it in my opening speech,—and I presume if he had meant differently by either of the words, he would have explained them,—it entirely shuts out Spiritualism altogether. If Mr. Burns did not recollect that I used those words and defined them, then I have something to complain of in his carelessness in not recollecting them. If he takes my definition as the correct one, then he is entirely out of court; but I confess that, having listened to his anecdotes, I cannot bring them into consonance with his propositions. He says that all his propositions are in accordance with known laws of nature. Now, one of those that he submitted to us last night was that of a person going through a brick wall, and the hole closing up again after the person had passed through. I do not think I am exaggerating it in summarising it in that fashion. Now, I confess that is not in accordance with known laws of nature, as far as I am able to express any opinion about them. I am not yet expressing an opinion as to the truth of the occurrence, I am only correlating his anecdotes and his arguments together. Well, then Mr. Burns related another anecdote, still more interesting, of his having in the dark felt a soft, moist mouth kiss his lips with an audible intonation. The sort of impersonification behind the mouth was somebody described as "Rosie." I am obliged to put it in that vague manner because I could not quite gather anything more definite. Does Mr. Burns mean to say that that is in accordance with known laws of nature? Let us examine mouths ordinarily. Take them to a state of hot, feverish disease; take them to death. If any of you have had any experience of dead bodies, I think you have found the lips the reverse of soft, moist, and so on; or, at any rate, when they get moist, there would hardly be any pleasant sensation in any kiss upon the lips. I am obliged to follow it out in this way, because if the language does not mean something, it is the most utterly ridiculous nonsense that could be laid before you. I submit that either Mr. Burns's anecdotes have misled him, or that his proposition, that everything is in accordance with known laws of nature, is, at least, slightly exaggerated. Well,

then, to put another position, which I confess, to use his own language, slightly puzzled me. He said that spirits are material; and, in order to enforce it upon us, he says they are just as material as we are. Well, he gave some evidence of that. Presuming "Rosie" to be a spirit, there was the soft, moist lip and touch. But do spirits eat, breathe, speak? According to our friend, they do. Do they see? Do they write? What is meant by saying that they are as material as we are? Was that a phrase which was uttered without consideration; or if it was uttered with consideration, what was it intended to convey? As material as we are! Do they grow? Are they subject to disease? If you do not mean anything of that kind, you should not use those phrases. I will now follow the kind of anecdotes that were submitted to us, and I will deal, if you please, with the things in as fair a spirit as it is possible to deal with them. I will submit first, that supposing the whole of the alleged manifestations to be as true as some of them are most certainly false,—and I will explain to you those which are certainly false in a moment,—then they do not advance one whit in support of the proposition that man has an animal and a spiritual life, and that death is the sunderance of the two. They are not connected with it. The proposition may be true or false, and the anecdotes true or false, and neither have the smallest relevance one to the other. I say, supposing them to be true as some of them are certainly false—and I will give you an illustration of those which seem to me to be certainly false. When I am told that Mrs. Guppy came through a roof, I am not prepared to deny that; but when I am told that the roof closed up again after Mrs. Guppy had come through, the whole evidence of experience is so against people coming through roofs and making a hole which closes itself up, that I am obliged to say I do not believe it. I do not mean by that that the persons tell me a lie. There are many people who utter statements which they have the strongest conviction are true, but their statements are not always true. Dr. Winslow, Dr. Maudesley, and a very large number of other medical men of that kind, would give you numerous instances in which people make statements in which they have the most perfect confidence, but which are in no sort of sense based upon fact. Take the case of Mrs. Guppy, for instance, because that I believe to be the one most thoroughly vouched. Mrs. Guppy was brought a considerable distance in a very light dress, so far as I can judge. She came, at any rate, through one ceiling, as the house was shut up. I do not know whether it was the top room of the house or one lower down. If it was lower down, probably she came through several ceilings. Her dress does not seem to have been damaged, and dresses, I presume, are not pretended to be spiritual dresses; so that however much the individual spirit might escape, when you come to deal with a coat, you can judge that by the ordinary arguments that you apply to coats. Not always. I will give you one instance in which it is clear that that judgment would not apply. As you have heard, I happened to be one of the Committee of the Dialectical Society, and a lady stated there, I believe most conscientiously, that she had seen the ghost of her dead husband. I asked her how he was dressed. It appeared he had been a naval officer, and she told me he was dressed in his uniform coat. I asked her whether she recognised the colour. She told me "Yes." Whether she recognised the buttons upon the

coat. She told me "Yes." I asked her whether she recognised them enough to detect the ornamentation upon them. She told me "Yes." So that if her statement was true, and if Spiritualism be true, and we accept that statement, then there are ghosts of coats, and ghosts of buttons. I submit, then, the evidence proves a little too much, because you have got to have the sunderance of the life of the gilt button—the sunderance of the life of the frock coat or the *surtout*. But I say, that supposing all the statements were to be as true as some of them are most decidedly false, then they do not prove the point; and next, that supposing the whole of the manifestations, as they are called, to be as important as the majority of them seem to me to be most wretchedly trivial and ridiculous, then they do not prove it. I ask you, Could anything be more absurd than the tambourine story we were treated to last night? If that is an evidence of superior intelligences, I would rather be limited to the inferior ones at present. And then I was amused with the thorough frankness and ingenuousness of my antagonist. I believe him to be thoroughly honest in what he was saying, for what did he tell you? In order to prove that this was done by Spiritualism, he said it was performed by some forces which nobody at present understood. I took down his words accurately. Well, that is what happens every time you see Houdin, Professor Anderson the Wizard of the North, Maskelyne, or other clever conjurers. I do not deny that wonderful things are done in a way that nobody understands, but I object to being asked to believe in spirits because nobody understands the performance. But what do you have? You have fiddles with phosphorus, banjos and accordions that play tunes under tables. I ask whether sane men ever had submitted to them for the basing of a grave theory a series of phenomena of a more trivial and ridiculous character? And it is not limited to the statement our friend made last night. I have not come here without taking the pains to read everything that it has been possible for an English or French reader to get, upon this subject, and I pledge you my word, and I defy our friend to challenge it when he rises, that out of the whole history of American, French, and English manifestations—and I will wait for the others till I hear them—he cannot find me three per cent. which even affect to be for any useful purpose; and out of the three per cent. that do affect to be for any useful purpose, I will defy him to find me three per cent. that really are. But I say, that supposing they were as important as they are trivial, I deny that a banjo playing in the dark, or a tambourine rattling you do not know how, or a table waltzing across a room, supposing them all to have happened just as they are recorded, are any sort of evidence that man has two lives, one animal and one spiritual, and that death is the sunderance of one of those from the other. And I think I have a little to complain of that our friend did not extend his frankness, because I challenged him to tell me, if there is a sunderance, as he says, does either of the lives cease, and if so, which, and why one more than the other? You will remember I put that question, and there was no sort of answer given to it. Then, clearly some of those manifestations might be the result of sleight-of-hand. I do not say they are. I have no right to express such an opinion. But I have seen the Davenport Brothers; I have sat with them from nine o'clock at night till three in the morning. I have seen

Maskelyne's experiments. Maskelyne only pretends to be a conjurer, to do his by sleight-of-hand and dexterity; and I have seen Maskelyne do every one of the things that I have seen the Davenport Brothers do, and I have seen him do a thing that the Davenport Brothers did not do. I do not know how it was done; but it was much more wonderful than any of the stories that Mr. Burns told you last night, and perhaps you will permit me to tell it you. Maskelyne is tied just as the Davenports are, and I won't weary you with that; but one thing that he finishes up with sometimes is this. You are permitted to go upon the stage where he performs—and he only calls it a performance; you are permitted to see that there is no trap-door so that he can disappear. An ordinary screen is brought, and you are permitted to examine the screen. When the screen is brought, a box also is brought with a canvas cover and a cord. Maskelyne goes inside the screen. The box is put there. The canvas cover and the cord are put there. Three or four of you are permitted to stand all round the screen, and they only make one condition, that you shall not look inside. After a little shuffling and scuffling, and a few minutes have gone, apparently nobody being in with Maskelyne, you are told you may remove the screen; and when you do, you find the box shut up, the canvas cover over it, and the cord tied on the outside; and when you have undone them all, Maskelyne is found inside the box. If that does not beat your spirits into fits, sir, I do not know what does. Maskelyne did not talk any nonsense about psychic force to do that with: he did not make any pretence of having some disembodied spirit to take him in and out. And I ask you for a moment, try to conceive the possibility of Spiritualism being true, and then suppose that a number of spirits, or some one spirit, would go with the Davenport Brothers, or people of this kind, all round the world, exhibiting at so much a-head. Why, if there were any one thing wanted more than another to stamp this thing as completely as it could be stamped, you have it in that. Now, I will say, suppose all these manifestations really to happen, and suppose none of them to be mere optical delusions—and I submit that some of them are very probably optical delusions—you know it is very easy to produce abnormal conditions of the senses, in which the line between sanity and insanity is very hard to draw. You may produce them by drugs very easily and temporarily; and by a peculiar phrase which fell from our friend, he said that in spirit circles, unless you had got the proper combination of temperaments, you might sit for hours, days, months—and if he added my experience, he might say for years, for I never got any of them. What is the proper combination of temperaments? What is the proper combination of temperaments when you want five or six little children to fancy that Old Bogey is behind the door? Why, how many little children have believed in Old Bogey over and over again, have not dared to go upstairs in the dark, have been frightened by old Bogey in the dark? There has just been the proper combination of temperaments to bring Old Bogey there. Suppose none of these cases to be optical delusions, and delusions are more plentiful than some would imagine. Take Mrs. Thwaytes's case, which was argued recently before the legal tribunals. That was a spiritual delusion. Johanna Southcote's was another. I only take cases which all you, friends, so much more intelligent than myself, will at once agree are delusions. I won't go into the question of delusions in the

particular anecdotes put before you. I only show you how delusions are very possible. And there is another matter. When you are not accustomed to the phenomenon which may be real, it is extremely easy to give a very unreal version of what does happen. Anyone dabbling in chemistry will tell you that. I confess, if we are to judge from the speech of my friend, I should think that he had dabbled very much in these things, without having the proper experience to draw the line between delusion and reality, and I will give you the proof of it in his own words. He said: "Mr. Bradlaugh has treated us to an essay on zoology." I was not aware of it; but perhaps that was the correct way of describing my first speech. I do not think others will come to that opinion when they read it. But he went on to talk about a theory of life; and this is what I want to comment on. He said: "We do not want a theory of life for fifty years to come." What, not the man who was telling you that there were two different kinds of life, one of which was sundered from the other! Why, such a man ought to be a Past Master in the theories of life before he advanced any such propositions as two kinds of life and their severance; and the man who could advance the proposition on the one hand and make that statement on the other, only shows that he has not learnt to weigh the value of the words he utters to you. Now, I say, that supposing all these things to be real, there being no possibility of delusion and none of sleight-of-hand, and all the witnesses competent, then they do not prove one whit in favour of the proposition, and our friend has not sought to connect them. It is not enough simply to throw out a proposition. For example: supposing he says that America is Asia, and then proves that Greenwich is on the other side of the Thames, that does not connect the one proposition with the other. He says man has got two natures; a banjo ran about the room and knocked Smith on the head: and he expects me to see the sequence. I confess I do not. Will you permit me for a moment to furnish you with a little of my own experience in reference to Spiritualism? It has been unfortunate, and I will take the first case first. I should mention, that with reference to Lottie Fowler's experiments, of which I have no personal knowledge, I have received a letter from a gentleman who was present last night, in which he says that at one of the seances, a light being suddenly lit while music was playing, one of the mediums, at any rate, was seen in the act of playing. I am reluctant to express any opinion for or against.

**Mr. BURNS:** Name.

**Mr. BRADLAUGH:** You will be at perfect liberty in your next speech to ask me for the evidence, and I shall be at perfect liberty to exercise my own judgment, and the audience, as to what course I take about it. I am not so young a debater that any calling "Name" would induce me to make any statement I did not want to. I only mention the mere matter just as I pass, and I mention expressly that I have no knowledge myself personally of Lottie Fowler, and no means of expressing any opinion; but I will say something now of Mr. Home. I was one of the Special Committee to sit with Mr. Home, and I am bound to say Mr. Home met me in the frankest manner possible. He told me I was one of the few people he wanted very much to see, and probably as my address was not known, and I am not a very public man in England, that was the reason he had not discovered me until I was placed on that

Committee. But I met him in the same frank spirit; and as he offered every opportunity for investigation, we took it, and the first evening we changed every shred of clothing he had on for some other. Perhaps that might have destroyed the proper combinations that were required, for we had not the slightest scintilla of anything. I sat with Mr. Home night after night, till Mr. Home was tired, and we had precisely the same result, except two things, which I will tell you. One was, that on one evening we fancied we heard taps. I got under the table. I pressed my thumb against the hard wood table, and there were taps as distinct as those with the pressure. I do not pretend that Mr. Home's taps were produced in that way. I am quite prepared to accept the possibility of raps without any sort of artificial means or any sort of delusion or trickery, but I am not prepared to connect the raps with spirits. Why, I was at Dr. Arthuis's in Paris a little while ago, in his consulting room; he professes to cure diseases by electricity. You might have heard raps all over his place while his machine was going. You could produce them of different density of sound according to the metals you used as conductors. I experimented with it, and the results were astonishing. I will tell you another thing. I will defy any person who does not know the exact spot where the rap is produced, by his unguided ear to relegate the sound to the exact place that the sound really comes from. It is the most delusive thing possible to relegate sounds in that way. The chairman tells me I have only now one minute, and I will therefore reserve my interesting experiences for my next speech.

#### MR. BURNS'S FIRST SPEECH.

MR. BURNS: I was afraid, ladies and gentlemen, that there had been some little misunderstanding between my opponent and myself, but I find we are now coming to some slight convergence in the method of handling this subject. I was thinking perhaps that instead of its being "Modern Spiritualism," it was the old question of spirit and matter, the old kind of philosophical view of creation as to whether the intelligent phenomena which we observe in the world were the result of matter, or whether the material and intelligent phenomena were the result of spiritual action. We may well set such a question aside, because this matter of Spiritualism may be discussed independently of that, although, philosophically speaking, it is necessarily a part of it. I may say that Spiritualists view creation as composed of two opposites. They consider that if the universe were a homogeneous mass, it would be impossible for any action to take place in that mass, and hence there could be no formation or phenomena of any kind. Therefore, they think that there is spirit and matter; the two are dependent upon each other for manifestation, and, indeed, for existence—yet, philosophically speaking, they are two; and the view that I gave of matter last evening, which is the opinion of scientists, is to the effect that matter itself is not a simple element, that you only see one of the phases of matter when you see it in its present state, but that there is really a life in matter, the same as there is in the nervous system of humanity, and that life is connected with peculiar laws and principles working and operating for the purpose of bringing about all the results that we see produced in creation, and which present a wonderful harmony, as

if there were one mind or one principle of intelligence manifesting itself through them all. Now, coming nearer to the subject, I showed that man had got two grades of functions, and showed that his organism was composed of two grades of matter. There is the body that we see, but there is the interior working forces which we do not see; and then there is that which controls that working force, making up three different conditions of existence in man's body, which is demonstrable to anyone who will take the trouble to observe. Again, by the power of the will over objects, like over a table, and by the power of clairvoyance and clairsaudience, and by the power of biology and impression upon other minds without the utterance of words, I showed that man has already all those functions which are attributed to spirits, and thus I made good my first proposition that man had really got two modes of function. I do not call it two natures; I say he has a psychical grade of function which brings him into relationship with psychical existence, and then he has got the physical instrumentality by which he is able to bring himself into harmony and sympathy with what we call, conventionally, the "material conditions" in which he is placed. That I made good in the remarks that I adduced to you last night. Now, without laying myself open to dishonesty, I am free to confess that seeing that these discoveries have been so recently made, and that so little is known about them, I am not in a position to advance a theory of life. I am not here with any such pretensions; I am simply here as the pioneer of a new science, of an entirely new branch of anthropology; and I am also free to confess that I may make many mistakes in the rambling remarks, and inferences, and observations that I advance, and it is the use of discussions like this to bring out those mistakes. Spiritualists, like all scientific men in their investigations, are correcting their mistakes from day to day, and the more they are criticised, and investigated, and put to it, the better they like it, because it points out to them the road to truth. Spiritualists have nothing to fear from investigation. Every person who is a Spiritualist to-day, once was not a Spiritualist, and would not have believed in it at all but for the fact that such and such a mind was induced to investigate the subject, and was thereby led to a definite result. Now, my purpose in my present speech is to try and substantiate the last proposition, and if I succeed, the second one must necessarily be true. Our friend asked, last evening, that I should give him the reasons why we suppose that spirits exist, and the reason why we suppose that spirits communicate. It is true that I brought forward a great many instances last evening, but I did not connect them. I did not labour for the purpose of connecting them in the way that I refer to this evening. I now bring you a short review of the various manifestations, but before I do so it is necessary for me to ask you, In what does a person's individuality or personality consist? What is individuality? What is personality? How do you know that this is Mr. Bradlaugh? How do you know that this is Mr. Burns? That is the first thing to settle. What does a man's individuality consist in? In the first place, a man's individuality consists in form, and in the other considerations that go along with form. Then after that it consists in manifestations. There are various manifestations. There is the manifestation of the voice; then after you have opened your mouth and spoken, there is the

connectedness between what you say now and what you said before. If a figure representing myself were to stand up here and speak with different voice and inatter and manner from what I did before, you could not possibly believe it was me. If the knowledge I gave, and seemed to possess, in past times when I appeared before you was not forthcoming with me, it would be just another "Tichborne case;" you would question me backwards and forwards to see if I were the right man or not. If I sent you a letter, you would know it came from me by the handwriting and the style; you would know by the manner and by the matter of that letter-writing. Even if I sent you a telegram from a foreign part, how would you know that that telegram came from me? You would know by no other means than by the relevancy of the message that was conveyed to you. It is necessary for us, friends, in order to be scientific, to keep this matter of personality strictly in our eye—and, indeed, to define it properly would take a great deal more time than is at my disposal. Now, spirit-communion is intercourse with a human being, and what is difficult in the matter, even granted by many Spiritualists, is the identity or personality of the communicating power. We will review a few of the ways in which those communications are received by Spiritualists, because it is my purpose, as far as time will allow me, to place the subject of Spiritualism entirely in your hands in the most open and ingenuous manner; I have no trick, and no reservation whatever to make. I wish I only had more time; but it would take many evenings to show you the *modus operandi* of every form of spiritual communion and all the attendant circumstances in such a light that you would be able to weigh the evidence as well as those who are accustomed; because, as my antagonist has very kindly noticed for me, those who are not accustomed to certain phenomena are liable to make mistakes in their explanation of them; and, indeed, we, who are much accustomed to such phenomena, find that we are making mistakes continually, and it is by those mistakes we learn the nature of that which we are handling. Now, the most simple way of communicating a personality is by pantomime, by gesture. Supposing I were a good mimic, I could act in such a way that you would say, "Oh, that is so-and-so—the very way he makes his face, the very way he expresses his words." Now, that is one form of spirit-communion. The lowest form of spirit-communion is what is called the personating medium, where there is pantomime exhibited. You go into the presence of a person you never saw before; all at once you see that person overcome by an influence, and he or she acts out the character; it may be a death scene, it may be some peculiar memorable event in the life of some person that is near and dear to you; and oftentimes these pantomimic actions occur in respect to people you have no knowledge of; you have to go and make inquiries before you can verify them, showing that it did not come of your own mind. The second form of communion is by telegraphy—this tilting of a table, which is considered to be so absurd. Where is there anything more absurd than for a person to sit in this way (leaning forward on the table), looking at a telegraph needle ticking backwards and forwards—what a silly, childish trick it is! This telegraph needle is just exactly like the movements of the table; you can use the table for a telegraph the same as the needle; and I may say I have never seen a frivolous manifestation connected with Spiritualism,

as I have never seen a frivolous phenomenon in nature. If the manifestations of Spiritualism are facts at all, they are facts in nature; and how dare we dictate to nature and say that she shall on any occasion be amenable to us as to whether it is right and proper for her to conduct herself so and so or not! I say, then, that while these spiritual manifestations can in the least degree present us with a problem that we cannot solve, we cannot, as reasonable people, afford to look upon them with disgust. Now, as to these signals; they are expressed by the tipping of the table and by the raps, and by the moving of objects—even by the moving of the human hand. The way in which this movement is conducted I explained last night—I gave you the philosophy of those physical manifestations—but it is entirely by the matter which is communicated, by the personality, which is evinced by these movements, that you attach any importance to them as relating to spiritual existence. If you go into a telegraph office the needle is going backwards and forwards, and you say to the clerk, "What are they saying? It seems to be all one character." "Oh," says the clerk, "that is nothing; that is simply calling a station, that is a code-signal for the station," and so it is that the table may move a great deal, and there may be nothing but simply the action of the forces necessary to move the table. But if you get messages through that table that are cognisable to you, they are just as important as if they were communicated in any other way whatever—a telegram that you attach as much importance to as if you had heard it spoken by the lips of the person from whom it came. Then the third way of communion is by symbol, by picture. This picture, or this symbol, can be conveyed in a number of ways. Our friend here spoke about the blue coat with buttons, and the ghost of those buttons, and of the thread that sewed them on, and all that sort of thing. Now, supposing a spirit can communicate, what would be the use of that spirit communicating by symbol if the symbol were not appropriate to the personality of the spirit? This has been very well explained by Mr. Varley at a meeting of the Dialectical Committee, where the Spiritualists attended and gave their evidence. If the symbol is made upon the sensitive brain biologically, we know quite well that it may be anything which is in the mind of the bioligiser; and if the spirit shows itself as a figure, it is just as easy for the spirit to show itself in one semblance as in another. It would have been just as easy for me to have come in fustian to-night as in this woollen coat, if I had so chosen it; and if we are to suppose that men can dress as they please in this condition of existence, are we to suppose that they have less power in manifesting themselves in another condition of existence? I am not going to carry your minds away into spiritual life, and tax you with the philosophy of existence there; that is a different question, but I simply lay that argument before you. Then the fourth way of control is by trance-speaking—the spirit entrances the medium. Supposing I were a mesmeriser and had a subject, by throwing my will-power upon that subject I could cause the subject to become another person; you have all seen the experiments of mesmerists, and I wish to show you that in speaking of all those methods of spirit-communion I am demonstrating to you that each one of them is in accordance with one or other law of nature. I have not time, of course, to descant upon each one; if I had time I

could prove it to the letter. I have to throw out my matter suggestively, for you to think upon as you may have opportunity. Now, this trance is effected simply in the same way that one person mesmerises another. I said last night that a human being had a certain fluid which connected his will with his organism. If you cut the nerve and intercept that fluid I cannot move my arm. But a spirit has a similar fluid—what the French philosophers call the *perispirt*—which surrounds the individuality of the spirit, just the same as there is a halo of nerve-atmosphere, as recorded by Dr. Richardson, surrounding the human body; and, as I explained last night, this atmosphere is the force of my body going off, which, under certain conditions, can be collected, and is available for the purpose of producing these manifestations. What is a medium, and what is meant by this matter of temperament which our friend has considerably misunderstood? We do not mean by temperaments in a spirit-circle people that are capable of believing “Bogey” stories; nothing of the sort. We mean, as I explained last night, those people that give off the peculiar form of magnetism necessary. A country fellow coming in would wonder why one piece of iron would be a magnet and another would not. So it is in this matter of Spiritualism. Certain people have the magnetic property; certain people have not the magnetic property. For instance, I am not one of that kind myself; our friend Mr. Bradlaugh is not one of that kind; neither of us is a medium. We are positives, and that is the reason we kick about and make such a row in the world, so fond of getting up upon platforms and hammering at it, when we might be comfortable at home or dozing about in some nice easy fashion. But there is another class of people in the world, the very opposite to Mr. Bradlaugh and myself, and those opposite people are mediums. The peculiarity of the medium is, that he gives off a magnetism with which the spiritual atmosphere surrounding the spirit may become intersphered—the *perispirt*, as the French call it, of the one becoming involved with that of the other, and then there is communion between the two: the volition—the will-power of the one—can control the organisation of the other. You know quite well that it is only certain people out of an audience that the biologist can draw up. Some fellow comes up of his own accord, and the biologist begins to operate upon him, but he gets operated upon—he “catches a Tartar,” that is, he gets somebody more positive than himself; and so it is that certain people of peculiar temperaments are alone capable of being affected by this biological influence, or, in other words, they are only capable of assimilating the magnetic influence that comes from the sphere of the spirit. This is entirely in accordance with the laws of mesmerism, which everyone now understands to be facts, although forty or fifty years ago I should have had to dispute them quite as much as I have to dispute this further advancement of the question now. By this trance-speaking a great deal of valuable matter has been given to the world. I tell you what it is, friends, it is as great a proof of spirit-communion as anything else, to go away down into some parts of the country, ay, and in parts of London also, and see a man or woman get up in an entirely unconscious state—for afterwards they do not know one word they have said,—people who cannot write their own name have never read a page of a book, have been brought up in the Christian religion,—and yet, when they are in this trance-state, they will give you

beautiful philosophical addresses, that people are glad to go many miles to hear; and when they touch upon theology, they are able to walk into the merits of our prevailing religion in a way which it would do our friend Mr. Bradlaugh good to hear. I have no time to dwell upon this phase of the manifestations; but here we have not only got a personality—sometimes personality accompanies those manifestations—but we have got a philosophy, and we have got a theology which that person never learnt in any form whatever, and hence you have got even a greater wonder than if you had merely individuality manifested. Then, the fifth method I might adduce to you is the automatic writing. By a similar process to that by which a mesmeriser can make a person's arm cataleptic, so can the spirit infuse its magnetism into the nervous passages of the arm and cause the medium to write by such means. I have had writing done on two different subjects with a pencil in each hand, the writer speaking to a third person at the same time. In that way I have seen quite a number of names written exactly as the persons wrote them when on earth, and yet the writer never saw the signatures of those persons; in fact, never heard of their existence. There is a little boy at Aylesbury who has got up, and in a sleepy state he has painted a whole gallery of pictures, and has written the autographs of a great number of people that he never heard of. He painted an exact *fac-simile* of that celebrated picture of Turner's, the Pilgrimage of Childe Harold, without knowing that there was such a picture in existence. He came up with his uncle to the Gallery to see if they could find the picture, and they also found another that he had done. If any person present wishes to see that affair, they need only go to Aylesbury, to Mr. Wilson's, the ironmonger, in the Market Square, and he will show them with all the pleasure possible. Then I might call your attention to a sixth method, and that is what is called impression. Certain people have the power of writing by impression. Look at all the poets, and all the men of genius; where do they get their ideas from? You sit down to write; you have no notion of what you are going to write; but you write a great deal, and when you read it over afterwards it is as new to you as to any other reader. That is writing by impression. This is no test, it is said to be genius; but I have yet to find out what genius is. But persons in this impressive state give utterance to matters of fact that are capable of being tested, and hence it is made to appear that these matters of fact have not originated in their own experience. Then there is the direct writing. Yes, the spirits write direct, without any person to hold the pencil or pen or anything. I was at a seance the other Sunday evening—wicked man!—down at Mr. Slater's, a man of considerable acquirements in science, Mr. Slater, the optician in the Euston Road, and there we had two messages written upon a slate, without any person holding the pencil. There was a small slate ruled with red lines, on the one side across, and on the other long ways. A little bit of slate pencil was bitten off the point of a pencil and placed upon that slate. The slate was seen to be clean. Mr. Slater and Mr. Holmes went into an improvised cabinet where there was sufficient light for them to see the slate. The one held the slate at the one side, the other at the other, and they held each other's hands. We sat, and in a little while we heard the scratching of a pencil; one side got written on, and the slate was turned over and the other side was written on.

I will read you the matter that came upon it. If any of you wish to see this thing done, you can go and see it any day you like; you have simply to put a little bit of slate-pencil on the table, and the slate on the top of it, so as to keep out the light, because these matters occur where physical light is not in action (laughter). If you will explain to me what you are laughing at, you will tell me something I do not know. Perhaps you cannot. I will tell you why this darkness is necessary. You will observe that the power, the instrumentality which handles those objects, is made up of a subtle magnetic fluid; you will also be aware that light comes to the eye, and goes all through space in certain rapid vibrations; the vibrations of light interfere with the coherency and the formation of the psychical element, and hence you cannot get those manifestations in the light. You are all aware the rogue of a fellow that takes your portraits by photography goes into a mysterious dark closet, and does certain things there; so there are other rogues in the world besides Spiritualists, it is very lucky (applause). I am going to read to you what was on one side, and then what was on the other side of the slate. "Matter, power, spirit, each points to the other, and each finds in the other its fulfilment. But spirit is the root of all things—the invisible creator of nature—eternally the same, while the creature is ever undergoing fresh changes. Spirit is uncreated and self-existent. Nature and all in it exist and perish. Nature is the garb of spirit, sometimes seen in rays, sometimes clothed in the royal garments of majesty. But nature is never more than a covering, a form, a type, a perishable image of an imperishable Being. Only Spirit and Revelation are real. Matter and force, life and act, have only value and significance because therein spirit makes itself known and develops its eternal existence. Man even is dust, and nothing without spirit." On the other side was written—this is different theology, showing that two persons wrote these communications:—"The same process of philosophy that materialises spirit also spiritualises matter. We lose nothing in giving up the old ideas of immateriality if we still hold that matter is cunning enough to produce consciousness, thought, affection, and will. Names are of no consequence. If the latest thinkers choose to call the thing that manifests these phenomena nervous fluid, or ether, or force, or tissue under the play and vibration of a combination of forces, I do not see in this language any danger of our shocking our old-fashioned souls. Matter or dynamical machinery that is capable of personality is very likely to have also the faculty of immortality. Good night, dear friends, Doctor."

#### MR. BRADLAUGH'S SECOND SPEECH.

MR. BRADLAUGH: I suppose it is utterly useless calling my friend's attention to the fact that I have repeatedly defined the words I use; that he repeatedly uses the same words, and in an entirely different sense, without giving the slightest explanation. If our friend's ability to judge of a "beautiful philosophical address" may be estimated from the manner in which words have been thrown about in this discussion, I am afraid we can hardly accept his doctrine that beautiful philosophical addresses are delivered by the spirits. Nor do I follow him in his

illustration of the Aylesbury boy. Suppose it to be true that the Aylesbury boy copied exactly Turner, how does that prove that man has two natures, and that one of them is sundered from the other at death, and that one afterwards exists? You might as well say, because a cartload of cabbages costs 6d., 5 cwt. of turnips will cost 2s. 3½d. I assure you, there is just as much connection between one proposition and the other—(a hiss)—and the person who hisses simply shows that he may have spirits, but has not brains. Permit me to say that our friend is so utterly forgetful of everything that has passed in this debate, that he took the pains, in a roundabout way, to tell you how you could distinguish an individual, when that was one of the very first things I did in the course of my speech in defining the way in which you distinguish one mode of existence from another. I took great pains—you may remember the illustrations I used, of horse, man, glass, tree—because I knew how far it would bear upon this debate. Our friend entirely forgets it, because, if he remembered it, he ought to have shown where he objected; and in roundabout words, without troubling to say what he means, he talks of halo, of spirit, and spirit-spheres, and a lot of words which might as well be mumbo jumbo, for all sorts of purposes of argument or logic conveyed in them. Suppose it to be perfectly true that upon his arm, or upon some piece of paper, something was written, he did not know how, or upon a slate, in equally mysterious fashion, how, in any sort of sense, has he connected that with his proposition that man has two natures, and that at death one of them is sundered from the other? There has not been even the semblance of an attempt; and I do complain that after a debate has lasted three hours, we should be just in the same position as we were when we started. Do not forget our friend has not yet told you to what class of animals he limits this; whether it is limited to men, to some races of men, or to other animals; he has carefully avoided every point I put in the beginning, and to tell me at last, that the question of whether there is only one existence, or whether there are two, whether there is what you call spirit and what you call matter, or whether there is only one substance, is not a matter that we need inquire into in this debate, is certainly about as ridiculous a statement as it would be possible to make in discussing Spiritualism, because, if the logic of the beginning shuts out the possibility of spirit, it is no use discussing it afterwards on any sort of mere inconsequential illustration. Well, then, our friend says, and I want, if I can, to deal with it without putting my own view too forcibly, he says it is just the same, taking his own illustration, as telegraphy, one of the means of communication. Supposing you went into a telegraph office, and you saw the needle moving about; well, you would not understand that, no—if you knew nothing about it you would not; and if you knew nothing about it, and the operator told you it was a spirit brought the message, you would be as likely to believe him as you would the operator who took a slate into a cabinet. But I take exception to your doctrine that the electric telegraph has never brought more important messages than spirit-telegraphy. If spirit-telegraphy will bring the price of corn, if spirit-telegraphy will foretell a storm that is coming, if spirit-telegraphy may be utilised for any of the ordinary purposes of life, then I can understand the argument. But I must confess—and here I have another proof of my

friend's honesty, although not of his discretion—I must confess I admire his notion of the way a debate ought to be conducted. He says, "We won't discuss the old question of spirit and matter," but he tells you what the scientist's views of matter are—they do not happen to be any I have ever heard before, and I have studied a little about matter and force, and so on, from Buchner, Vogt, Priestley, Moleschott, and others, taking Spinoza as my master—they do not happen to be included in any of those. And then he says, what? "Oh, there is a wonderful harmony, showing all one mind." Oh, but you might have taken some trouble to prove that, if it was any good to your case. Where is the harmony in an avalanche? Where the harmony in a shipwreck? Where the harmony in an earthquake? Where the harmony in the eruption of Mount Vesuvius? I object to words being pitched out without the slightest thought as to what they mean. If that is the sort of thing you get in your beautiful philosophical addresses at the spiritual seances, I do not wonder at your being pleased with them, nor at the results as they manifest themselves here, but I would suggest it is possible to improve upon them. Well, then, our friend asked, "What is genius?" Well, in a country where Shakespeare has lived, and near where Voltaire wrote, it would be possible to give you illustrations that might serve you; but with a man like Winslow, or Maudsley, to guide you, he will tell you that all that you call genius must result from an organisation, and a development of that organisation; an education of it built up, little by little, and little by little; and when you tell me that any of your spirits will put into man, and out of man, that which has never come within the range of his perception, I tell you, you simply utter words that have no sort of weight. And what on earth has clairvoyance or animal magnetism to do with your position, or electro-biology, or somnambulism? In any medical hospital they will give you very many instances of clairvoyance in connection with somnambulism, which very often occur to female patients in particular stages of their life. It is one of the commonest class of extraordinary phenomena that we have to deal with; but what sort of connection has that with your proposition that man has two natures on earth, and that one of those is sundered from the other? and even in your last speech you did not tell us which it was that was got rid of. You have carefully refrained from giving us the slightest opinion that can enable us to understand what you yourself meant—supposing, by a stretch of fancy, that you yourself know what you mean in dealing with it. Well, now, if you please, let us test this matter. Our friend has talked of invisible things, spirit being invisible. Last night he told us steam was invisible, and I heard a great number of his friends applaud it. ("So it is.") Some gentleman says, "So it is." Well, probably we do not mean the same. By steam I mean the elastic fluid which is created by the continuous application of heat to water, and I say that the steam is seen in the form of vapour, and that vapour is not one thing, and steam another—(applause)—and I say that if the gentleman who interrupts me would not get his own steam up, he would do better, because when the steam is got up without the safety-valves, then there is an explosion. I say that there was never a more ridiculous point put than to say that vapour is seen, and steam is not. (A voice: "Steam is invisible.") If you tell me so, all right; it won't

make my opinion different. We clearly do not mean the same by "steam." (The voice: "Steam is invisible.")

The CHAIRMAN: I must draw the attention of the meeting to one of the rules, and that is, that the right of addressing the meeting is confined to the debaters, and myself on a point of order.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Whether steam be visible or not, patience clearly is not amongst some of my opponents, but the man who tells you as an illustration of invisibility that steam is invisible, I say, with any ordinary chemist's definition to guide me, tells you that which is not accurate; because I say that vapour, as our friend expresses it, is but the state of the water when the steam is created, and that steam and vapour are not two distinct things which can be spoken of. Steam is the vaporisation of the water. ("No.") And if you say "No" fifty times it may satisfy you, because we find that noes do satisfy some people; but I beg you first, if you please, to go home, put the kettle upon the fire, and experiment, instead of experimenting in making a meeting disorderly. Now the next point that I want to draw attention to is, that our friend said in his speech last night, that matter was the result of force. He did not say what he meant by force, nor did he say that he meant by matter anything different from what I have said. Seeing that matter was the result of force, I want to know whether he means by that, that force preceded the existence of matter; and, if so, he should give some explanation of his conception of the precedent state of force before matter yet existed. I will not weary you with any sort of belabouring of that point as the matter stands now, and I confess that I feel in the difficulty, that unless one simply turns the matters that have been put to you into utter jocularity, there is nothing whatever that remains for the discussion here. Because I do not want to be reduced to the position of having to admit or deny whether something happened in St. Luke's Asylum over the way, or not, I am content for the purpose, without disputing the occurrences of the things, to take them for our friend's argument, and I ask him to show me the connection between those and the propositions he has put to you. To relate to you that some boy did something somewhere is no more than relating that Houdin or Professor Anderson did something somewhere else, and is not to have them connected with the position which our friend is bound to prove. The onus does not lie upon me to account as to how some slate was written upon, or how some man tied or untied himself; the onus lies upon our friend to show that that is the result of what he calls Spiritual influence, and to make it clear to you in dealing with it.

#### MR. BURNS'S SECOND SPEECH.

Mr. BURNS: I have abstained from trying to convince my friend Mr. Bradlaugh, about steam and vapour, and other matters, because I think he has quite as good a right to have his own opinion about these things as I have. I am one of the freest of Freethinkers, and I do not care a couple of straws how much Spiritualism Mr. Bradlaugh, or any friend before me, believes in; it will not alter my position a bit in regard to the matter. I do not know whether there is anything significant about it or not, but I am very sorry to see the varied tactics of my friend Mr.

Bradlaugh, and also his great acquaintance with mad-doctors. I have not been able to get so deeply into the secrets of that malicious set of beings, who are perhaps the greatest scourges of the country; and I hope, if Mr. Bradlaugh gets nearer to the reins of Government, he will cause a great revision of those statutes affecting lunacy, because there are hundreds of people with psychological faculties in a state of abnormal action, and they are locked up in lunatic asylums, whereas, if they were properly trained and developed, they would turn out to be very useful members of society. I wish to direct your attention for a few minutes to the proof that these influences come from spirits. For instance, we talk with spirits face to face, and we see spirits face to face. Let me give you an illustration. We sit together in the seance, jolly, talking, enjoying ourselves; immediately we hear five or six other people taking part in the conversation, and we find that these other people have been in different places during the day from what we have been. One can tell us what was taking place perhaps in New York, another perhaps in some part of England or Scotland, or up and down the country in that way. Now, if a thing can speak, it ought to be able to tell what it is, and who it is, and where it came from; and these spirits are not things that allow us to judge about them, but they tell us exactly what they are and who they are, and they give us their credentials in such a way that every person who has investigated the subject thoroughly has come to the conclusion, ay, and are coming to the conclusion in hundreds and thousands every week, that these manifestations are the work of spirits. It is not a matter of logic at all; it is simply a matter of fact. How much logic would it take to prove the existence of Bethnal Green, or even the existence of Mr. Burns or Mr. Bradlaugh? The only way that you can prove the existence of those spots on the face of the earth is to become practically acquainted with them. I wish to say a word or two more about direct writing, to show you that that writing does come from a mentality, from an individuality; and in giving the characteristics of individuality our friend Mr. Bradlaugh entirely left out the characteristics of the individual man, the highest individual with which we are acquainted. He spoke about the horse, and so on; he might also have spoken about the man, but it was in such a categorical way that we cannot put our finger upon his definition of individuality as it applies to the power of the human mind. I have some cards before me, which are photographs of other cards, and those other cards were written upon by a human being, who did not possess a body of the same kind as you and I possess, and they were written under test conditions as follows. Four or five gentlemen tried this experiment. The investigator is desired to proceed thus:—Here is a card; pinch a bit out of the corner of it and put it into your purse. You do so. Put the card down; and as darkness is the condition, you turn out the gas. In two minutes after you have turned out the gas, you turn it on again; you find the card lying written with an inscription in Hebrew, in Greek, and in Latin. But you say, "Is this the same card? Is it not a card that has been brought into the place surreptitiously somehow?" But you take out the little crumb from your purse, and you fit it in—for you tore it off in a peculiar way; you fit it in, and you find it is really the same card. This kind of manifestation has been tried time after time; and if you can imagine a number of people sitting together who know nothing but indifferent

English and Scotch; if you find a number of people so constituted sitting together, and getting a writing in those three languages, and, at a subsequent sitting, one in German as well; why, then, if you can suppose that such comes from anything but a human mind, I do not know what the characteristics of individuality are. There is every characteristic of individuality apparent. If you got a letter by post, who would you suppose wrote it? And if that letter was written in a certain language, would you not suppose that it was written by some person who knew the language? And if the persons present, when that writing took place, did not know the language, would you not confess that there was an intelligent being at work that used that language? There does not seem to be any other mentality than human intelligence that we have been able to discover in our acquaintance with nature. As to this writing, I will give you a combined illustration. One evening I sat for experiments where there were three clairvoyants present, because we have heard a good deal about the senses being beguiled, and one clairvoyant might be under a hallucination, and it is well to check the experience of one person with that of another; the more senses you can bring to bear upon any phenomenon, it does not matter what it is, the greater certainty there is as to the nature of that phenomenon. One evening we were sitting at Mr. Everett's, No. 26, Penton Street, Islington. Now, Mr. Everett is not a "Wizard of the North," he is not an Anderson; he is simply a tradesman, who is desirous of gaining knowledge, and is hospitable enough to open his doors now and again for friends to come in, and in addition to giving them instruction, he sometimes gives them a little supper, and so that is all he gets out of the transaction. We sat there one night for the purpose of making experiments, and there was a voice talking to us, conversing away with us just the same as we would converse with each other, answering our questions and discussing with us, and telling us all about himself, and in every way comporting himself like a human being. In a little while one of the clairvoyants said, "See! there is something up at the ceiling." Another said, "Yes, there is an arm." Another one says, "Oh! there is something standing on the table." Then it is said, "Oh! it is writing on the ceiling." They all three corroborated each other spontaneously; there could be no chance of the idea of one mind being affected by the action of the other. We struck a light; we looked, and we found the name "John Watt" written upon the ceiling in a large hand, without any human being present having written it, as we all sat closely together in such a way that it would have been impossible for such a thing to have been done. There are a number of people present in this hall who have seen that manifestation. Then, again, I have to speak a word or two about the materialisation of spirits. I spoke of that last night. It is supposed to be a great miracle to see such things—for a spirit to communicate, and for those manifestations to take place, that seem to be so prodigious in the estimation of my friend. But there is no miracle about them at all; they are all a necessity of human existence, and they are all in accordance with the usual modes of human existence; for, indeed, you see a materialised spirit before you now. I am a human being, and I have got a solid, material body. What is this solid, material body composed of? It is capable of being resolved into the elements that may exist in this

atmosphere, with the exception of certain minerals, which also can be volatilised. Hence, you can reduce the human body into an impalpable ether. What is it that has brought this human body together? What fortuitous circumstance has brought those atoms together, and what is continually bringing them together? We talk about death; but we are dying every moment of our lives. What is death, but simply the man throwing off certain elements, that is all, and he keeps continuing taking others on; but when once the power of attraction is overcome by the power of repulsion, repulsion takes place quicker than attraction, till at last the equilibrium is lost, and then the connection with the body is severed. How is the spirit materialised? I told you of the *perispirt* around the intelligent principle which constitutes the essential of a man. This *perispirt* is the thing that connects my intelligence with the external world, through the medium of my body. My body is the instrument; and speaking of the person with the injured brain, our friend says, "Oh, if the man had a smashed brain, what would be the consequence?" I say, "Oh, if you had a mote in your eye, what would be the consequence?" You could not see out of it till you had the mote removed; of course you could not, but the man was there all the time, only he had not the opportunity of manifesting in that particular way. The body is simply the instrument of the man, and if you derange the action of the instrument, of course it is of no use to the man. This materialisation of spirits, then, is carried on in the same way as the materialisation which we see in everyday life. The spirit is the positive principle; the spirit is the magnetic element. As I said, it requires two elements in nature to cause form. We want the force. All force is spiritual, and the effect of all force is material. That is just the difference between them. No person ever saw force. The forces of the magnet cannot be seen. Matter is simply an indication of force—simply an indication of action; and the more you think of and discuss the matter, you will see that that is genuine philosophy, given upon that slate without any excogitation or quotation whatever. The spirit is the magnetic principle, the positive element, the constructor, and the will of that spirit is such that when it comes into an atmosphere where the proper elements exist, it can absorb into its periphery those material elements that are there floating, and it can individualise itself materially in the very same way as we individualise ourselves materially, and from the very same elements. The medium, in whose presence this manifestation is capable of occurring, gives off the protoplasm—something nearer to protoplasm than Professor Huxley has discovered; the protoplasm of protoplasm—the nerve ether, that goes to make that protoplasm that Huxley talks of. The spirit can gather that out of the atmosphere, and out of the body of the medium, more particularly if that medium is in a deep comatose condition at the time, and sometimes the experiment robs that person of so much power that he is not able to control his nervous system afterwards, because of the drain made upon it. I leave out of the question the prudence of doing those experiments, but there is many a thing done in surgery and in science that it would not do for people to engage in every day of their life. Surgeons get cut with poisoned knives, and that kind of thing. We cannot be all anatomists, we cannot be all dissectors; hence, we need not be all mediums; but we may profit by the sacrifices of those who put themselves into such positions for our information.

## MR. BRADLAUGH'S CONCLUDING SPEECH.

MR. BRADLAUGH: I have arrived now at my last speech. Our friend has not told us all through the debate whether Spiritualism applies to any other animals than man, or whether it is limited to any races of men, and I complain that it is most unfair to leave me in that position, because I challenged it most clearly at the beginning. I ask how can you expect him to be able to relate to you the proceedings at a spiritual seance accurately, when he could not remember my speech of last night, and has actually told you I had not defined man, or said but very little about him, dealt with other things instead, when I devoted a long portion of my speech to the definition of man, his vitality, and his intellectual vitality. If our friend simply has not a memory for it, then how are we to judge of his memory even for relating spiritual seances to you? I will not suggest that he wished to misrepresent me in any way; I do not think he did, but see how painful it is to me when I have endeavoured at any rate to state a class of arguments, and when our friend talks just as though not one of them had fallen from me at all. Then our friend says, "Mr. Bradlaugh seems to be very familiar with mad-doctors." To whom should you go to study the mind but to those who have devoted themselves to the study of the mind? If I had gone to a veterinary surgeon, or to a civil engineer, I might have been wrong, but for mental phases, and the careful examination of them, the only men you can go to are those who have studied them in their abnormal as well as their normal conditions. Well, but does Mr. Burns understand the value of one phrase which drops from him? I am inclined to believe not. He says a thing is not a matter of logic, but a matter of fact, and he gives you the illustrations of what he considers matters of logic and matters of fact. He says you could not prove the existence of Bethnal Green by logic. If that is true, then I have got to unlearn everything I have learnt, and learn everything over again. I thought there was only one proposition which was above and beyond logic, and that was to each individual the fact of his own existence, and that only, because the very office and nature of testimony is to make a matter more clear after you have given the testimony than it was before you commenced. I do not wonder at people being Spiritualists, if our friend is a fair example of the sort of judgment that is brought to bear upon them. Now let us, in order to test the logical faculty, take one of his own illustrations. He says a card is written on in Hebrew, Greek, and some other languages. He says, suppose that none of the people there understood any of those languages. But why should I suppose that, to begin with? It is very good of you to suppose it, but why should I? How would you account for a card written on in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin? How account for it? By the ability of some person to write upon it, or some machine to print upon it. You say we are to be guided by the teachings of experience, and you pretend that the conditions which operate upon your body are the conditions always operating. Then by my experience there is the answer; and if you appeal to experience it is the only answer you can get. And what do your spirits write? Is it anything that is of the slightest utility of any kind? or a bold hash-up of a bit of some book or another, which was not understood by the man who wrote it on the slate, and who made non-

sense of it in the act of writing? I protest against reasonable men being dealt with in this way. And then our friend put it that he stood in the same position here with a new thing as Mesmer did with magnetism fifty years ago. It is not true. Spiritualism is as old as the world, but Spiritualism represents the infancy and ignorance of the world, and not the education of it. In the infancy of the world there was a spirit in every brook, a spirit in every mountain, a spirit in every tree, a spirit in every lightning-flash, a spirit in every storm. People who could not take the pains to inquire into the "how," manufactured the spirit as the efficient cause for it. Now, if I had been present when those cards were done, I would have tried to have found out how. I might not have succeeded, because I have seen Houdin perform, and I have not found out how he did his tricks. I attended Maskelyne's experiment, and I did not find out how; but it was the man's business, and he behaved much better to me than Davenport did. Now I sat with the Davenports. They said: "You must sit in the dark; you must hold Mr. Fay's hands one side, and Mr. Ira Davenport on the other." I said, "But why?" They said, "The spirits might hurt you." I said, "I will take the risk of that." I thought I was able to tackle the two Davenports myself, and there was only that question of Mr. Fay. They said, "If you do not submit to the conditions, there can be no manifestation." "Very well," I said, "then I will see the performance, but you must not expect me to express an opinion upon it." I ask you whether that is the kind of way to deal with science. To a scientific subject every test is lawful, and laudable, and proper, and I feel pained when I remember the investigations that have been conducted, and the sort of wretched hash that is given of them here, as though they were spiritual manifestations. Why, Reichenbach, in his book published twenty-five years ago, has collected a series of matters of much greater value, and things have been advanced by Engledue and Elliotson and others, thirty years ago, in ways which have been made useful to science. But is there one shadow of a pretence that any one of these things has been made in the slightest degree useful? Your telegraphy, what does it bring? Your writing on cards, what does it bring? Your people who chalk names on the ceilings, what do they tell? I can understand this to be paltry conjuring; but when you tell me it is the grand genius of the world, not susceptible of the conditions of the body, able to act independently, coming to teach lessons to human kind, I am obliged to say there is not one of your facts that will bear investigation. And there was one point you must not forget. You accorded that I was not likely to be a medium. You quoted Tichborne. Do you remember one sort of classification he made of men in the world, in the course of his cross-examination? He divided them into men who were able to take care of themselves, and men who were not; and I complain that men should have these stories told to them without the ability to judge of them, as though they were fact. To be told that Mr. Home went in at one window and out at the other; to be told that Mrs. Guppy came through the roof; to be told that live lobsters have been pitched into people's laps,—why I urge that out of Bedlam statements were never made more monstrous. And you cannot blame me for the line this debate is taking. I was willing to have tried it on purely logical grounds. I did not in my opening speech introduce one element which could lead up to a thing.

of this kind. I carefully refrained from using one phrase which could mislead. I was willing to have dealt with such phenomena as you would attribute to electricity or magnetism so far as you wanted to have used them; but I say, without fear of contradiction, that there is not one definition I have given, not one of the arguments I have put before you, that you have condescended to deal with, and you have gone on telling a lot of anecdotes as though they were answers to the whole thing. And when you tell me that mad-doctors are the scourge of the country, I cannot even accept such a proposition. When I find amongst the pauper population of the country insanity upon the increase; when I find that that insanity is in the chief the result of bad food, and bad shelter, and bad clothing; when I find in our counties the lunatic asylums beginning to rival the workhouses, I say it requires a different kind of dealing with than to utter grand sentences like that; and I protest, in the name of the platform upon which I speak, against the using of words without some thought as to the meaning they are intended to convey. I do not complain that our friend is in any sort of fashion lacking in honesty, because I believe him to be as thoroughly honest as any man I ever met; but I do believe that he has plunged over head and ears amongst a lot of words of which he does not understand the value at all; that he has accepted things without taking the trouble to weigh them or examine them. Why, in chemistry, in any one of the sciences, if he had dealt with his experiments in the same fashion, where would he have been? Why, what has he told you, to give you a proof that he does not in any way understand what he is dealing with? He does this. He says, we teach the doctrine that there are two opposites, spirit and matter. He has not taken the trouble to define to you spirit; he has not grumbled at my definition of matter, although that precluded the possibility of two existences at all. I do not pretend he ought to have been bound by my definitions; but if he considered those wrong, he ought to have given you a different sense, and shown you whether they were. Where does this matter stand? Modern Spiritualism pleads by our friend, and it is not enough for him to say that he is unversed in debate. He has lectured scores, if not hundreds, of times upon this subject; he is one of the teachers amongst his friends; he is the editor of *Human Nature* and the *MEDIUM*; he at any rate stands in the accepted position of being able to express the opinion of Spiritualists to the world. And it is not a question of a man coming here to defend a cause. He says: "We challenge investigation." What is the use of challenging investigation if, when questions are put to you, you answer not one of them? Why, on the very point our friend put, he said that they contended for a sunderance. I say, if you contend for a sunderance, do you contend for a union at birth, or what do you mean? Do you contend for pre-existence, as well as after-existence? Not one solitary word has he deigned to say in explanation of it; nor has he yet told you, although he spoke of animal life, physical life, and psychical life, whether he considers that the animal life ceases with the death. If he tells you in the last speech, it will be manifestly unfair, because other arguments would have turned upon it. I did not let one minute pass; I challenged him the moment it fell from him; and I ask you, as grave men, if this were a question for a jury; if fifty shillings depended on the verdict you have to give; if it was one of the most trivial incidents

of your life, I ask you, would you, upon the sort of matter that has been submitted to you, give in a verdict in favour of our friend? He brings you a card. He does not know how it was written, and he says a spirit wrote it. When I deal with his own illustration of Rosie, he has carefully avoided going to it again, although I put questions upon it. I ask you, judge this matter, and judge it properly. The delusion is able to spread, and does spread. There have been all sorts of delusions; in the time of Henry and Louis there were miracles worked at the cemetery till the decree of the King forbade the working of them any longer. Nothing is more contagious than mental delusion. You may persuade yourselves in the dark into a variety of things; and there is no darkness greater than we meet in the broad daylight by the men who shut their eyes to the lights of science around. I have occupied my time. I do not regret having entered into this debate, but I do regret that it has not been in any fashion followed from the line I laid for it. (Applause.)

#### MR. BURNS'S CONCLUDING SPEECH.

MR. BURNS: We are just getting into the heat of this question. (Laughter and hisses.) Our friend Mr. Bradlaugh is tremendously anxious to get a great deal of it circumvallated. Now, I prefer to take time. It is very likely that if he pleases we may have more of this kind of thing, because, as he throws out, there are a great many other ways in which the question could be discussed. I am going to agree with him in one particular, and that is that any person who has not an acquaintance with those manifestations, and would go away from this hall believing them from what I have said, such a person would not be acting prudently, and say I agree with Mr. Bradlaugh that any person who goes away, and upon my testimony believes in things beyond his experience, is a fool. I have never asked any lady or gentleman here to believe in things because I have said them. I simply give you the results of my experience, that it may be a plea for you to make some effort to extend your experience, unless it be that we are to go and ask Mr. Bradlaugh what is and what is not, and be tied down to his definitions. It is quite probable that there are more things in heaven and in earth than have entered into the subject-matter of Mr. Bradlaugh's propositions; at least I find that such is the case, and I am very glad indeed to see that in the course of this debate a great many matters have been opened up to me for my further investigation and verification. As to scientific tests, they are of a very difficult kind, and our friend Mr. Bradlaugh, in making tests of psychological matters, requires to bear in mind what kind of psychological influence he sets to work while he is making his test. If he was making a test with nitrate of silver, he would have to be very careful what kind of elements he put in, or he would destroy the combination at once. In a psychological matter the tests are equally precise and scientific. I will give you an instance. I said I had a very positive temperament. The other day I saw a manifestation of spirit forms in the daylight. Seven spirits were there, and talked to us and spoke to us—(interruption).

MR. BRADLAUGH: I trust our friends will not express any dissent; it is not fair. Still, I do say that no new matter of fact should be introduced into a speech which I cannot deal with. Everything that

is said now, by the rules of all fair debate, must have relation to what has passed before during the debate.

Mr. BURNS: There is no new manifestation whatever; it is the very same thing that I have been discussing the philosophy of during my last address. I was going to give you an illustration of scientific test. Now, during this manifestation there was a spirit calling himself John King.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: I object to any new matter of fact, and that is new matter of fact. John King has not been alluded to in the previous speeches.

Mr. BURNS: The spirit manifesting himself could not bear the sight of certain persons' eyes. Dr. Dixon was there; there was also a lady who is present, and other ladies were there; they looked at this form—

Mr. BRADLAUGH: I really must rise to order. This is all new matter, which I have no opportunity of dealing with.

Mr. BURNS: It is not of any great importance to me. I will come to the point. The point was the matter of a test, but I wished to tell you the circumstances, which are just the same as the other circumstances I have related. You will observe that there is nothing particularly new except the test which our friend has brought forward, and he is very anxious I should refer to the things that he touches upon. To show you the delicacy of this matter: the rays of magnetism coming from the eyes of the person now addressing you caused that materialised form to melt away, while it was being looked at by several pairs of eyes. This instance itself shows you how difficult the matter is for investigation, and our careful we ought to be in going into the question of test. As to Elliotson, and all those gentlemen that have been named, we are quite well aware of their experiments; we do all the experiments that they wrote of in their voluminous books, week in and week out continually. As to the utility, the *cui bono* of Spiritualism, why, this is the subject of a debate in itself; I have not had time to touch upon that. I have employed the time in laying the necessary foundation for considering that question; and as to the history of Spiritualism, and the use it has been to society from the early records of history, there is also a great deal to be said upon that. Of course it is very easy for our friend Mr. Bradlaugh to say it is the juvenility of humanity; but when I look at the "children" who are Spiritualists, and the big people who are not Spiritualists, I do not see such an overawing condition of mind in the one compared with the other; and I ask you, who has cited the greatest number of facts, and introduced the greatest number of scientific considerations, and has brought forward the greatest number of new truths in this debate? And again, I wish to call attention to the fact that I have established my three propositions, and therefore I have put out of court the propositions and the pleadings of my friend who opened the debate. I showed you last evening that man had two sets of faculties, and that there were clearly two conditions of matter entering into man's organic circumstances. Then this evening I have shown you that those intelligences, those individualities, those identities that lived with us as men and women, and have been separated from us by death, are capable of coming back amongst us in a great number of ways, and proving to us that they do exist, and establishing their individuality in

every way possible. We can handle them, they can touch us, we can see them, we can hear them, they can lift things about; we can see them in the organic state, we can see them in the psychical state, we can identify them from descriptions of people who do not know them, and have no idea of their individuality, and we can know them by long acquaintance with them. We have every proof of the existence of spirits that we have of the existence of human beings, and that proof I have adduced to you during this debate. As to the matter of Spinoza, &c., it is a notorious fact that Spinoza proves every one of my positions in his "Ethics."\* He proves immortality, he proves the existence of the spiritual essence which is claimed by some Spiritualists. I am not much of a reader myself. (Laughter.) As I told you, I am a hard-working man, but I have read enough to know that Spinoza is entirely with me as regards the spiritual philosophy. He is not with me as regards apparitions: he did not believe in psychological phenomena, as they manifestly were not invented, as the Yankee said, in his day, at least they were not then understood, but Spinoza was entirely of my philosophy. And now a word to conclude. Our friend Mr. Bradlaugh is, I suppose, a Secularist, and I am a Spiritualist; and yet, barring the difference that I admit a certain number of facts in nature that he rejects, we are both alike in almost every other detail. I hold before me here the "Principles, Objects, and Rules" of the National Secular Society, and to the whole of these I am ready to subscribe in every iota. And I would say further, that there is no possible collision between those facts of psychology and the principles of Secularism. There can be no possible collision. Why, the greater number of my friends, up and down the country, have once been Secularists. I have Mr. Shepherd, of Liverpool, taking the chair for

---

\* During this debate I avoided parading my merits in any way, that the cause of truth might the more signally triumph unaided by adventitious circumstances. Hence I did not boast of my reading or erudition, which I am free to say are sadly defective. I had only seen Spinoza's "Life, Letters, and Ethics" for a few hours one evening, when a friend left it, yet the principles of that great thinker sufficiently impressed my mind to enable me to make use of the expressions in the text. I have since procured a copy of the work (21s.), from which time and space prevent me from quoting fully. Ethics, Part I. "Of God," is an argument to show "that God is the First Cause absolutely" (Prop. 16, Coroll. 3); that "besides God no substance can exist, or be conceived to exist" (Prop. 14); "that attribute is that which the understanding apprehends as the essence of substance" (Prop. 9); "that the extended thing and the thinking thing—thought and extension—are either attributes of God or are modes or affections of the attributes of God" (Prop. 14, Coroll. 2); "that the Absolutely Infinite Entity or Being is necessary to be defined as the Being consisting of an infinity of attributes, each of which expresses a certain eternal and infinite essence" (Prop. 10, Scholium); "that everything which by its nature may exist in numbers, must necessarily have a cause for its existence external to itself" (Prop. 8, Schol. 2). In the same Scholium, Spinoza observes: "I do not doubt but that they who judge of things *confusedly*, and are not accustomed to apprehend things by their first causes, will find some difficulty in understanding the demonstration of our seventh proposition. The difficulty here arises from the distinction between *modifications* of substances and *substances* themselves being overlooked, and from ignorance of the way in which things are produced." In the Scholium to Prop. 15 it is argued that "all who have ever thought of the Divine nature in any proper way deny that God is corporeal." In the reasoning involved in these quotations, my assumption that Spinoza is of my philosophy is abundantly substantiated, and the spirit-faces being a "mode of substance" corporeated before our eyes through the active agency of an "incorporeal substance" is an

me when I go to Liverpool; I have another gentleman, who is a Spiritualist, and is also proprietor of a Secular Hall in a part of Yorkshire, and I have the editor of the *Spiritual Magazine*, who used to stand upon the Secular platform; and I say, How is it possible that the facts of nature can be rejected by any sound—I will not say creed—but sound principles of any kind? If the principles of Secularism are sound, they ought to give unlimited liberty to the mind. The principles of Secularism ought not even to—

Mr. BRADLAUGH: I am sorry to rise to order. I thought we were discussing modern Spiritualism. I am quite ready to discuss Secularism at some other time. I think if our friend would only have told us which of those forms of life died, and which did not, it would have been better.

Mr. BURNS: I am very glad to give my friend every opportunity. I have found no fault with him whatever, except for giving a slight indication of slander against a medium. My friends, if any man will stand up on a public platform and repeat anything that is libellous or disparaging against a woman without giving the name, I do not know where his manhood is. (Applause.) She may only be a spirit-medium, but she is somebody's wife, and she is perhaps somebody's mother, and her character is as dear to her as your character, English men and women, is dear to you, and I would not for a moment see a man stand up and try to stab a person in the dark without resenting that moral assassination. I have the pleasure of knowing—it is quite a recent case—that it is an infamous lie. I say to you in parting, Spiritualism is a matter in which you do not need to depend upon mediums at all. You can go home, every one of you, and settle it at your own fireside. It is not a professional matter, it is a universal truth, inherent in the nature of man, and it is capable of elucidation by all those who take the trouble to observe the conditions. (Applause.)

---

experimental demonstration of Spinoza's philosophy. In *Ethics*, Part V., "Of the Power of the Understanding," is reasoning to show that man is immortal. "Prop. 23. The human mind cannot be absolutely destroyed along with the body; something of it remains which is eternal. *Demonstration*: There is necessarily in God a conception or idea which expresses the essence of the human body, and this therefore is necessarily something that pertains to the essence of the human mind. But we ascribe no duration to mind that can be defined by time, save only and in so far as the actual existence of the body, which is explained by duration, and may be defined by time is expressed—that is, we do not ascribe duration to the mind, except in connection with the body. As, however, there is necessarily a something which, by a certain eternal necessity, is conceived by the very essence of God, this something, pertaining to the essence of the mind, will necessarily be eternal." In the Scholium appear the following remarkable words:—"Our mind, inasmuch as it involves the essence of the body under a form or aspect of eternity, is eternal, and this its existence cannot be defined by time or explained by duration." But mind as substance cannot exist apart from its attributes, and that which is most real has the greatest number of attributes; furthermore, it has been shown that the human mind and Divine mind are identical in nature, and in the idea of them is comprised all that is positive and potential. Therefore, this potential substance being the source of all modes and affections of substance, the mind has as an essential attribute, the power to manifest itself in time and duration, as experimentally shown by Spiritualism and in every-day life; or as Spinoza expresses it, "extended substance is one among the infinite attributes of God" (Prop. 15, Schol.). I hope this note will give some idea of the value to be attached to Mr. Bradlaugh's boasted knowledge and assertions. I would not have added this note had not my antagonist given me the lie direct in respect thereto by his grimaces on the platform.

J. B.

MR. BRADLAUGH: I beg to move a vote of thanks to the Chairman for presiding over us for these two evenings.

MR. BURNS: It is my place to second that proposition. I do so with great pleasure. It is through the instrumentality of the Chairman that I have had the pleasure of debating this subject before you.

The resolution was agreed to.

MR. BRADLAUGH: I beg, before the Chairman returns thanks, to state, with reference to what has just fallen from our friend, that if the gentleman who gave me the information does not authorise me to deal with it within a week, I shall print his letter in the *Reformer*. I may say I have no right to deal with it now. Mr. Burns had a speech before, in which he might have challenged me to do it; but he left it till his last speech, so I will exercise my own discretion; and I tell you frankly, the only reason I do so is, the gentleman told me if I could manage not to make his name known to-night, he might be able to detect further matters.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have had very great pleasure in presiding on these two evenings; and it is an additional pleasure to find that there is some indication—at any rate, on the part of one debater—of pursuing this subject a little further. I hope that that mind will continue; because there are so many matters which have been opened, that I am sure it will be a desirable thing if these gentlemen—who have acted throughout with so much courtesy—and have been listened to with so much attention, should have another opportunity of trying their mettle.

The proceedings then closed, but as the parties were leaving the platform Mr. Bradlaugh handed a letter to Mr. Burns, which is supposed to have been the letter containing charges against a medium, as mentioned during the debate. Mr. Burns deliberately tore up the letter, and threw the pieces in the direction in which the letter emanated, with the hope that all imputations of malice or ignorance against unoffending innocence might meet with a similar fate. The uproar from Mr. Bradlaugh's friends was so great that no words could be heard, and the meeting terminated in great confusion.

In introducing the report, the *National Reformer* alludes to this incident as follows: "After the termination of the debate on the second evening there was considerable excitement, caused by an unusual display of temper on the part of the champion of Spiritualism towards a gentleman who had written a letter alleging trickery on the part of some mediums referred to by Mr. Burns." This quotation is incorrect in two important particulars. First, the mediums were not referred to by Mr. Burns, but by Mr. Bradlaugh, who introduced the slander into the debate. Secondly, the "display of temper" was on the part of Mr. Bradlaugh's friends, and not on that of Mr. Burns. To place at his disposal that which he had characterised as "an infamous lie," was simply to give him the power to deal with it as any man of moral sense would. To Mr. Bradlaugh and his friends such a matter seems to be a morsel of exquisite sweetness. The offer made to Mr. Burns was an insult which he very properly treated in the summary way reported above.

## APPENDIX.

### HOW TO INVESTIGATE SPIRITUAL PHENOMENA.

It is a common but very significant saying that to cook a hare you must first catch it; and the suggestion thus conveyed indicates the prime necessity in attempting a study of Spiritualism. Reading is all very well, for the experience of others is a valuable aid to progress, but it can never stand in place of experimental knowledge. Hence the cry, when a man is assailed by some irrepressible Spiritualist, How or where can I see anything of it? The public have a vague impression that some one called a medium is necessary to elicit the phenomena, and that such services are only available to those who have the money to pay for it. This notion is only partly true. There are only a very few professional mediums in England, and these are able to obtain some of the more remarkable and special phases of the phenomena. Once they were sceptics, and quite unconscious of the wonderful power which is daily being exercised in their presence. Circumstances introduced them to a circle, or enabled the manifestations to occur spontaneously. Their friends begged of them to sit for investigation: gradually the circle of inquirers widened till the mediums' time became so much occupied that no other avocation could be followed, and a charge had to be made to provide means of subsistence and to afford protection from the importunities of sitters. In this way all public mediums have been produced. The function of mediumship is not an art which can be acquired by tuition or dexterity, but it is a natural endowment dependant upon bodily temperament, and it may be developed by exercise and propitious circumstances. Mediumship thus being a natural faculty, it ought to be of frequent occurrence; and so it is. It is probable that there is a latent medium of one sort or other for every family in the country. Not that there is a medium in every home, for several families may be found in which there are no mediums, while the members of another family may be all of them mediums. Like literary talent, mechanical skill, and other qualities of mind, mediumship is not by any means found equally represented in each individual.

Such being the case, and mediumship being a principle inherent in man, the question of Spiritualism is capable of universal solution. Do not, then, take any man's word as a finality, whether he declares in favour of Spiritualism or against it. Sit down, observe the conditions, and produce results for yourselves. Spiritualism is simply a branch of science, treating of an unexplored region of human nature. It treats not only of man's relations to the spirit-world, but it demonstrates what man is, what his powers are, and whither he is bound. If man is immortal, he must be so in accordance with natural law; and, if a fact, it must be capable of discovery. There is therefore no superstition or credulity in Spiritualism, but each investigator speaks as he finds, and reasons according to the facts presented to his intellect. To remain in ignorance of any department of man's being is to leave the field to the occupation of that grim giant, Superstition, whose two heads, Negation and Credulity, by their withering scowl, reduce to tyranny, slavery, misdirection, and misery, the ignorant denizens of an otherwise fair world. That all may in part rescue themselves by the acquisition of knowledge, there is herewith placed freely at their disposal—

### RULES AND CONDITIONS FOR THE SPIRIT-CIRCLE.

**ATMOSPHERIC CONDITIONS.**—The phenomena cannot be successfully elicited in very warm, sultry weather, in extreme cold, when thunder and lightning and magnetic disturbances prevail, when the atmosphere is very moist, or when there is much rain, or storms of wind. A warm, dry atmosphere is best, as it presents the mean between all extremes, and agrees with the harmonious state of man's organism which is proper for the manifestation of spiritual phenomena. A subdued light or darkness increases the power and facilitates control.

**LOCAL CONDITIONS.**—The room in which a circle is held for development or investigation should be set apart for that purpose. It should be comfortably warmed and ventilated, but draughts or currents of air should be avoided. Those persons composing the circle should meet in the room about an hour before the experiments commence; the same sitters should attend each time, and occupy the same places. This maintains the peculiar magnetic conditions necessary to the production of the phenomena. A developing circle exhausts power, or uses it up.

**PHYSIOLOGICAL CONDITIONS.**—The phenomena are produced by a vital force emanating from the sitters, which the spirits use as a connecting link between themselves and objects. Certain temperaments give off this power; others emit an opposite influence. If the circle is composed of persons with suitable temperaments, manifestations will take place readily; if the contrary be the case, much perseverance will be necessary to produce results. If both kinds of temperament are present, they require to be arranged so as to produce harmony in the psychical atmosphere evolved from them. The physical manifestations especially depend upon temperament. If a circle does not succeed, changes should be made in the sitters till the proper conditions are supplied.

**MENTAL CONDITIONS.**—All forms of mental excitement are detrimental to success. Those with strong and opposite opinions should not sit together: opinionated, dogmatic, and positive people are better out of the circle and room. Parties between whom there are feelings of envy, hate, contempt, or other inharmonious sentiment should not sit at the same circle. The vicious and crude should be excluded from all such experiments. The minds of the sitters should be in a passive rather than an active state, possessed by the love of truth and of mankind. One harmonious and fully-developed individual is invaluable in the formation of a circle.

**THE CIRCLE** should consist of from three to ten persons of both sexes, and sit round an oval, oblong, or square table. Cane-bottomed chairs or those with wooden seats are preferable to stuffed chairs. Mediums and sensitives should never sit on stuffed chairs, cushions, or sofas used by other persons, as the influences which accumulate in the cushions often affect the mediums unpleasantly. The active and quiet, the fair and dark, the ruddy and pale, male and female, should be seated alternately. If there is a medium present, he or she should occupy the end of the table with the back to the north. A mellow mediumistic person should be placed on each side of the medium, and those most positive should be at the opposite corners. No person should be placed behind the medium. A circle may represent a horseshoe magnet, with the medium placed between the poles.

**CONDUCT AT THE CIRCLE.**—The sitters should place their hands on the table, and endeavour to make each other feel easy and comfortable. Agreeable conversation, singing, reading, or invocation may be engaged in—anything that will tend to harmonise the minds of those present, and unite them in one purpose, is in order. By engaging in such exercises the circle may be made very profitable apart from the manifestations. Sitters should not desire anything in particular, but unite in being pleased to receive that which is best for all. The director of the circle should sit opposite the medium, and put all questions to the spirit, and keep order. A recorder should take notes of the conditions and proceedings. Manifestations may take place in a few minutes, or the circle may sit many times before any result occurs. Under these circumstances it is well to change the positions of the sitters, or introduce new elements, till success is achieved. When the table begins to tilt, or when raps occur, do not be too impatient to get answers to questions. When the table can answer questions by giving three tips or raps for "Yes," and one for "No," it may assist in placing the sitters properly. The spirits or intelligences which produce the phenomena should be treated with the same courtesy and consideration as you would desire for yourselves if you were introduced into the company of strangers for their personal benefit. At the same time, the sitters should not on any account allow their judgment to be warped or their good sense imposed upon by spirits, whatever their professions may be. Reason with them kindly, firmly, and considerately.

**INTERCOURSE WITH SPIRITS** is carried on by various means. The simplest is three tips of the table or raps for "Yes," and one for "No." By this means the spirits can answer in the affirmative or negative. By calling over the alphabet the spirits will rap at the proper letters to constitute a message. Sometimes the hand of a sitter is shaken, then a pencil should be placed in the hand, when the spirits may write by it automatically. Other sitters may become entranced, and the spirits use the vocal organs of such mediums to speak. The spirits sometimes impress mediums, while others are clairvoyant, and see the spirits, and messages from them written in luminous letters in the atmosphere. Sometimes the table and other objects are lifted, moved from place to place, and even through closed doors. Patiently and kindly seek for tests of identity from loved ones in the spirit-world, and exercise caution respecting spirits who make extravagant pretensions of any kind.

BEFORE proceeding with their investigations, inquirers into Spiritualism should correspond with Mr. Burns, Proprietor of the Spiritual Institution, 15, Southampton Row, London, W.C., who will gladly forward a packet of publications and useful information gratis. Stamps should in all cases be enclosed for return postage. Deputations of mediums or lecturers may be arranged for to visit any locality where public meetings or seances can be instituted.

The following publications are of great use to investigators :—

**MEDIUMS AND MEDIUMSHIP**, by Thomas Hazard, a work reprinted from the *Banner of Light*, is an excellent guide to the development and use of mediums. Price 2d.

**A SCIENTIFIC VIEW OF MODERN SPIRITUALISM**, by T. Grant, gives the whole matter in a nutshell. In Enamelled Wrapper, 6d.

**CONCERNING SPIRITUALISM**, by Gerald Massey. Fancy Wrapper 1s.; Cloth Gilt, 2s.

**EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATIONS OF PSYCHIC FORCE**, by William Crookes, F.R.S., &c. 1s. This work is illustrated by drawings of mechanical contrivances to prove that the manifestations really take place.

**RULES TO BE OBSERVED AT THE SPIRIT-CIRCLE**, by Emma Hardinge. 1d.

**ON THE SPIRIT-CIRCLE AND THE LAWS OF MEDIUMSHIP**. A Lecture by Emma Hardinge. 1d.

**THE CREED OF THE SPIRITS AND THE INFLUENCE OF THE RELIGION OF SPIRITUALISM**. A Lecture by Emma Hardinge. 1d.

**THEODORE PARKER IN SPIRIT-LIFE**. A Narrative of Personal Experience given inspirationally to Dr. Willis. 1d. This little work gives a good view of life in the spirit-world.

**THE PHILOSOPHY OF DEATH**. Gives a clairvoyant description of death-bed scenes and the condition of the departed spirit, by A. J. Davis. 2d.

**OUTLINES OF TEN YEARS' INVESTIGATION OF SPIRITUALISM**, by T. F. Barkas. 1s. 6d. A calm and dispassionate statement.

**WHAT IS DEATH?** By Judge Edmonds. 1d.

**WHAT SPIRITUALISM HAS TAUGHT**, by William Howitt. 1d.

### USEFUL WORKS FOR INVESTIGATORS.

**Spiritualism; its Facts and Phases**. Illustrated with Personal Experiences, and *fac similes* of Spirit-Writing, by J. H. POWELL. 176 pages, cloth, 1s.

**The Year-book of Spiritualism for 1871**. Presenting the status of Spiritualism for the current year throughout the world; Philosophical, Scientific, and Religious Essays; Reviews of its Literature; History of American Associations; State and Local Societies; Progressive Lyceums; Lecturers, Mediums, and other matters relating to the momentous subject. By HUDSON TUTTLE and J. M. PEEBLES. 5s.

**The Seers of the Ages; or, Spiritualism Past and Present**. By J. M. PEEBLES. 5s.

**Where are the Dead? or, Spiritualism Explained**. An account of the astounding phenomena of Spiritualism, affording positive Proof by undeniable Facts that those we mourn as DEAD ARE STILL ALIVE, and can communicate with us; that Spiritualism is sanctioned by Scripture and consistent with science and common sense. With Specimens of Communications received; Extracts from its Literature; Advice to Investigators; Addresses of Mediums; and all useful information. By FRITZ. Price 3s.

**Footfalls on the Boundary of Another World**. By R. D. OWEN. 7s. 6d.

LONDON: J. BURNS, 15, SOUTHAMPTON ROW, W.C.