

# Mediumship Defined and Defended

A REFUTATION OF

The Great Psychological Crime

---

BY

W. J. COLVILLE

---

BOSTON, MASS.:  
THE BANNER OF LIGHT PUBLISHING CO.,  
204 DARTMOUTH STREET  
1904

# MEDIUMSHIP DEFINED AND DEFENDED.

## LECTURE I.

### MEDIUMSHIP AND HYPNOTISM.

We make no apology for coming before the public at this time to consider frankly and without prejudice, arguments for and against the astounding assertions made in a much-discussed book, "The Great Psychological Crime," which has recently stirred up an immense amount of controversy concerning Spiritualism in general, and mediumship in particular. The book is addressed to "the progressive intelligence of the age," and it is to that same intelligence that we also make our appeal. The volume under discussion is divided into three parts, named respectively, Modern Hypnotism, Spiritual Mediumship, and Retributive Justice. There is also a supplement made up of theories of "The Wise Men," and an Editor's Postscript. Florence Huntly, the editor, who stands sponsor for the book, is a well-known literary woman. Consequently, though the author remains anonymous, a well-known person has stepped to the front, and practically mothered all the contents of the volume. At the outset of our criticism we wish to make it distinctly clear to all who shall read our utterances, that we by no means disagree with, or seek to controvert all that the book contains, for we are thoroughly convinced that there is much teaching scattered through it, which, if studiously followed, would improve the general state of human society. But in the course of its 400 pages, it makes so many rash assertions, and advocates so many objectionable dogmas, that it has appeared to us to be nothing less than an act of duty to comply with urgent requests which have reached us from many quarters, to "present the other side."

The main dogmatic assertion which characterizes the entire work is that mediumship and hypnotism are identical, and that both are diabolical. The sub-title of the book is "The Destructive Principle of Nature in Individual Life," a phrase which immediately invites opposition because it is far from clear to the profoundest thinkers and astutest philosophers of the present day that a destructive "principle" exists in the universe. Change, disintegration, decomposition, and all kindred terms may be presented in a scientific vocabulary which includes such allied words as transformation, and transmutation, but the destruction of an individual soul, whether in this world or in any other, is a mere supposition founded upon no accurate knowledge of the true ego. We are quite well aware that various Christian denominations advocate a doctrine known as "conditional immortality," because they wisely and humanely reject a dogma of perpetual misery and pain, and have not realized any higher alternative than endless woe or individual extinction. Such a concession to humanizing views of the future life, we can readily welcome as a substitute for something far more dreadful which this hypothesis has been invented to replace, but we are driven to no such hypotheses by the logic of reason, nor are we forced to entertain any such pessimistic views by considering the phenomena known as hypnotic or mediumistic. With certain fundamental propositions of the author, we readily agree as, for instance, when a great psychological crime is defined as an act which deprives "the intelligent soul of man of any of the inalienable rights, privileges, benefits, powers, or possibilities with which God or Nature has invested it." To thus deprive a soul would certainly amount to criminal deprivation, but the singularly weak spot in the assertion is the implication, as though decided beyond question, that some hypnotist or controlling entity out of the flesh has the power to do this. What a curious view of "God or Nature" must be entertained by a writer who attributes to some finite, and largely ignorant hypnotist or spirit control, the power thus to upset the order of the universe and thwart the

intent of the Deity. Here is our first radical and invincible objection to the teaching of the book. It exalts something very much like a Calvinistic denial of the universal beneficence of the Eternal revised to meet the taste of the present day, into the very central throne of the universe, and causes the reflecting reader to wonder deeply how comes it that "God or Nature" is so weak as to allow such monstrous creatures as hypnotists to roam at large in seen and unseen spheres alike, doing their deadly work of destroying human souls, who, apart from such fiendish machinations, might have attained to the celestial summits of everlasting blessedness. Not very cleverly disguised Satanism plays a considerable part in the imaginary tragedy worked out by the author of "The Great Psychological Crime," though we may, and we ought to give him credit for desiring to defeat the adversary while the French Satanists are said to have sought to curry favor with the Prince of Darkness, who is aptly termed the "Very Low" in contradistinction from the "Most High" in reputed Satanist publications. Gerald Massey's "The Devil of Darkness" is a pamphlet which Florence Huntly and her friends might study with great advantage. So very time-worn is the old argument against Mesmerism, and still more forcibly brought against Spiritualism, that both systems owe their origin to Satan, that it provokes scarcely more than a smile or a sneer in many circles today when the old ghost of a hideous ancient theory is resuscitated to scare the present generation; but the old dogma changes its costume quite frequently, and thus presents the charm of newness based on its outward aspect, even though its essence remains entirely unchanged.

We have really so very little in common with the author of the strange volume we are now considering, when it comes to a theory of the universe and a philosophy of human life, that we may, for that very reason, find it somewhat difficult to put ourselves in his place and view matters from his standpoint. Firstly as to Hypnotism, and secondly, as to Mediumship, we wish to express our own views un-

equivocally, so that they may be readily compared or contrasted with those of the author to whom we are seeking to reply. First, as to Hypnotism. The word is simply derived from the Greek "hypnos" signifying sleep. A simply hypnotic process is one which induces sleep. This is the simplest definition of the word under discussion, and in that rudimentary sense, many reputable physicians and other intelligent people are using it in England, America, and many parts of the European continent. The honored names of Liebault and Bernheim of the school of Nancy in the south of France, as well as of Charcot of Paris, with many others, are constantly associated with the rise and progress of the system of practice commonly designated hypnotic. Christian Scientists and some other bodies of people take umbrage at the word, and to these, everything called hypnotism appears evil. Some even go so far as to use the very innocent word suggestion as the equivalent of hypnotism, and whenever they seek to denounce a method of therapeutic practice which seems to differ from their own, they bring forth one of their anathematized words and frighten their credulous followers by exhibiting a lingual scarecrow. Such childish toying with words is contemptible in the eyes of dispassionate students of psychic phenomena, and to the lasting credit of Thomson Jay Hudson, an author who made some unsupported assertions contrary to Spiritualism, be it said that in the first of his popular books, "The Law of Psychic Phenomena" he stated the case for hypnotism very reasonably and fairly. Hypnotic treatment is not the highest form of suggestive practice, and it would be foolish, and perhaps dishonest, to deny that there are decided dangers connected with the employment of hypnotic methods, but freely granting all that should be granted on the contra side of this question, it may, with complete veracity be argued that medicine and surgery are by no means unattended by dangers, as well as difficulties, and this fact is never disguised by the most honorable and successful of surgeons and physicians. There is a dark and dangerous side to every subject, and did we perpetually dwell

upon the adulteration of food and the risks attending locomotion, we should soon work ourselves into a frenzy and either become insane or be forced to retire into some primeval forest to escape the perils of social existence. For tempests, animals, reptiles and insects would be present, or likely to appear, to destroy our peace. Let it be once for all admitted that dangers lurk everywhere, and that we must be surrounded by them, but the path of wisdom is to develop moral and mental fortitude as well as physical courage, by rising above the dread of them.

Among a number of so-called "new" definitions of terms, we recognize many which have long been accepted by thoughtful and earnest students of psychic problems. White Magic, or Leucomancy, has always been identified with righteous employment of psychic agencies by all who have studied the literature of Occultism, while Black Magic, or Necromancy, has been equally identified with malicious misuse of similar potencies. That there is a combination of White with Black Magic in the practice of Modern Hypnotism, every student of occult or psychic science thoroughly well knows. But to characterize all hypnotic and all mediumistic phenomena under the "Black" heading, is simply absurd, so much so, that Florence Huntly in her answers to Lyman Howe, as published in "The Progressive Thinker," of Chicago, during the winter of 1903-04, has been obliged, during her defence of the book whose cause she has enthusiastically espoused, to refuse to admit that either hypnotism or mediumship is ever involved in such psychic processes as can be proved beneficial or even innocent. The modern like the ancient controversy, hinges upon definitions rather than upon root-ideas among enlightened people. Sermons innumerable have been preached against necromancy and witchcraft, with which Spiritualism, as well as Hypnotism, is constantly being confounded, and until we have arrived at far greater clearness of statement than has yet been reached by the average writer or lecturer upon these themes, we are likely to be treated to oratorical and literary diatribe containing considerable plausibility, even though it may be devoid of sound phil-

"A fool and his money are soon parted," after sending their dollars to such characters.

These remarks have no reference to alleged mental healers who undertake to confer benefits by "absent treatment." They are intended to apply exclusively to such as agree to assist people to injure their neighbors to their own personal financial advancement, or worse still, from motives of revenge or malice. Such proffers of aid in a nefarious undertaking can never appeal to simple-minded persons, harmless though ignorant, and even when the assistance of a pretended Black Magician is sought and obtained, we have no guarantee that his spells will work successfully. To confound medical hypnotism, or ordinary Spiritual mediumship with such diabolism, is a mark of gross ignorance of the whole subject under discussion. The way of hypnotism is not the highest way to attain good results in the practice of what Dr. W. F. Evans called "mental medicine," but though there is a far more excellent way, and we should endeavor to point out that better road and travel on it, we are not thereby justified in utterly condemning a method which, though it has decided imperfections, is not the villainy which its enemies declare it to be. The old trials for witch-craft, with all their absurdity and cruelty were not entirely void of common sense, even in the Middle Ages, because witches were only condemned in consequence of the belief that they had poisoned some one, or seriously injured property, thereby proving, according to the prevalent belief of the period, that they had entered into a compact with the powers of darkness. Though it is our chief object in this course of lectures to explain and vindicate genuine mediumship in all its many phases, we are also desirous of doing full justice to those good physicians and others who use the word "hypnotism" to signify suggestion. For our own part, we do not particularly relish the word any more than we like the word "control" as used by so many Spiritualists. It is, however, only an act of justice to overlook idiosyncracies of speech in an endeavor to grasp an essential meaning, and however much we prefer the better words, suggestion and com-

munion, to hypnotism and control, we can easily see that many people who use the latter when we use the former, do not employ them in any offensive sense. The whole argument for and against both hypnotism and mediumship hinges upon the freedom of the medium's or the patient's will, and until the exact relation between the different parties involved in a psychic transaction is clearly understood, reams of paper and gallons of ink may be devoted to controversial writing out of which no clear philosophy can grow. Dr. C. O. Sahler, of Kingston-on-Hudson, N. Y., in his admirable book "Psychic Life and Laws," speaks with the authority born of long practical experience on hypnotism and its limitations, and this highly successful practitioner, whose famous Sanitarium has been for many years a source of great blessing to multitudes of afflicted persons, declares that there is no coercion employed in legitimate hypnotic processes. When we consider the action of an unseen operator in the Spirit World, we are only imagining a human entity entirely divested of flesh, exercising precisely the same mental powers as exercised by a similar entity while still on earth; we consequently shall not seek to disprove a parallel, but we refuse to call it "deadly" or "destructive" or anything else dangerous or pernicious except it be clearly established that the cases thus designated clearly reveal malice on the part of the operator and injury done to the subject.

It is going quite far enough on the path of denunciation to confine one's condemnatory words strictly to such practices as unmistakably involve a violation of the sanctity of human freedom, and this is not involved in any instance where both or all persons involved in a transaction are agreeable to it. It may be and it often is unwise or indiscreet to yield to certain influences which are not very noble or very intelligent, but in all these matters individual judgment must be exercised and we can scarcely expect a transformation for the better in this direction to be accomplished through any other agency than that of increased individual development. Some years ago the Countess Wachmeister, a very able lec-



turer, spoke frequently on "The Dangers of Hypnotism," and many were the hair-raising and blood-curdling tales she told of hypnotic victims; but when the evidence was sifted it came to appear that nobody was helped to resist unrighteous psychic influence by dreading it. There are two very necessary safeguards against all unwarrantable psychic pressure and these are high moral purpose and strength of intellect, neither of which are children of fear, nor can they ever be cultivated by the use of diatribe. The author of "The Great Psychological Crime" has resorted to such absurd extravagances and printed so many unverified statistics that whatever good might otherwise have been accomplished by a criticism of hypnotism and mediumship is completely neutralized by this ridiculous over-statement and unfair denunciation. The credulity of the public has certainly been counted upon and also its extreme suggestibility, or the author would never have ventured upon such wild assertions as he constantly indulges in, and as to his theology it is an extremely poor and unsatisfactory makeshift, a sort of conditional immortality doctrine very badly degenerated. Dr. Quackenboss, of Columbia University, New York, is certainly mentioned with the respect due to his moral integrity and intellectual standing, and he is one of the witnesses called with intent to condemn hypnotic practice, but the testimony furnished by this authority is almost entirely on the favorable side and the only attempt to set aside this testimony is a labored endeavor to prove that Dr. Quackenboss is self-contradictory. There are certainly seeming discrepancies in such quotations as the following taken from his "Hypnotism in Mental and Moral Culture": "Hypnotic sleep implies a mind condition in which the mental action and the will-power of a sensitive subject are under the control of an operator who has induced the state," and, "Will-power has nothing to do with hypnotic suggestion, neither the will-power of the operator nor that of the subject," but we feel we are in no way misinterpreting the meaning attached by Dr. Quackenboss to his own words when we explain that hypnosis is not induced by a peremptory,

dogmatic or forceful exercise of will-power on either side, but that it rather follows upon the existence of mutual sympathy, and exactly the same remark will apply to mediumship. A forcible exercise of will-power has an exciting tendency leading to extreme arousal of certain faculties and the active discharge of certain functions; but sleep of any kind is induced by quiet, restful psychic forces which are the exact reverse of forceful and agitating. Here is a parallel by no means deadly, but quite sound and logical. Among normal people who have some mind of their own and know what they are seeking, it is customary to establish in thought what is subsequently to be translated into action. The patient who having suffered from insomnia and naturally desires relief, requests the hypnotist to suggest sleep to him, and all that the operator in that case does or needs to do is to hold the idea of sleep very firmly and quietly in his own consciousness to the exclusion of all other thoughts. This idea is then transferred to the willing subject who instead of consciously or subconsciously resisting this transferred thought opens his mind gladly and gives it cordial welcome. In the case of one who wishes to develop mediumship exactly similar conditions may prevail. The communicating (or controlling) spirit is not behaving like a burglar seeking to effect violent entrance into a building by breaking down its barriers of defence; he is simply a friend who desires to comply with the wishes of the medium as well as to gratify his own. The act is mutual whenever there is desire on the one side to deliver a message and equal desire on the other side to receive it. William Stead's experiences throw much light on this branch of the general subject and it is particularly interesting and important to note that the man through whose hand "Letters from Julia" were written is characterized by an amount of individuality which his opponents do not hesitate to call pig-headed obstinacy.

Let us take, as an extreme and very popular example of current shallow views of Hypnotism, George Du Maurier's famous story "Trilby," from

which a great many sparsely informed people have gathered their ideas on Hypnotism. "Svengali" is the typical hypnotist of the vulgar stage and "Trilby" is his victim. Needless to say that there is a vivid fantastic element in that story which men of science are almost disposed to ridicule; still let the story pass as though it were an accurate morsel of history and even then we have seen no over-riding of the will of the subject when all factors are considered. Many a young laundress with an ambition to appear on the stage would eagerly welcome any means whereby that ambition might be gratified, and though "Svengali" is neither an ideal man nor a model husband, he is a fine musician and possesses certain attractions in the role of impressario for a stage-struck girl. Doubtless many young people, and older people also, yield foolishly to various influences which work eventually to their detriment, but the fact of their doing so only proves that caution is needed in the conduct of psychic experiments as well as everywhere else in life. Mediumship has not proved an unmixed blessing, but it is not criminal any more than anything else is criminal which is liable to abuse. The greatest of difficulties is to point to a single beneficent agent which has never been distorted or perverted. We are no blind zealots advocating indiscriminately all that passes for hypnotism or for mediumship, but we do claim that the advantages outweigh the disadvantages. A very great deal of mediumship is simply due to greater than average sensitiveness; it consequently often appears in early childhood or in most unexpected places and at times when no one seems to specially desire it. The problem of mediumistic susceptibility may be an intricate one and the topic should be handled fearlessly. What we protest against is wholesale denunciation of psychic processes which are often palpably beneficial, though occasionally hurtful.

A safe rule to follow is to always claim the sovereign right to say your own Yes or No to any psychic suggestion. You can be hypnotized, but you need not be,—it rests with yourselves whether you are or not. In like

manner you can develop mediumship, but you are not compelled to develop it. Self-responsibility must always be upheld, and when it is steadily maintained, dangers and pitfalls vanish.

---

LECTURE II.

MAN AND HIS COMPLEX ORGANISM.

To all Spiritualists the idea of possessing more than simply a physical body as the instrument of the abiding human entity is very familiar, and though some of the terms employed by "new" psychologists, whether of Hudson's or some other modern school, may be rather strange to ears long accustomed to a different terminology, it is easy for the average student of psychic science regardless of special party affiliations, to readily comprehend the phrase "dual organism," and even the expression "two organisms" is not difficult to comprehend. Though widely opposed in their views on hypnotism, Prof. Hudson and the anonymous author of "The Great Psychological Crime" are alike prepared to teach that man has a subtle interior organism which agrees well with the New Testament, and with Swedenborg's doctrine that there is an interior body which continues to live after the physical frame has returned to its pristine elements. "There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body" is one of the most familiar quotations from St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians, and though psychical and physical may be adjectives more in vogue today among students of psychic problems, than spiritual and natural, the root idea is the same whatever language may be employed. The Theosophist of the type of the well-known author and lecturer, C. W. Leadbeater, simply goes further into detailed definition when he speaks of man as the owner of several bodies each interior to the other, as, for example, when in his widely discussed book "Man Visible and Invisible," he discourses upon a causal, a mental, and an astral body within and superior to the physical organism, which, to the materialist, is the only body of which we can possibly know anything. Clairvoyance in some in-

stances may have extended even far enough to trace these various bodies, each more ethereal than the other as we proceed inward in our investigation. But, this deeper question aside, we can all readily accept the practically universal testimony of ancient and modern seership, that there is a psychic organism which continues to exist, and through which the human ego continues to act after the dissolution of the physical frame. The writings of Andrew Jackson Davis and Mary Davis, long ago familiarized the reading public with accounts of clairvoyant experiences which threw much light upon the spiritual body, which Swedenborg tells us, corresponds with the physical structure, part to part and function to function.

While heartily agreeing with all reasonable theories concerning the triune as well as dual nature of man, and experiencing no resentment against a theory of man's seven-fold constitution, as proclaimed by many Occultists, we utterly fail to see that the acceptance of any such facts or theories proves a case against mediumship or even against hypnotism; but the object of the book we are criticising is evidently to use every fact that can possibly be proven concerning man's interior nature as a weapon with which to attack, first, whoever is called a hypnotist; and second, whoever yields to whatever is called "spirit control." Had this author contented himself with declaring that hypnotic processes would be superseded by higher methods as intelligence advanced, and that the idea conveyed to the average mind by the word "control" would give place to some more agreeable epithet, such as "communion" for example, very many intelligent people could and would have followed his reasoning with great interest and doubtless with profit also; but such sweeping denunciations and such hideous theology as we find constantly brought to the front, lead us to feel that so benighted a mode of controversy hardly comports with an enlightened understanding of what are genuinely higher phases of psychic experience. While discussing "Man and His Two Organisms," the author very reasonably tells us that Paul knew what he was talking about when he wrote to the Corinthians, and that it is evident that Christ fully

understood the relation between man's two bodies to the third and highest element in the triune nature of man. But we must take decided exception to his *non sequitur*, when he suggests that the searching and vital question: "For what shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" has any connection whatever with the crude and wretched theory, founded on a literal distortion of the famous text quoted, around which enormous controversy has raged for centuries. This passage has, times without number, been reasonably explained by Universalists and by many others who are not identified with the Universalist denomination. The original idea is not difficult to interpret, if we stop to consider that "life" and "soul" are often employed interchangeably in those English translations of the Greek text with which we have become familiar. Two very distinct notes of a high ethical character can be detected in this celebrated saying of Jesus; the first of these sounds a protest against undue devotion to material things, and the second urges us to consider the supreme importance of the spiritual life of man. Without straining the obvious meaning of the passage in the least, we can readily follow the utterance of a wise spiritual teacher who counsels us against placing undue stress upon the transitory vanities of earth, and whose main object is to contrast the far superior importance of the true life of the soul with the evanescent existence of the flesh. Life on earth can never be fairly judged or viewed in anything approaching true proportion unless, or until, we measure all values by a spiritual standard. When Prof. J. R. Buchanan declared that psychometry and its general acknowledgment might inaugurate a new era in civilization, he made a very thought-provoking statement, for though it would be absurd to infer that the mere practice of psychometry as ordinarily exhibited would greatly transfigure human society, the possibilities lying dormant within the soul when aroused to activity will certainly lead to a complete transformation in social life, and in every industry. The soul needs to be found, and after we have caught some glimpses of its reality and potency we should

be ever on our guard against indulgence in such practices as will obscure the heavenly vision. The whole cumbersome pessimistic edifice laboriously built up by a very curious and obscure "College of Natural Sciences" is erected on a fundamental fallacy; not a new mistake by any means, but one that must, as long as it is tolerated, serve to mislead all students of psychology. The soul is conceived of as something that can be lost in the sense of being exterminated, but such a perversion of the word "loss" is utterly unjustified by reason, or by etymology.

Now as the author who so persistently insists upon the loss of the soul, through yielding to hypnotic influence or indulging in the practice of mediumship, quotes glibly from the gospels, it is but fair to answer him out of that very scripture to which he has made his appeal. Jesus cautions his disciples against losing their souls, or, in other words, getting bewildered or lost among the many psychic entanglements which gather around those who indulge in sensuality or who worship idols, because they, in consequence of such idolatry, lose sight of spiritual realities, and come to feel that they have lost their way, as in a wilderness. But far from pronouncing such "lost" ones as on the verge of extermination, or as already blotted out, Jesus says that the Good Shepherd goes after every lost sheep in the desert and brings the one who has strayed away from the fold home in his arms, or on his shoulder, with great rejoicing. The gospel metaphor may well have been taken from the 23d psalm, and may well apply to the love and wisdom of the Eternal working through universal order, and through the agency of unchanging law, causing all of life's experiences to work together for good to every member of the human family. But leaving aside any particular origin for the similitude of the shepherd and the sheep, the plain teaching concerning "the lost" mentioned in the gospels is that they are the strayed who will yet be brought home, or, as Edna Lyall in one of her ennobling stories, "We Two," has defined it, "Lost is not yet found." A very popular London preacher, Rev. R. J. Campbell, successor to Dr.

Joseph Parker at the City Temple, has frequently insisted upon the need of emphasis being placed upon the words of Jesus referring to the "lost sheep," that it is only lost "until he find it." We are thoroughly familiar with the stale and unjust criticism often passed upon the sublime doctrine of universal elevation, or the salvation, ultimately, of the entire human race. Its opponents say that it discourages the pursuit of virtue and thereby makes more attractive the path of sin, but such an unfounded assertion is abundantly disproved by the positive statement of the Universalist denomination as contained in the fourth of the five principles of the Universalist faith, adopted in Boston in 1899: "The certainty of just retribution for sin," which is immediately followed by the fifth statement: "The final harmony of all souls with God." It is not to defend the very questionable practice of that doubtful and chameleon-like something called "hypnotism," nor is it to gloss over irregularities and immoralities which unfortunately do at times disfigure the exercise of mediumship, that we take up our cudgels; it is against a very serious false doctrine that we thus vigorously protest, and that doctrine is no less than a positive assertion that souls can be destroyed; and not only that they can destroy themselves by a perpetual course of wilful sin, but that when in weakness some unenlightened individual has come into the clutches of a hypnotist on earth, or an unclean spirit in the unseen realm, the "destructive principle in Nature" will blot out that soul forever. There are weak-minded and credulous Spiritualists who can believe almost anything, and there can be no doubt in the minds of sober thinkers, that such have often been misled by the ready attention they have given to foolish and flattering messages which have come to them from some source in the unseen realms with which they must have been in more or less affinity. That a certain serious degree of discomfort and disappointment is in store for those who unwisely place implicit credence in all that comes through mediumistic channels, is abundantly self-evident, but such painful experiences consequent upon human folly are educational



but not destructive. While freely granting and warmly advocating the helpful doctrine that penalties follow close upon the heels of folly, we are compelled in common honesty to conviction to express, in the strongest possible language, the diametric opposition which must ever exist between the theory of corrective discipline, and that of destructive punishment. "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth" is a good old text with an obviously salutary meaning. It teaches that the order of the universe is in itself so entirely beneficent that the hardest penalties we ever undergo are means whereby we grow purer and stronger. The discussion of the shadow-side of mediumship will do much good provided it is reasonably conducted. "Light" of London, a decidedly able and instructive periodical, in its issue dated April 2, 1904, gives the following contribution to the discussion of how far so-called evil influences can and do affect human life. Mrs. M. H. Wallis, a highly respected lecturer and clairvoyant who has occupied a prominent place on the English platform for many years, gave utterance to these sentiments while speaking under an influence which some people designate a "control." The query concerned especially the fate in the spirit-world of those who had, while on earth, been especially intemperate.

"If he continued to desire fresh indulgence his gloomy condition would increase, and himself be shut off from the clearer spiritual atmosphere. Should the desire be very strong, he might find himself in close association with those like-minded on the earth, and in that way exercise a harmful influence on another, which would be reactively injurious to himself. But it is only those who have similar desires who can be thus influenced, for one who is determined to live a temperate life cannot be affected by such an individual approaching him from the spirit side. It is, however, a fact that there is much hypnotic, suggestive influence without any direct intention of such result, both on the earth and on the spirit side, made upon those who are susceptible."

Light editorially adds:

"These are golden words, which should be framed and glazed, and set up where all can see them. It is not at seances only that we come into contact with evil and

debasement influences; it is not only those who rap, and tap, and lift tables, and materialize, that we ought to fear, but rather the daily, hourly, constant influences all around us. Nor is it only the influences of the disembodied that we should be careful to guard against, for the suggestion may come, all unwittingly and unsuspected by us or by them, from those on our own side of the grave, and these influences sent out by those here may be perceived (not consciously, but in their effects) by those on the other side who are striving to free themselves from the chain of habit welded upon them during their earth-life, and which the whole force of their better natures, under the action of their higher impulses, is now struggling to break.

"Let us, then, take this lesson to heart! What is true for the living is true for the dead; what is true for the good is true for the bad; what is a fact as regards low impulses is a fact also as regards incentives to good.

"What, then, are we doing, and what are we preparing the way for, when we allow ourselves to slide into habits of self-indulgence? We are, in the first place, giving opportunity to some spirit, who is himself fettered by his evil habits acquired during life, to indulge by proxy those desires which he can no longer gratify in his present sphere, and thus we are causing him to strengthen the earth-tie instead of helping him to rise to higher regions of the spiritual atmosphere. Next, we are forging chains for ourselves, which will in turn bind us to earth, and cause us to influence others to their harm, after we ourselves are departed from this life. Again, we are influencing our companions, by that potent yet mysterious force which is called that of bad example. That force is so strong, and so strange, that no one has ever been able to define it fully. We think Mrs. Wallis' 'control' has done good service in giving an explanation of it. It is unconscious suggestion, exercised, like hypnotism, by the strong will of the hardened self-seeker upon his more wavering and therefore weaker brother. Unfortunately men are less apt to be determined, and therefore power-

ful, in the way of good than in that of evil, and this is why 'The road to Hell is paved with good intentions,' frustrated by stronger influences. The man who is as determined in the direction of good as the majority of evil men are in the direction of evil, is a great power in the world, far more so than he is at all aware of.

"Again we say, it is not so much that we have to guard against the chance of meeting with evil or depraved spirits at our seances, as that we have to fortify our hearts and minds against the admission of continued suggestions from without, whether from those still in our midst or from the other side.

"But in this picture of possible evil we have also an assurance of certain hope, of a principle that for many of us has become a certainty. We are, or ought to be, both receivers and distributors of good thoughts also, and what we have to do, and the lesson we have to learn from Modern Spiritualism, as a part of its great mission on earth, is that we ought to take equal care that not only the influences to which we render ourselves receptive, but the thoughts and wishes and desires we send out in return, are pure and right and holy.

"No one of us can escape this responsibility, be he Spiritualist or scoffer. And here the Spiritualist certainly has the advantage. The scoffer is like the ostrich that buries his head in the sand; the Spiritualist, while willing to know the worst, also desires to know the best, and knowing it, to follow it out in practice. The scoffer believes that his thoughts are his own, uninfluenced by others, and influencing only those to whom he imparts them. This is just where we differ from him. Our thoughts are our own when we have made them so, just as any suggestion received from any source whatever, or from a combination of circumstances, may be taken up by the thinker, the man of genius, and molded into a noble utterance, a great invention, a masterpiece of art, which he may then give forth to the world and see labeled with his name. But it is not only in great thoughts and great deeds that our influence in the world and in eternity lies. If it were so, many of us would have

to confess ourselves useless creatures indeed. To receive, mature, and give forth great thoughts is a grand aim, but to receive, cherish, and spread around us sentiments of love and charity and holiness is in its way a still greater one, and it is one that, in very considerable measure, lies within the power of every one of us."

Such teaching as the above cannot fail to exercise a beneficial influence upon all who ponder it, and surely the most determined stickler for the necessity of presenting both sides of a subject, and never disguising dangerous tendencies, must be completely satisfied with so frankly outspoken a declaration on the part of a representative advocate of Spiritualism. But even if every word of such a homily be endorsed, we are as far as ever from ascribing to evil influences the power to annihilate a soul. With all due deference to the wisdom and kindness of the editorial staff of "Light," we must ourselves take exception to one statement among the quoted paragraphs, and that is the, by no means original, declaration that "unfortunately, men are less apt to be determined, and therefore powerful, in the way of good than in that of evil." It would be truly unfortunate if such a misfortune did really exist, but we are quite certain that evidences of the most thoroughly conclusiye character are easily obtainable which will prove to demonstration that when good habits have once been formed they will never be broken, while bad habits can and will be overcome in all cases because of the very misery they inevitably bring forth. The gospel of Spiritualism as proclaimed in "Light" is very noble and highly edifying, and is a complete offset to the wretched pessimism which its editors righteously disown; but even in the best of editorials we may occasionally see where a pessimistic tendency has crept into the writer's commentary on current circumstances, in consequence, no doubt, of a prevailing tendency which has become a perfect nightmare in the modern world. If ever there was proof of the malign influence of adverse suggestion long continued on a gigantic scale, it is surely to be found in the all but universal belief in the downward drift of human tendency.

and as the much abused Bible is always called into account to sustain every demeaning and ridiculous view of God and man entertained by fanaticism, the Fifty-first Psalm in particular, and many portions of the prophetic books incidentally, are constantly appealed to in support of the most depressing and degenerating doctrine ever invented by superficial observers,—the depravity of all natural human tendency. A well-known American Spiritualist, Epes Sargent, author of "Planchette the Despair of Science" and other valuable books, has given in poetry the best interpretation of "The soul that sinneth it shall die" that we have yet encountered. The hymn which is to be found in standard Universalist Hymnals rings with this bold affirmation, which appeals at once to reason and to the loftiest religious sentiment.

"The soul that sinneth it shall surely die,  
Die to the sin that did its life confine."

If any critic declares that such is an unfair use of Biblical language we need only remind him that St. Paul has given us the phrases "Ye are dead" and "I die daily," which, if destructionism is true, must teach the absurdity that the people to whom the apostle wrote in terms of friendship and encouragement were already annihilated, while he was destroyed afresh every day. Death means change, transition, transformation, and when the word is thus rationally understood, "the soul that sinneth it shall surely change and be transformed" is a rendering which truly conveys the spirit of the original. During the process of change there may be much despondency and suffering, and far be it from our intention to belittle the penalties which follow in the wake of transgression; but no possible good can be derived from such petty and puerile conclusions as those reached by promulgators of the views we are continually endeavoring to counteract. Man may certainly be the possessor of three brains, as the author of "The Great Psychological Crime" informs us; but if as many as seven brains be found in man's possession, such a discovery will in no way affect the main body of our argument that his views on the destruc-

tion of the human entity through the agency of hypnosis are preposterous. A great deal of more or less reliable description how the hypnotist does his work can easily be accepted as relatively accurate, without the main issue being touched at all. We need not deny that certain people are hypnotized to their detriment, nor need we seek to disprove that discarnate as well as incarnate entities may both hypnotize and be hypnotized, but all these admissions lend no support whatever to belief in a destructive principle in Nature. Belief in this destructive principle as an evil force is very ancient. The second Isaiah writing after the return from Babylon in what is known as the post-exilic period in Jewish history, has met and refuted Babylonian Dualism (Isaiah XLV.) in the strongest possible terms, but though one of the most popular books of the Bible answers the dualistic dogma completely, the old error is still lifting up its hydra head, though in the modern world the poetry of Robert Browning has done much to slay the monster. We should not allude so much to hypnotism in these discourses had not a desperate effort been recently made to set up a hypnotic man of straw, then identify this scarecrow with mediumship, and finally execrate both together. The student of psychic problems must be willing to wade through a great deal of questionable matter on his way to a solid intellectual footing, and it will not do for advocates of Spiritualism in its reasonable phases to be unprepared with answers to their detractors.

The peculiar manner in which facts are brought forward and theories twisted in defence of an indefensible position is one of the comicalities of "The Great Psychological Crime." On page 109 of that book, Prof. De Lawrence is quoted as saying "Suggest to a subject while he is sound asleep that in eight weeks he will mail you a letter with a blank piece of note-paper inside, and during the intervening period you may yourself forget the occurrence, but in exactly eight weeks he will carry out the suggestion" and "Suggest to a subject that in ninety days from a given date he will come to your house with his coat on inside out, and

he will most certainly do so." On those statements we can logically build no wicked edifice, because, even if such phenomena should exactly occur, no violation of moral order would appear, and the simplest exercise of common sense should be enough to convince the intelligent reader that it is the sheerest nonsense to dash off into an irrational and lachrymose diatribe concerning "the deep and ominous importance of all this," etc. Now the simple truth of the matter, admitting that Prof. De Lawrence's claims can be actually substantiated, is that the sub-self of the sensitive, hypnotized or entranced, accepted certain suggestions that in eight weeks or ninety days from a certain time he would do certain things which in no way did violence to his moral sense. The most upright and pure-minded person on earth need not hesitate to turn his coat inside out, nor to enclose a blank sheet of paper in an envelope; therefore Hudson and many other authors can steadily hold their ground in the face of all such experiments and stoutly maintain that you cannot force any one to act against his moral convictions; but it may be added, if he has no developed moral convictions he may be induced to act without them.

The absurdly hysterical raving of the author on pages 110, 111 and 112 of "The Great Psychological Crime" can only excite pity for such evident nervous derangement as the queer substitute for reasoning displays. Not the minutest particle of evidence has been brought forward to prove anything "horrible" though one of the incidents related was slightly comical, but we are gravely told (page 111) that "with these established facts in mind, those who know that there is a life beyond the grave as well as those who honestly believe that there is such a life, will readily understand and appreciate the horrible truth that even physical death is, of itself, no barrier to the operation of this subtle and mysterious power when once hypnotic relation has been fully entered into." Take such a statement for what it is really worth, purge it of its horrible error, and cleanse it so that it may be used as a vehicle for the conveyance of salutary truth, and the conclusion we reach will be almost, if not entirely,

identical with that of nearly all practical students of the evidences of Spiritualism. There is a life beyond the present, and in that next but not ultimate state, we find ourselves continuing, until we have outgrown it, in about the same moral and mental condition we were in previous to our transition. If we have been weak and unduly submissive to others, while on earth, we do not at once blossom forth into strong characters in the next state of existence. It is certainly not wise to blindly follow fashions and in an ape-like manner imitate our neighbors, nor is it desirable or satisfactory to take beliefs and opinions for granted, and hold ourselves ready to obey any command, or even suggestion, which may be given to us by others. The hypnotic subject and the average spirit-medium of the less enlightened type is not an ideal hero or heroine, and does not afford an example for all the world to imitate; but in common justice to both or either, it is but fair to teach that weakness is not criminality, and that many people will ignorantly submit to people around them in what they consider to be matters of minor importance, who could not be induced to commit grave offences against the moral law.

The mystery of our subself or subconscious mind is very intricate and there may be many processes going on within us of which we are by no means fully aware. Certain it is that undue pliability is a source of danger, and in future lives as well as in this world, we must remain amenable to the universal law of sequence. If there are any among our readers who require bracing so that they may stand up more firmly for the right of individuality, and such have been warned against blind yielding to outside control, we can only rejoice that they have been helped even by the words of an unbalanced author; but while we gladly allow that some good can be accomplished even by a book that reeks with error, we do not think it fair to let the public believe that such terrible charges against hypnotism and mediumship are unanswerable. The simple practice of suggestion is not hypnotic, and the rightful exercise of mediumship does not imply involuntary control. Take the



good advice and useful warnings out of "The Great Psychological Crime," and the book may benefit you, but its over-statements and mis-statements are often of so serious a character as to largely vitiate the evidently good intentions of the writer. Andrew Jackson Davis' "Magic Staff" is always admirable. "Under all circumstances keep an even mind."

---

LECTURE III.

SPIRITUAL MEDIUMSHIP ANALYZED AND CLASSIFIED.

The title of this lecture is that of Chapter V. in "The Great Psychological Crime" which opens with these words: "Mediumship is the process by and through which a spiritual intelligence obtains, holds, and exercises control of the will, voluntary powers, and sensory organism of a medium. It also includes the relation which exists between the two individual intelligences during the continuance of the mediumistic process." A little further on the words occur, "Mediumship is nothing more and nothing less than spiritual hypnotism. It is indeed the hypnotization of a physically embodied individual by a spiritually embodied intelligence." We have quoted the above sentences at the outset of this discourse so as to leave no doubt in the minds of those who have not read the book to which we are replying, as to the exact position taken by its author, despite the fact that Florence Huntly in some of her contributions to the press since its publication has seemed to greatly modify these expressions while seeming to remain in complete accord with the teaching of the volume she has been defending. So sweeping are the paragraphs just quoted that they leave no room for doubt as to their author's meaning, and as he has only words of condemnation for hypnotism, vigorously expressed in the four preceding chapters, we are not left in doubt as to what his motive must be in thus identifying mediumship in its entirety with his bete noir, hypnotism. The definition is singularly crude, dwarfed and garbled, and its chief error consists in the fact that

it arbitrarily confines the use of an expansive and elastic word within the circumscribed area of its poorest, smallest, and least desirable definition. Mediumship as a word is entitled to no such restrictive use, as any student of the English language perfectly well knows. In the first place it needs to be remembered that a medium properly means a channel of communication, which by no means necessarily implies that the mediumistic process is involuntary, coercive, or in any sense opposed to the desire of the individual who acts as medium. The simplest definition of mediumship as applied to communion between two or more intelligent entities is that one is willing to transmit intelligence to, through, or from another. Voluntary and active mediumship is quite as readily conceivable as passive and involuntary mediumship. When the author, whose conclusions we are disputing, goes on to say: "Mediumship is a subjective psychic process" we ask him to define "subjective" comprehensively, and not take refuge in a term of many meanings; then even if the word may be correctly used in such connection, and sometimes it may be, though not always, there is nothing evil or dangerous implied by that word which, when rightly understood, is as innocent of all harmful meaning as its companion "objective." We simply deny the allegation that "the spiritual intelligence dominates and controls the will, voluntary powers, and sensory organism of the medium" 'in anything like all cases; though we are ready to admit that there are phases of mediumship which may be justly described in such language. Utter lack of discrimination is displayed whenever such a wholesale charge is made, and it is just such statements as the foregoing which catch the attention of the timid, and of all who are swayed by prejudice, and which cause them to denounce and villify without investigation, a whole system like Spiritualism, which, while it has its defects, has also its decided excellencies. A great deal that follows after the passages we have referred to would be reasonable enough if disconnected from the absurd endeavor which is made to qualify all mediumship as destructive, and only to discriminate be-

tween milder and darker shades of turpitude in mediumistic processes. If all mediumship is thus placed under the ban, there is no chance for considering the topic impartially, or weighing evidence dispassionately. A foregone conclusion that there must be harm in all mediumship robs the investigator of rational judgment, and causes him to prejudge and perforce condemn without examination.

The benighted author of "The Great Psychological Crime" has two words to conjure with,—hypnotism and mediumship, thus whenever he seeks to place the seal of condemnation on anything, one or the other of those perverted terms is at once brought into requisition, and to the book-hypnotized there is no appeal from the awful decision when Sir Oracle has given forth that sentence. The classification of mediumship is fairly good in the chapter which seeks to condemn everything it classifies, but the denunciation of all the classified phases of mediumship is arrant nonsense. Impressional Mediumship receives first attention, and this is sub-divided under two heads, into Conscious and Unconscious. The Conscious phase does not imply "control," and if it were properly investigated it would soon be discovered that a person who is simply sensitive enough to receive impressions but is not dominated by them, is in a thoroughly normal condition and differs from less sensitive individuals only by reason of his greater sensitiveness. A person who can receive an impression if he wishes to receive it is under no obligation whatever to take it or act upon it, therefore he has simply a wider range of psychic possibilities open to him than has his less sensitive neighbor. It is merely a gratuitous assertion that "mediums of this class are unable to differentiate accurately between their own independent thoughts and those which are impressed upon them from without." Some may not be able to discriminate, while others can discriminate clearly. At this point it is in order to enquire how far any persons have learned to thus discriminate. We are all probably impressional or impressible to some extent, thus we are all in something of a quandary when the ultimate question

is reached—how far do any of us know positively that our thoughts are completely independent? The law of reciprocity is certainly self-demonstrating, and though one may greatly admire and profit by such noble teaching as Emerson has given in his splendid essay, "Self-Reliance," we can none of us say that our mental independence is so complete that interdependence can be ignored. Independence is indeed well defined by Kate Atkinson Boehme and authors of a similar school to that of the editor of "The Radiant Center," when it is described as dependence upon the life, light and power within, instead of on extraneous influence; but independence is never absolute, and though its relative importance is very great, it is quite possible to attach to it so exaggerated a value that while seeking overmuch to become independent individuals, we cut ourselves off from right relations with our fellows in the spiritual universe. If we know anything of universal order and of natural law, we must perceive that solitariness is not the goal of life which is set before us, therefore it is quite possible to take a mistaken view of self-reliance, and also of direct dependence on Deity which, though it may prove highly attractive to the unreflecting mind, is soon seen to be a specious sophistry by all who reason deeply. It sounds very pious and sublime to declare that we rely entirely upon the infinite absolute, and that we find God in the depths of our own souls, and therefore can feel no need for any finite help or guidance. But strangely inconsistent with their own profession must ever appear those who make such claims when, at the same time, they depend upon human teachers, and upon the contents of libraries, for a great deal of their information. There are indeed two sides to every question. James Martineau, the foremost advocate in England for many years of the intuitive school of religious philosophy, gave us that sublime hymn which begins with the exquisite stanza

"He who himself and God would know,  
 Into the silence let him go,  
 And lifting off pall after pall,  
 Reach to the inmost depth of all."

We know of no poem which counsels more strongly a right sort of introspection coupled with a study of external nature at first hand, but Martineau was a great reader and a great writer, as well as a great thinker. Not only did he meditate and follow an interior voice and vision; he also consulted with his fellow men and acquainted himself with all that was most edifying in ancient and in current literature. So happy a combination of mental habits develops the symmetrically cultured or well rounded human being, and though we should not call Martineau in any exclusive or distinctly modern sense, a Spiritualist, he gave abundant evidence of feeling as well as knowing very much concerning the true relation of human soul to human soul, as well as of all souls to the Infinite. Impressions must come to us one from the other, and one to the other, continually, and we should have to be extremely blunt and dull if we never consciously received any; but it is well to discriminate as clearly as possible between the results of our own reasoning processes and our susceptibilities to outside influences. This is where a great many people are sadly lacking, but this lack is chiefly due to failure to study the workings of the human mind as it operates in one's own case. Intellectual idleness is one of the chief dangers besetting the average sensitive.

But the so-called "medium" or "psychic" is by no means the only type of person who errs in this respect. Almost all victims of popular superstitions and all blind devotees of injurious fashions, customs, or usages of any sort, are victims of this dangerous neglect. A rational persistent study of the human mind is rarely undertaken, but when it is pursued fearlessly it yields abundant harvests prolific of immeasurable good. A very sensible test to apply is to discriminate between what we reason out industriously by a palpable mental process, and what is simply suggested to us, we may not know how or whence. It is quite possible to be so highly sensitive and immediately susceptible to suggestions as to know exactly what other people wish you to know or desire you to do, and still be thoroughly free to accept or not to accept the

proffered information; but even when suggestions are accepted merely as information, it by no means follows that one's conduct is necessarily affected by them. An Impres- sional Medium is often simply one who knows what oth- ers wish him to know, and who receives mental tele- grams from those who send him such. It may be easily understood by any average thinker that capacity to re- ceive a message does not imply obligation to act upon it. Receptivity is not mental weakness, but is often asso- ciated with more than ordinary intellectual and moral strength. The great divide between two diametrically op- posite states, such as unusual weakness and extraordinary mental power, is that though sensitiveness to impressions may be present alike with both: the former, because of weakness, is dominated by impressions, while the latter, because of strength, does exactly what he pleases in the way of handling or not employing any information he re- ceives. Impressibility is an evidence of possible medium- ship, and all real students of Modern Spritualism and Modern Psychology are coming into agreement on this one point, if on no other,—that the means of communicating with our friends who have "passed over" is exactly the same essentially as the means employed in the practice of simple telepathy or mental telegraphy of which spirit communion is a natural and logical extension. The en- lightened Spiritualist simply admits and proves more than does the telepathist or mental telegraphist, who falls short of being a Spiritualist. We again quote from the pages of "Light" an interesting record of experience related by a lady with whom we are well acquainted, one who, though a practising mental healer, is opposed to the prac- tice of hypnotism. The following narrative gives oppor- tunity for much instructive query and comment. Mrs. Bell Lewis sent this letter to "Light" in answer to an invitation in its columns for narratives illustrating "Home Telepathy," as distinct from professional experiments.

"PRACTICAL HOME TELEPATHY."

"Sir,—In your 'Notes by the Way' of March 12th, 1904, you say that you would like to hear of more being done in

Home Telepathy, and perhaps some of my experiences may be of interest both to yourself and your readers. From a child I have always been able to bring to me some persons, when I wished to see them, by simply thinking of them. Formerly I did it unconsciously, but now I do it consciously. For example, I have had living with me for nearly six years a servant, who is a thorough unbeliever in all these things, and who would scout the idea of such a thing as telepathy; yet she was so en rapport with me that I have sent her a telepathic message, when away from home, to change the dinner already ordered, and she has carried it out; and on one occasion had to send out to buy things for it, or she could not have complied with the message sent. The day before a Bank Holiday in August, I had occasion to go to the top floor of my house, then unoccupied. H. was sleeping in the basement, and had no knowledge of my going to the top floor. I left home by midnight train for the West of England, and arrived at my host's between 6 and 7 a. m., in a flood of rain, and almost as soon as I got there I remembered that the three windows were wide open, and no one would have any occasion to go up there during my absence. It was too early to telegraph, but not too early for telepathy. 'H.,' I said, 'as soon as you are dressed, go up and shut the top windows.' Now she was an old woman, and never would go upstairs if she could help it, but on my return I found it had been done, and my rooms were saved from damage. Another time, when at a lecture of the London Spiritualist Alliance at St. James's Hall, I remembered that an important message was to be left while I was at the lecture, and as it was a verbal one, neither of the servants would be likely to receive it correctly. 'H.,' I said, 'when the messenger comes tell Frederick to ask Mr. D. to see him.' Next morning, when H. brought up my breakfast, she told me that it all happened as I had mentally ordered. I rarely find, however, that I myself am affected in like manner, my work as a mental healer making me too positive; but shortly before last Christmas, one day when I least intended to do so, I paid a sudden visit to a friend, one whom I can always help

in sickness, and she said, 'I knew it was your knock at the door. I have been praying all day that you would come today.' So I had evidently received her message.

"With regard to hiding things, etc., I have often experimented in that way, but in such cases I think that the fact of all the persons being engaged thinking on the same object, enables the thought to be transferred, and makes it comparatively easy of success. When I want persons whom I know to write me, I do not write them, but call on them telepathically to do so, and I usually receive a letter within twenty-four hours. It is needless to say that both time, trouble and money are saved by my use of telepathy.

"BELL LEWIS."

Now the "H." mentioned in the above letter was evidently an "impressional medium," though seemingly unconscious of the fact, and many other equally good sensitives are apparently quite unaware of the nature and extent of their sensitiveness, which is, in many cases, constitutional rather than acquired. "H." was in the employ of the lady who signs her name Bell Lewis, and was always ready to comply with her employer's directions when given verbally in the ordinary way, at least as far as closing doors to keep out rain and providing meals for the guests in the house was concerned. The lady who sent her message from a distance sent no other sort of directions than she was accustomed to send and "H" was accustomed to receive and act upon. There was in that case no loss or surrender of individuality on the part of the receiver of the psychic dispatch, because, had her attention been called to the same matters in any ordinary external way, she would have with equal readiness responded. The only really open question is how far do people of the type of "H." really know of psychic experiences, consciously, beyond what they verbally profess to know? The writer of the letter introduces also another query. How did she send her mental messages "unconsciously" before she had learned to send them "consciously?" The problem of our sub-consciousness is



truly a profound one. We certainly must inwardly know more than we outwardly know that we know; this is a curious phrase, but it is the best we can fashion to meet this immediate requirement. Sub-conscious knowledge is closely related to rapport or affinity. Probably no telepathist, consciously or sub-consciously acting, is able to transmit intelligence to all people, or with equal clearness to any people at all times. Very much invariably depends upon the psychic state of both senders and receivers. The problem grows simpler the longer we study it, as we are soon able to trace very clear analogies between psychic and ordinary terrestrial phenomena. We hear, for example, certain conversation intended for our ears, and also much that is not so intended. This depends partly upon the clear enunciation of speech, partly upon the state of the surrounding atmosphere, and partly upon the listener's immediate receptivity. Here are three definite factors directly involved—a speaker's voice, the ambient air, and the condition of a possible hearer. Transfer this illustration to the psychic plane, and we have at once plunged into the modus operandi of simple telepathy, and of impressional mediumship. No control of any sort is exerted by one entity over another, though it is possible in some instances to connect control, or the will to exert it, with any objective as well as with any subjective process. The word control is not a pleasing term in any case, and we wish Spiritualists would put their heads together and replace it by a more agreeable word, one which would not give rise to so much controversy or require so much defining and refining. To control is often to coerce, therefore to be controlled is often to be coerced, which opens the door to a great deal of slavery and mischief. To impress and to be impressed is something entirely different, and certainly it must be admitted that we are all sometimes impressed, though many of us may never be controlled. A series of questions might well be put to mediumistic persons who claim simply to be impressed, and also to those who claim to be "controlled" with a view to ascertaining as far as possible, what is the sensitive's own mental attitude toward the unseen in-

fluences to which he is in a degree subject; and as we cannot accept the mere unsupported assertions of outside critics, we must base our verdict partly upon the replies to our questions given by the sensitives to whom they are addressed, and partly upon observation of the general condition of these sensitives. Their answers will throw light on how far they are desirous of receiving impressions or of yielding to control; their manifest condition, when intelligently examined, will afford data on which to build a conclusion as to the moral, intellectual and physical consequences of mediumship. Among many other questions the following may well be asked of as many sensitives as possible.

1. Are you consciously a medium, and if so, do you wish to continue such?
2. What is your own desire as regards your relation to those intelligencies by whom you believe yourself to be influenced?
3. What effect upon your health has your mediumship as far as you can judge?
4. What effect has your mediumship upon your memory and power of definite thinking?
5. Do you receive impressions gladly, or do they cause you annoyance or inconvenience?
6. If you think you are controlled by any outside intelligence, what is your own wish in the matter, and what effect do you consider that such control has upon you, speaking generally?

These six questions cover a great deal of ground, and we hope to receive a number of answers to all of them which we shall be at liberty to embody in a treatise on Mediumship based on widely extended experience and testimony.

Concerning Inspirational Speaking, the author of "The Great Psychological Crime" makes some reasonable and some very foolish statements, the most ridiculous of which occur when he says that inspirational speakers are overtaken with "lassitude, depression of spirit, physical exhaustion, general inertia of the entire being." When our author undertakes to quote such symptoms as attendant, in any special degree, upon mediumistic speaking, he

makes himself ridiculous before all impartial students, for two reasons:—first, because such conditions by no means invariably attend upon the kind of oratory he discounts, and, second, because quite equal lassitude frequently follows what everybody regards as strictly normal speaking. We should like to be able to convince lecturers in general that subsequent exhaustion is almost always due to one of three causes, and often to a combination of them all. First, adverse auto-suggestion, amounting to expectancy that fatigue will follow speaking; second, undue anxiety concerning the speech prior to its delivery or during it; third, imperfect ventilation and unnecessary heat in the audience room. There is food for thought in the following sentence: "All these symptoms serve to distinguish the impressional medium from the genuine inspirational speaker, who, by the exercise of his own independent powers, rises to the level of his inspiration." A fair moderate version of the entire case, which we are prepared to stand by, occupies middle ground between all extreme positions, consequently we should say that in order to guard against unpleasant sequences, it is essential that the impressional or inspirational speaker should be a voluntary co-operator with unseen influences or inspiring intelligencies, and that the nature of the discourse delivered should be always of an elevating character.

Emotional insanity is classed with impressional mediumship in the book we are reviewing, but it sustains no necessary relation to any phase of mediumship and there is no proof that mediumship has anything to do with it, though it is not unreasonable to teach that hysterical persons are sometimes mediumistic, but hysteria, which is a disease, may often only becloud and pervert mediumship. Spiritualism is in no way responsible for insanity, for a great deal of dementia has been evidently brought about by particularly false and terrifying religious beliefs, which nearly every Spiritualist repudiates. Though it is possible that religious mania may be in some way connected with "obsession," yet the special doctrines which most readily induce and foster mad-

ness are doctrines taught by religious bodies which condemn Spiritualism, and not by Spiritualists. To what profound depths of emotional insanity many people have been plunged by accepting views of the hereafter which Spiritualism completely disowns, is a matter of history, and alas, of present experience also, which cannot be gainsaid. Certain it is that highly hysterical people are apt to imagine and misinterpret many curious psychic experiences, but in their cases the regulation, not the condemnation of their mediumship is the only means of getting rid of distressing symptoms. A placid confidence in the goodness of the universe is the completest of all antidotes to emotional insanity, and though all Spiritualists are not sufficiently enlightened to thoroughly endorse the sublime philosophy of Robert Browning's magnificent poem, "Abt Vogler," it is but reasonable to maintain that the whole trend of Spiritualistic teaching is drifting further and ever further away from an acceptance of pessimistic conclusions which have grown out of materialism and also out of false theology; these conclusions when saddled on to Spiritualism are only like barnacles upon the sides of a ship, though attached to it they are no part of the true vessel. Even the bugbear "obsession" can easily be disposed of when it is honestly canvassed, for we have only to assail it in public print for its upholders to reply to us with such a modified version of the theory that diabolical element is nearly all out of it. To use an expression of Miss S. C. Clark's, published in the "Banner of Light," there are "friendly, loving obsessions." No doubt there are are such, but how wide is the gulf between such a conception and the old theory of demoniacal possession whoever runs may surely read. When an author who soundly berates mediumship tells us that by means of a Ouija Board "authentic messages from Spiritual intelligences have been, and may be received," we have no comment to offer. Granted that such is the case, we entirely fail to see that there is any need for an outcry against Ouija or Planchette.

Negative and passive states of mind appear very dreadful to the author of "The Great Psy-

chological Crime," who is perpetually on the scent for criminality, but every reasonable thinker knows that positive and negative, and active and passive states are equally good. The former are distributive, the latter are receptive; the former are essential to propelling or giving forth; the latter are necessary to absorbing or taking in. Every magnet has, and must have, two poles, one positive, the other negative; but one of these poles is precisely as good as the other. So with the human magnet, the active and passive directions of human will are equally voluntary. Voluntary passivity and receptivity can just as readily be conceived of as voluntary activity and positivity. We can be just as actively willing to receive a message as to send one, and just as truly in possession of all our voluntary powers when we are receiving communications from others as when we are actively transmitting intelligence. W. T. Stead, the well-known journalist, has explained the matter very clearly in his widely read "Letters from Julia," and it is absurd to invent and enforce a crazy theory of "cruel deception" or some other fabrication of disordered fancy to bolster up the untenable theory that every phase of mediumship is due to some evil unseen influence seeking to lead a poor misguided sensitive into some pit of destruction. The essential meanness of the theory of the universe displayed by the author whose scare-crows we are seeking to demolish, can only excite contempt and pity when that theory is seen in its native hideousness as a recrudescence of a very ancient and most displeasing form of dualism, in which "the destructive element in nature" is clearly stronger, for all practical purposes, than the constructive element. It is easy enough to believe that people sometimes deceive themselves and imagine that outside influences are writing to or through them when they are only giving objective form to some of their own subjective fancies, and particularly is this the case when people are flattered and led to believe that all sorts of wonderful things are coming to them without work or merit of their own. Quite possible also is it that when a dominant ambition sways

an intellect, such an ambition may serve as a connecting link between its entertainer and unseen influences who encourage the illusion; but in that admission there is a decided ethical note, and the strain of warning contained in it is a protest against indulging vain ambitions which may give rise to illusions and serve as points of contact with undesirable unseen associates.

"Neurotic Mediumship" is a term greatly approved by the neurotic writer who stupidly classifies clairaudience and clairvoyance under that hysterical heading. Neurotic is a word frequently met with in treatises on pathology and is almost invariably employed in connection with some phases of disease. To show up the absurdity of using so offensive an adjective in such a connection, we have only to quote from page 155 of the book under review, which says under heading "Clairvoyance": "Under this form of mediumship spiritual intelligences who understand the process are able to control the nervous organism of the eye through which impressions are conveyed to the consciousness of the medium. By this method of operation, they are able to impress upon the consciousness of the medium, whatever picture or image they desire. Or, they may, in a higher form of clairvoyance, produce a condition which opens, for the time being, a direct channel between the spiritual world and the consciousness of the medium. In this latter case the medium unconsciously employs the spiritual sensory organs of sight. He thus sees whatever there is to be seen upon the spiritual plane within the immediate range of his spiritual vision." Now, in the name of simple reason, if the above is all correct, what is there to be so alarmed about, and where are the symptoms of neurosis? Verule rubbish is a correct term to apply to very much of such an author's hysterical raving against a phase of mediumship, among many others, which, if his own definition of it be correct, is in no way objectionable. As "delusional insanity" is not, properly speaking, genuine mediumship, it is impertinent to mix it therewith in a pretended classification of different phases of mediumship. Insanity is some form of mental disorder, and as such, needs special consideration; for its

removal, we specially advocate intelligent and continuous mental treatment. When, concerning Speaking Mediumship, it is said that it involves "absolute subjection of the will and voluntary powers of the medium," we know it does nothing of the kind, though there may be occasional aberrant instances where any disorderly condition may be manifested. With regard to Materializing Mediumship the ground is very open for debate, as many phenomena advertised to the world under that caption are somewhat dubious in nature, and many enthusiastic Spiritualists are very uncertain in their views as to how far personation and transfiguration may account for much that passes for materialization. That "every living human psychical organism is a natural generator of animal magnetism and vital energy" is undoubtedly true, and furthermore, we can rationally endorse the saying that "under proper conditions animal magnetism is faintly visible to the physical eye;" it is also quite conceivable that this pabulum is made use of in the production of physical phenomena in general, and of materialization in particular; it may also be correct to say that "it requires but a very small amount of attenuated physical matter added to this physical magnetism to bring the compound clearly within the range of physical vision," but such possible scientific facts in no way justify or lend support to any "destructive" theory. The author who treats mediumship most unfairly covers his own tracks, to the best of his ability, whenever he gets into a corner by such a statement as "this, however, has nothing to do with mediumship, and its further consideration is therefore out of place at this time." With such subterfuges any phenomena of which a certain person deigns to approve can be arbitrarily eliminated from the mediumistic category and safely landed in a specially constructed ark of safety from the adverse gales of denunciatory criticism. Such pettifogging is repugnant to reason and can only influence the stupidly gullible who are prepared to mentally devour whatever an anonymous dictator chooses to enforce on the authority of his ipse dixit. Independent Slate-writing, Trumpet

Speaking, and Spiritual Tattoo Writing are all admitted to be genuine and "though it is nevertheless a fact that genuine communications are thus received from those upon the spirit side of life" all alike are under the ban of the same anathema, and mediumship is never to be regarded as either a "gift" or a "power." We should certainly hesitate to inflict so much of this silly diatribe upon our readers or audiences, were it not a fact that there is always a numerous class of timid and largely unthinking persons who are led to most distressing and erroneous conclusions by just such apparently, though unreal, authoritative dicta. Two things are made pretty plain by a perusal of the often nauseating contents of "The Great Psychological Crime." First, that mediumship cannot now be successfully denied or laughed out of existence. Second, that its most relentless opponents are resolved to scare a public which cannot be induced to scoff or to deny. Spiritualists are now simply challenged to defend the righteousness of their position, and this they ought to be able to do with dignity and some ability.

---

LECTURE IV.

RATIONAL DUALITY VS. IRRATIONAL  
DUALISM.

As it is often necessary to expose error in search for truth, we must again crave the indulgence of our audience and of our readers when we once more address ourselves to the not entirely pleasant task of unveiling the absurdities which are, even in these days, readily accepted by gullible multitudes because of the superficial plausibility of the language in which such errors are clothed. On page 287 of "The Great Psychological Crime" the author says "Duality is expressed in every department of Nature. Human intelligence recognizes the principle everywhere. In the following expressions we endeavor to clothe it in human language." Then follows a long list of words beginning with "Finite and infinite" and ending with "Growth and decay." By some



curious method of capitalization we are treated to "infinite" and to "Hell." Now for this queer exaltation of hell we are offered no reason whatever, because in every other instance the second term in the pair of opposites is not designated by a capital; it also seems curious that "Infinite and finite" should not have been the chosen mode of constructing the first sentence, and in our judgment, "Eternity and time" would read much more acceptably than "Time and eternity." But then, we are not dualists, and never have we felt quite so rejoiced to feel that we had never countenanced dualism in any form, than after reading the senseless jargon in which the dualistic theory is expressed by one of its latest advocates and exponents. The veriest infant who can reason must see at once the self-evident absurdity of contrasting "Time and eternity," as a pair of opposites like "Wet and dry" and "Summer and winter." Eternity must include time because there can be no time which is not enclosed in eternity, while summer and winter are mutually exclusive terms serving to designate limited seasons. When we are enjoying the warmth of summer we are not experiencing the cold of winter; but one season is as much a period of time as the other, and eternity must embrace all seasons. "Male and female" and "Man and woman" are placed in the list along with "Good and evil" and "Love and hate" and "Kindness and cruelty" and "Harmony and discord," which is another evidence of utter imbecility on the part of the classifier, because there is not the faintest analogy between the thought of masculine and feminine (which may be equally good, beautiful and true) and "Truth and falsehood" which cannot possibly agree together. That "Much and little" and "Many and few" bear some faint resemblance to "Finite and infinite" and "Time and eternity" may be granted, because little can be contained in much and few can be obtained in many, but we can think of the goodness of the few and of the little, as well as of the goodness of the many and the much. To compare "Finite and infinite" with "Man and woman" is to write unmitigated bosh. Such a comparison would be a

disgrace to a child's school exercise, and would suggest a composition which had emanated from a lunatic. A man is one human being: and a woman is another human being, but one is just as finite as the other. and one can be just as true and sincere and generous as the other. The insane list only needs one addition to make it complete, and that addition might serve to open too many eyes to its real inwardness, but though it seems like blasphemy to write it, the interests of true religion, sound morality, and genuine science may be served by completing folly's edifice with the final outcome of dualistic nonsense carried to its utmost,—Devil and god. We must not forget when seeking to do simple justice to Spiritualism, whether we are ourselves known as Spiritualists or not, that the latest conspicuous literary attack on Spiritualism is inextricably interwoven with the advocacy of a most absurd and detestable dualistic view of the universe as immoral as it is ridiculous. It has therefore become the business of many people by no means identified with Spiritualism, to join with professed Spiritualists in exposing a system of teaching which, if accepted, would undermine the very foundations of all elevating philosophy. We can but feel profoundest pity for the poor anonymous compiler of such hideous folly, who has put it into the power of every clairvoyant, clairaudient, psychometer or materializing medium throughout the world to chuckle with delight as he or she puts into the hands of sober thinkers, pages 287 and 288 of the supposedly influential book which is to put an end to the "dangerous" and "destructive" practice of mediumship. Many people are now beginning to ask, Are the opponents of Spiritualism today mostly anonymous madmen who make out verbal lists which insult the reason of every thinking individual, and who prate of high morality while they pen page after page of insulting diatribe, which, as on pages 218 and 219, would amount very possibly to criminal libel if real names were furnished? Who can place the identity of a "Mr. W. of Chicago" and "Mrs. L, one of the brightest journalists of the country at one time, and the widow of a well-known newspaper corre-

spondent?" Are such testimonies of the slightest value as evidence? Look into the Chicago directory for a "Mr. W" and then inquire how many female journalists "at one time" have borne names beginning with the letter L. On such flimsy and scandalous substitute for evidence, mediumship is to be utterly condemned. By whom? We may well ask and receive the quick answer from the intelligent elements in any community;—by fools only. When Mrs. Cora L. V. Richmond and other well-known people who are not ashamed of their names, undertook to reply to an anonymous vilifier, some of his champions at once raised the cry that if Mrs. Richmond is what she claims to be, a medium through whose organism unseen influences speak, then her inspired discourses are anonymous. This is a very mean piece of special pleading for two obvious reasons: first, because Mrs. Richmond herself comes boldly into public view and, second, because there is no moral connection between producing philosophic essays and poetry and publishing defamatory charges against whole bodies of one's fellow citizens. Dr. Jas. Martineau published many beautiful hymns anonymously, and it can be truly said that that noble scholar's sublime poetry was just as useful to the world before as after the individual author revealed himself. But what must be the moral blindness of a thinker who fails to see an immeasurable difference between anonymous authorship which attacks no one's character, and anonymous libel which uses the following exact language, the turpitude as well as folly of which is self-evident when we note that these ridiculous manufactured or, at least, highly perverted statistics are hurled in the face of the readers without even an attempt at verification. On pages 230 and 231 these quotations will be found. "From the chaos of mediums whose development has been sufficient to establish definite and unqualified results, science has gathered and is able to formulate and present the following verified results of the mediumistic process upon the medium, viz.:

"1. 73 per cent. of the professional mediums referred to, sooner or later develop abnormally increased and un-

controllable sexual passions, while as high as 92 per cent. show marked increase of sexual appetite or desire.

"2. A fraction over 60 per cent. develop hysterical or ungovernable temper, while as high as 80 per cent. show marked increase of nervous irritability.

"3. 58 per cent. develop dishonesty and fraud, while 95 per cent. show lack of moral discrimination and courage.

"4. A fraction over 70 per cent. develop inordinate vanity, while 92 per cent. become more or less egotistical.

"5. As high as 98 per cent. develop some discernible form of selfishness, sensuous desire, emotional weakness, or degrading physical appetite.

"6. In no instance does the process develop marked individual improvement from the moral standpoint."

Here is a wholesale defamation of character leveled against an entire class of persons, many of whom we know to be upright and honorable in all their dealings, though others may be open to the very charges brought against them; charges which with equal reason can be brought against people in all walks of life, because no class monopolizes either vice or virtue. Now it is surely reasonable to ask what is that "science" which makes such an awful disclosure? No authority whatever is even suggested; an anonymous writer makes bald damaging assertions without offering a shred of proof that any one of them is founded on any scientific information. Before it is possible for anybody to go into percentages, and even fractions of percentages, with the faintest show of truth or reason, he or she must have had opportunity for personal acquaintance with all the professional mediums in the world, and must also have had opportunity to examine every one of them carefully and critically; and even were such an opportunity granted to "science," it would then be necessary to accept the infallibility of the person making the investigation before we could rationally decide that the diagnoses were correct and the percentages accurate. If all professional mediums in any country lived together in a community, a visitor might, after remaining in that community for at least a year, and making very minute observations, arrive at some ap-

proximate conception of the moral tone of the persons constituting such a community, but even in that case, if the community were at all a large one, it would be extremely difficult to know all about the most private life of every one of its members. Practically what amounts to omniscience is claimed by this defamer, who would be unworthy of any serious attention when making such charges, were it not for the fact that the book which contains the libel has been made a veritable storm-centre in Chicago and been widely discussed all over America. Many people have been so much affected by it that they have quoted its most calumnious portions to the proposed detriment of a class of people which averages fairly with any other class in any average community.

We must not for an instant lose sight of the fact that these disgraceful charges are not made against fraudulent persons whose business consists in cheating the public wherever they can find victims of sufficient gullibility, but against honest mediums whom the bringer of the charges declares are really in communion with the Spirit-World. This it is which makes the slander so truly infamous. There would be some spark of ethical excuse for bringing a set of railing accusations against people whose only object is to deceive their neighbors, and if such people are in league with exclusively "evil spirits" then the old adage might apply, "Birds of a feather flock together," but no such claim is made by "science." The statistics are so cleverly concocted that whenever they are challenged, their author can slip like an eel out of any demurrer which may confront him. The transparent silliness of the milder and meeker condemnations is altogether ludicrous. Such a phrase as "more or less egotistical" means nothing because it could be applied to every human being in some interpretation of the language. Then the exact limits of "inordinate vanity" would be extremely difficult to define, and who is to be the judge of the exact dimensions of ordinate vanity? Then "some discoverable form of selfishness" is another empty phrase for it may well be asked, "Did you ever meet any one

entirely free from it?" As to "lack of moral discrimination and courage," the compiler of these extremely immoral and most cowardly statistics exhibits that lack in most unusual degree. Certainly we are told that another book is to be issued which will show us the way approved by "science" for the development of independent clairvoyance and much else that may prove desirable, but this earlier volume is not of a character to incline fair-minded people to follow the lead of an ignis fatuus, who "is not a medium and never has been a medium."

But to return to the immediate subject of our present discourse and continue our discrimination between reasonable duality and irrational dualism, we have only to review with simple impartiality the evidences for duality and the evidences against dualism. Duality as an interpretative expression of unity may be universal; the emblem of the winged globe, cherished long ago in ancient Egypt and elsewhere, was probably intended to illustrate the two-fold expression of unitary life. Male and female, as displayed through boundless fields of Nature, may be likened to the two eyes, two ears, two lips, two nostrils, two hands, two feet, two lungs, etc., etc., included in our anatomy, but nothing could be more absurd than to compare "Health and sickness" with "Receiving and giving." For example: To receive and to give are equally normal acts, but sickness is an abnormal condition. People do not go to a surgeon whenever they find they have two hands, so that they may get rid of an evil member by having one hand amputated, but should a tumor, an evidence of disease, appear in the body, a surgeon's skill may be invoked for its excision. "Sweet and bitter" may co-exist, but bitter herbs may prove quite as good and useful as the sweetest of pears and oranges, while to place "Tall and short" and "In and out," and "Back and forth" and "Heavy and light" as examples of duality in the same category with "Sound and silence" and "Harmony and discord" shows an utter lack of cogent reasoning and a complete absence of common sense. We should like to know which is the better or more desirable of the two "Large or small," but be-

tween "kindness and cruelty" there is no comparison, but direct moral opposition. It is positively amusing to read such a list and then remember that on such trash as strings of unrelated words of that description, poor benighted dualism depends for support in this 20th century. We have said hundreds of times that there is not a shred of evidence worthy of sober consideration in support of any such doctrines as the fall of man, human depravity, the final impenitence of any soul, everlasting misery, annihilation, a sempiternal devil, or any of the other nightmares and scarecrows of false theology which are even now bolstered up by a few presumably up-to-date preachers in large city churches. Neither Spiritualists nor professional mediums, with all their delinquencies, can have the sin laid to their door of defending and promulgating any such cruel absurdities as those detestable false dogmas which bring misery wherever they are taught. For our part, we are willing to overlook a great many weaknesses and a good deal of folly among a company of people, by no means infallible, who in many important matters have, as a body, always bravely and consistently fought side by side with many who claim neither to be Spiritualists nor mediums, but who are engaged in helping humanity to throw off an incubus which can never be anything other than a bar to human progress. As recently as Monday, April 18, 1904, the Boston Herald reported Rev. A. C. Dixon as having said, at the Ruggles St. Baptist Church, on the preceding day: "Reason revolts against the denial of the fall of man and the depravity of human nature, because all the facts before us confirm the claim that man is fallen and depraved." To this assertion we give the unswerving and uncompromising retort, **FACTS CONFIRM EXACTLY THE OPPOSITE**. Such distorters of the obvious teachings of facts, when soberly interpreted, entirely forget that what are vices in man are not such in many animals, and again they overlook what is also clearly self-evident to the patient student of human progress, that we of today very properly condemn practices which our ancestors did not consider sinful. A fair study of human development can result in only one

conclusion, and that can be felicitously and amply expressed in the words of the noble poet Whittier,

"And step by step since time began,  
We see the steady gain of man."

The presence of discord in the world by no means proves that man has fallen, though it may show that man has not yet risen to any very noble altitude. The discords produced by students of music give no evidence whatever of any "fall" or "depravity," because there is not a particle of proof furnishable that those children or adults, as the case may be, were ever musical experts. Before we can prove a fall we must first show the height on which those have stood who have sustained the fall; and before we can prove depravity we must show that originally some positive virtue was exhibited and that it has now been lost. That humanity on earth is in an imperfect but progressive condition cannot be intelligently gainsaid; and it must certainly be admitted that mere innocence, which can readily be associated with ignorance, can be forfeited; but if this planet is what Prof. Alfred Russel Wallace insists that it is,—a seminary in which we are being educated for some higher state of existence,—then, as he has ably pointed out in at least two of his books "Darwinism" and "Man's Place in the Universe," we can scientifically account for existing phenomena of every sort without having recourse to any such fabrications as a "fall" and "human depravity." The problem of evil may be well regarded as a serious one, and with evil we are obliged to cope, but Christians of all denominations might surely believe in the plain words of their accepted gospel "Overcome evil with good," a precept which could not be followed if good and evil were alike potential and eternal. The unanswerable answer to the dualistic hypothesis, no matter whether expressed in Persian or in English metaphor, is that the dualistic theory on close examination refutes itself; for no sooner is it traced back to its source than we find that it never was originally intended to do more than offer a plausible explanation of certain widely observed temporal phenomena.



The Persian or Parsee Ahrimanes is a brother of Ormuzd. During a long period of time, the Zend-Avesta inform us, these brothers are engaged in conflict, but they did not always fight, nor will they always keep up their warfare. Milton's Satan is only a temporarily lapsed Archangel who is undergoing a mysterious experience brought upon himself by his determination to run things his own way in defiance of the order of the Universe. Lucifer is before Satan, and as Marie Corelli has clearly shown in her widely discussed novel "The Sorrows of Satan," even the arch-fiend—disguised as a fashionable modern gentleman who arranges garden parties—may eventually recover his lost estate, and we should like to add far more than recover, because no one's experiences can be of absolutely no use to him, and were we only to return to a condition which was formerly ours, we might well say that all our discipline was purposeless. Redemption, recovery, reparation, and all similar words are apt to prove misleading, therefore (whenever possible) we substitute for them expressions which have no such poor or doubtful meanings. Such words as deliverance, emancipation, education, and evolution can be used in almost every instance without qualification; and when we find in a dualist's list strangely headed "The Way of Death," "Evolution and involution" in company with "Freedom and slavery" and "Sanity and insanity," we have a fresh proof of the utter inability of the human intellect when perverted by a dualistic belief to see straight, or to have any rational conception of the law of opposites. "Labor and rest" and "Waking and sleeping" may well be cited as evidences of the dual expression of a single beneficent energy, but there is not the ghost of any logical resemblance between such reasonable and harmonious alternations of experience and "Nature's destructive Principle." Health is preserved by alternate work and repose, and we never knew before that even full-fledged pessimists ever imagined that such beautiful facts could be adduced in support of their ugly theory. Pessimism, with all its error and gloom, is at least less illogical than dualism, because the confirmed pessimist is a denier of good

and a believer in evil. Pessimism and Devilism can be fairly regarded as synonymous. So can Optimism be considered synonymous with Theism. No Bible text is more often quoted than "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life and that life is in his Son." This is a most beautiful and truthful passage, but one which has been so detestably perverted that we can hardly wonder at the contempt which has often been showered upon it by many who wisely reject a false application of it, but unwisely refrain from considering it at its true value. The wages of sin is death to the sin, which invariably commits suicide; but God's gift to humanity is eternal life which is in the Son, another word for the universal Logos. No student of the first chapter of the Fourth gospel can fail to trace the ancient Gnostic doctrine of the Logos as the indwelling light and life of every human being, shining out from the page of a mystical document which requires some considerable knowledge of ancient Theosophy to completely unravel.

Spiritualism and mediumship have been assailed from many sides, and the fraud practiced in the name of Spiritualism has done much to prejudice the public mind and to deter investigation, but a large amount of opposition has been intentionally leveled against fraud and deception only. A number of years ago, Rev. Charles Voysey, of London, excited the indignation of some Spiritualists and the risibilities of others by suggesting that a number of peep-holes might be contrived so that outside observers might be able to look into a seance room and see what was actually going on. We do not think such a process entirely practicable, but it is quite possible that in many cases a company of people forming a circle imagine they see more than actually takes place, therefore the unexcited peeper would see less than the sitters saw. The "subjective mind" or "sub-self" may be responsible for much that passes current for mediumistic experience, therefore the Society for Psychical Research of Great Britain may be inclined, as a body, to go far too slowly for some of its enthusiastic Spiritualistic members, a few of whom

have withdrawn from its fellowship decidedly disgruntled. But such a book as "The Great Psychological Crime" receives no endorsement from any scientific quarter because it distinctly repudiates the sceptical attitude and is dogmatically diabolistic in confession of belief. "All bad" is the key note to the creed of one who thoroughly believes in "an overwhelming preponderance of evil spirits." "All bad" and "very bad" are the words which end a chapter on "Mediumship and Morality" from which we have quoted the abominable manufactured statistics which can be weighed by all our readers at leisure. Indeed, "all bad" and "very bad" must be the fitting verdict in the court of highest appeal when dualism has to stand its final test, for after being weighed in the balances of enlightened reason it will assuredly be thrust into some mental crematory wherein all the garbage and offal of false belief can be transmuted by the all-purifying flames of the only "hell" which has ever existed in the universe. Hell with its fire, sulphur and brimstone, is an ancient argument in favor of cremation both literally and figuratively, for just as the flame in the literal crematory annihilates naught but only liberates atoms more quickly than they can be liberated by burial, so when ancient metaphors are rightly translated and Oriental poetry yields up to us its treasures of hidden beauty, another Dante, having learned in the school of Mathew Arnold to discriminate between the fluid language of poetry and the exact language of science, will write over the portals of his new substitute for the old Inferno: ABANDON DESPAIR, ALL YE WHO ENTER HERE.

From many standpoints we may well rejoice that we have at last been treated to an authoritative unveiling of the real inwardness of that dualistic philosophy against which the noblest prophets of every age and the truest seers of every clime have thundered in stentorian accents. Those weaker Spiritualists who have often coquetted with dualism, and those timid mediums who have refused to ally themselves with any who declare in unfaltering accents that all things are working together for the best, have now been clearly shown in what disesteem they are

held by the great veiled prophet of the dualistic propaganda. Who among optimists doubts or denies that there are transformations in Nature? but change of form is not destruction of element. "The granite rocks disorganize to feed the hungry moss they bear," is a very beautiful fact and one which well supports a reasonable philosophy, but "There is no death," is the cry of the author of the famous poem which pays such loyal and royal tribute to the law of transmutation. Any one phase of the operation of universal law is quite as beneficent as any other phase, thus not "Life and Death" but birth and death can be cited to express two distinct critical points in the life of any individual. Intelligent men like Andrew Jackson Davis, who is today widely re praised by many Spiritualists who at one time seemed forgetful of the mighty work he has long accomplished, teach that birth and death are alike beneficent and that universal progress is the experience of all humanity. We shall most certainly suffer for all our mistakes and follies here and hereafter, but suffering is truly benevolent in its end and object and it can only cease when its cause is obliterated through its effective agency. When we suffer let us exclaim with Henry Wood and other sensible and kindly authors: "Pain is friendly," but knowing that its uses are to call our attention to wiser paths of thought and action, and also to repair damages which some mistake has caused, we shall not refuse to so set to work to change our modes of thinking and acting as to outgrow the need for its continuance.

We close with an interesting extract from the accepted confession of Christian Scientists, who are certainly not Spiritualists, and who do not advocate mediumship, but whose views on the constitution of the universe are far nobler than those of the great majority of their opponents: "We acknowledge God's forgiveness of sin in the destruction of sin, and in the understanding that evil and sin are unreal, hence not eternal. But the belief in sin is punished so long as it lasts." These words of Rev. Mary Baker G. Eddy

can profitably be taken to heart by many who do not, as well as by all who do belong to the flourishing organization of which she has been, from its commencement, the acknowledged leader.

---

LECTURE V.

MEDIUMSHIP, MORALITY AND MARTYRDOM.

Not only does the author of "The Great Psychological Crime" bring most awful charges of immorality against those who practice mediumship, he also insists that all mediums are martyrs. Here again is a palpable evidence of dubious statement and another display of manifest disposition to becloud a discussion by an inexact use of language. To brand a system as immoral is to condemn it, while to pronounce a whole class of people immoral is a shameless and libelous proceeding, but the term martyr is more often one of honor than reproach. Martyrs have frequently been canonized as saints and the phrase in the *Te Deum Laudamus*, "The noble army of martyrs praise Thee." removes the term entirely out of the regions of stigma and disgrace, by uplifting the martyrs into fellowship with prophets, apostles, and other extremely noble orders of humanity. Outside also of church history and religious poetry the title of martyr is frequently applied to men and women who have defended a noble cause at risk of their earthly all, and by so doing have won for themselves unending praise and gratitude. The word martyr does not necessarily mean anything other than a witness, consequently a faithful witness and a faithful martyr are interchangeable expressions. Martyrs have been divided by ecclesiastical authors into three distinct classes:

First, martyrs in will only; Second, martyrs in deed only; Third, martyrs in both will and deed. The first and third of these varieties of martyrs have been universally extolled while the second class is composed of dubious elements. "Mediumship is a martyrdom" is a compact phrase, but it is a very ambiguous assertion, seeing that a large percentage of acknowledged mediums are very

ordinary people and lay no claim to martyrdom and give no evidence that they are enduring it. In perfect accordance with a thoroughly pessimistic theory of the moral rottenness of the universe, we find these words (page 233) "Perhaps among all the varied classes and conditions of society no individual man or woman upon the physical plane of life is more cruelly imposed upon than is the honest and conscientious medium. Indeed, the pitiless deceptions and relentless brutalities practiced upon these honest, simple-minded, and credulous souls by unscrupulous, selfish, and vicious spiritual controls, in order to insure their willing and continued submission to the mediumistic process, should command the genuine sympathy and unfeigned pity of every honest lover of fair play. It should also stimulate an indignant protest in the mind of every one who has even the most limited appreciation of what we know as common decency and honor." Did we accept such a shocking condemnation of the moral order of the universe as the above paragraphs distinctly teach, we would at once confess our faith in a Supreme Devil and no longer attribute everything to "God or Nature" as neither the former nor the latter word can suggest anything so utterly diabolical. In refuting so heinous a charge against universal order, we need not be Spiritualists nor advocates of mediumship, because such an infamous doctrine is quite as offensive to the intelligent non-Spiritualist as to the most enthusiastic upholder of Spiritualism. This is Devilism, the direct antithesis of Theism. We can reasonably believe that if people constantly encourage impure thoughts they thereby attract to themselves what Swedenborg has called "an influx from the hells" but that remarkable seer, who has written far more than we can believe about "evil spirits," distinctly teaches throughout the entire series of his voluminous theological writings that an innocent sphere is always a protection, and that we are related to the world of spirits through our dominant affections, which is a thoroughly rational doctrine. The shocking immorality of teaching that honest, simple-minded persons are dupes of devils, should at last open the eyes of gullible

believers in such monstrous fabrications of disordered imagination, to the terrible tendency of their hideous creed. Belief in one or many devils has been the bane and bug-bear of every system which has endorsed it, for, in a last analysis, it is always found that beliefs in devils are scape-goats in some cases, and sources of wicked distrust in the essential goodness of the universe in others. Morality in such teaching !!! Bosh! And yet in the chapter containing the horrible sentences we have quoted we find the author advocating quite a sensible view of life beyond the grave in language acceptable to all reasonable Spiritualists and to a great many people also who are not classed with Spiritualists. Nothing can be fairer or saner than to say "The mere putting off or dispensing with the physical body at physical death does not in the least alter the essential nature or character of the individual himself. He is exactly the same, minus the encumbrance of the physical body. He is neither wiser nor more honest. He enters that life precisely as he leaves this. He carries with him into that life all the predominating habits, appetites, passions, desires, propensities, and ambitions, which have governed him in this."

Now to the reasoning mind, unobscured by prejudice, accepting the foregoing description of what Figuiere, the celebrated French author, would call the "Tomorrow of Death," nothing can be more ridiculous than to infer that the majority of unseen human entities are so desperately wicked as to cruelly deceive, even had they the ability to do so, honest, simple-minded mediums. If the moral status of the average man or woman in the earliest post-mortem state is neither higher nor lower than just before it, the author who identifies all mediumship with a most distressing and unnecessary phase of martyrdom must be thoroughly vaccinated with the hateful belief that the majority of his fellow-beings are no better than thugs and blacklegs of the worst description. Here we have another proof of what we are constantly contending for—the supreme necessity of a righteous conception of human life. We are told by this strangely mixed-up author that there are thirteen distinct spheres or conditions of life con-

nected with this planet through which individuals must pass in their evolutionary flight, and that these spheres have definite locality. These spheres are described in a manner very familiar to many students of Spiritualistic literature as one within the other, the lowest being in the very atmosphere of the earth and the higher circles much further away from our physical conditions. "Natural Science" names the first seven of these "Terrestrial spheres" and the higher six "Celestial spheres." Granting that the author really knows that there are these thirteen spheres, each superior to the other in beauty and spiritual development, he is not thereby justified in declaring that those who inhabit the first sphere are such monsters of iniquity as his doctrine of the utterly needless martyrdom of mediums positively declares they must be. The lowest circle may be very far from being intellectually and morally exalted as compared with the higher spheres, yet it may contain a vast number of kindly spirits who would scorn to betray and deceive the innocent even as they, while on earth, would have scorned to commit such cruelty. Very much is said about the American Indian, who is by no means the wretch or rascal he has been painted. Fennimore Cooper's tales and many of the disgraceful exploits of the "Cowboys" of a past generation have done very much to prejudice the unthinking masses against the original dwellers on the prairies. The Indian fought for his home and family and fought desperately when he was ruthlessly attacked, but where is the typical white man of today who would not consider it his duty to resent aggression to the utmost of his power, if violence were used against him and his belongings, precisely as his own ancestors in many instances used force most brutally against the Indian? Granted that many simple-minded mediums have Indian guides, such influences are not evil and in many instances they prove useful and benevolent. The Indian "medicine man" in the "happy hunting ground" is not a devil to be dreaded, though he is not a sage whose every counsel is a gem of wisdom. Take "Indian controls" at their surface value and there is no cause whatever for imagining



that they are wicked even in cases where their moral and mental development is not particularly high.

Instead of blindly accepting a mass of diatribe on the authority of a very pretentious author and a very dubious institution which prates of complete mastery of "Natural Science" it would be far more rational to make a tour of investigation and judge at first hand of the mediums who are supposed to be guided by Indian influences, and if the experience of others is at all like our own it will soon be discovered that there is indeed a very close similarity between the sensitive and the attendant spirits whoever they may be, and that is because the very law works which the author with whom we are compelled in so many ways to completely disagree, states to be a law of nature. Indian influences are sometimes healers and we have known several cases where the remedies prescribed by entranced sensitives were practically identical with those which Indian medicine men have long been accustomed to employ. Probably no one of much refinement of taste enjoys what some mediums call an Indian "pow-wow" where they whoop and yell and indulge in ear-piercing war-cries; but very much may be disorderly and vulgar which has no malicious origin or tendency, and it is for this reason that we take such decided exception to all unrighteous and unreasonable condemnation of mediums or of unseen influences, who, however unrefined they may appear, are certainly not vindictive. It is a very superficial dodge of many who throw dust in the eyes of unreflecting readers to say that they are not condemning the medium, but the unseen obsessing spirit. Very well. We will accept the explanation, but we are by no means satisfied with nor convinced by it; for remembering that the author who brings the charges declares that the wicked deceivers in the spirit-world are only human beings in the earth-bound sphere, it is no less discreditable to a sound philosophy of human life to attribute such devilish propensities and conduct to human beings out of the flesh, than to those who are yet in it. There is not a loop-hole of escape from the conclusion that a thoroughly degrading view of human

nature is the bottom plank of all this diatribe, therefore, it again becomes our imperative duty to protest, on logical and ethical grounds, against all the nightmare fantasies evolved by the disorderly thinking of whoever sees in evil more power than he beholds in good. Useless is it for persons who hold far milder views to bring forth theories of sub-conscious activity, unconscious cerebration, or even trickery on the part of genuine or alleged mediums, for no such theory will be accepted by any one who sets out to prove that all phenomena called mediumistic are due to infernal devices on the part of unseen enemies of incarnate humanity.

Here and there in the book, as in the chapters entitled "Mediumship and Emotionalism" and "Mediums and Their Motives" we find many reasonable utterances sandwiched between the very worst teachings in the volume. Much that is said about religious revivalism is undoubtedly true and much that is said about the motives of mediums is also entirely fair; it is only with the attribution of distinctly diabolical motives to the psychic influences to which mediumistic persons are subject that we take decided issue. The utterly unbalanced character of the charges brought against mediumship itself rather than against individual mediums is encountered very clearly on pages 272 and 273, where, after a discussion of "healing mediumship" the author flies off upon the following tangent: "In the final analysis of mediumship and the mediumistic process we cannot stop with the motives and intentions of the medium any more than we can with those of the anarchist who assassinates the president of a great nation under the mistaken conviction that he is thereby rendering a great and valuable service to society. The final tribunal to which all these questions must be submitted for ethical judgment must take into account not only the motives and intentions of the individual, but his rights, duties, and obligations as well, both to himself and to society of which he is an integral part." Words such as the foregoing, sensible as they are, lose all their point and application when two such widely different results are compared as healing an invalid and as-

sassinating a president. Healing and murder are surely not to be placed in a parallel column or in the same category. Judging these two trees by the respective fruits they have actually borne, who can hesitate to desire to cultivate the one and to extirpate the other. On page 274 the author has shifted his base entirely and is now calling attention to the glaring sensational advertisements which often appear in newspapers, but which ninety-nine out of every hundred Spiritualists entirely disclaim. Many advertising fakirs impose upon the credulous in various ways, but there is no proof that people who advertise that they are "seventh daughters of seventh daughters" or that they can perform every imaginable wonder in exchange for a fee ranging from 25 cents to \$5.00, are either Spiritualists or mediums. Some may be both, some may be neither, but Spiritualists as a body do not anywhere acknowledge them. Edgar Saltus, who is always interesting and witty, no matter on what topic he may choose to write, once gave a charmingly naive account of his experiences with clairvoyants, fortune-tellers, palmists, astrologers, etc., in New York. In the poorest part of the city, in very humble surroundings, he got his fortune told for 25 cents; in 14th Street, he paid \$1.00; in 30th Street \$2.00, and in the most fashionable neighborhood bordering on Central Park he paid \$5.00, and substantially he says the same tale was told him everywhere. Now being a level-headed man this popular scribe undertook to analyze the cause for so many people parting with money readily in hope of hearing something of their future, and the decision at which he arrived was that at least 90 per cent. of average people want encouragement, and it brightens their lives to be told by a crystal gazer, a card-shuffler, a cup-reader, or anybody else, that brighter prospects are in store. Now this decision of a popular novelist meets the case fairly well in a vast majority of cases, and this leads us into the very heart of the question of SUGGESTION.

A reasonable defence of honest mediumship cannot call for blind acceptance of the supposition that every so-called mediumistic phenomenon proceeds directly from the

spirit-world, or is precisely whatever may be claimed for it. A great many people who are truly sincere and fearless investigators of psychic phenomena freely state that they are thoroughly convinced that our sub-consciousness has very much to do with alleged mediumship, and they are also sure that self-suggestion, consequent upon some fixed mental habit of the mediums or the sitters, often colors communications. The view taken by Saltus appeals to us all very strongly. He does not profess to settle the question concerning the source whence fortune-telling proceeds, but he does say that numerous persons in all walks of life are very ready to pay money to hear something encouraging. Auto-suggestion and alto-suggestion can never be entirely separated. The auto-suggestive process blends so closely with the alto-suggestive that the two are often quickly resolved into one. The average impressible person who is in quest of encouragement rather than merely seeking to satisfy curiosity, is told that his health and business will soon improve, and that a bright future awaits him. "Castles in the air" are quickly built by persons of romantic temperament, and not by any means so quickly demolished. If prospects are outlined in roseate tints by the crystal-gazer or some other rather mysterious or romantic individual, the average sitter allows himself to be agreeably impressed with the favorable outlook and he does actually, by his own subsequent mental attitude, do much to make the glowing prophecy come true. Many prophetic statements are provisional and conditional. Quite often advice is mingled with prediction and when this is the case much good is often done, quite regardless of the exact source from which the prognostication may have emanated. Did an opponent of vulgarizing sacred things protest against the indecorum which often offensively asserts itself in connection with mediumship of an inferior type, and much that goes with it, we could readily emphasize with an aesthetic protest; but even though it be freely admitted that coarseness of behavior and doubtful messages are frequently encountered, we can readily and reasonably attribute all this to the average calibre of the various

parties connected with the transactions. To predict disaster or in any way to cast gloom over the lives of others is surely culpable, and this tendency does unfortunately exist, especially among people whose own thoughts are gloomy and who have habituated themselves to pessimistic thinking. But here again common honesty compels the declaration that this tendency to maximize the dark and minimize the bright aspect of existence is no fault peculiar to mediums, or to fortune-tellers. They are simply, to an extent, sharers in a very general pessimism, which is a pernicious influence in society wherever it obtains a foothold. Suggestion undoubtedly plays a very large part in the production of much that is genuine from one standpoint, though unreliable from another.

In the general field of psychic experiences by suggestion we mean, inclusively, very much that is certainly an influential factor in cases where the word is seldom if ever technically applied. Very frequently people have made up their minds that something must and shall occur, and so strong is this determination on their part that they stubbornly refuse to consider even the possibility that events may proceed otherwise. A highly sensitive woman who "sits" for the public is very apt indeed to be so greatly influenced by this dominant belief and expectation of a sitter, that she yields to it unconscious of the source whence it emanates. Something comes to her, she says, but she cannot clearly define where it comes from, and the sitter is delighted to receive an echo of his own thoughts, and often accepts the echo as a direct and most important revelation. We have known many people declare that mediums have given them unbounded satisfaction when they have simply been told exactly what they wished to hear, while in other cases when genuine information, as the sequel proved, was actually conveyed to them, they expressed extreme dissatisfaction and declared they received nothing of the slightest value through the medium. There is an important aspect of all this which is often overlooked, viz., our instinctive belief in the efficacy of re-inforced suggestion. We are greatly helped to carry our plans into

effect by being assured through other lips than ours that our darling projects are fore-ordained to victory, and this assurance is greatly enhanced and the force of suggestion greatly magnified whenever we believe that we are being assured of triumph by intelligences around whom our imagination casts a halo. The so-called "independent medium" may be above yielding to any suggestions from sitters, and may be able to discern clearly the actual state of a situation unbiased. This is a very desirable condition to attain, but though it must bring confidence, in the long run, it may not prove an immediate source of ample revenue. People are continually forgetting that in dealing with clairvoyants and all similarly endowed people, they are dealing with fellow-men and women who average, morally and otherwise pretty nearly equal with the rest of humankind. Neither great saints nor exceptional sinners are usually found in the ranks of sensitives, therefore we ought not to be surprised when we find that mediums are generally impelled by the same motives which impel other people. Desire to please clients is practically universal among members of all professions, and professional mediumship certainly exists. Something can be said for it and something against it. The chief argument in its favor is that it is a supply to meet a pressing demand, and that as long as the public wants it it will be furnished. The principal objection raised against it is that to work mediumistically for money calls for a degradation of mediumship consequent upon immoderate regard for the opinions and wishes of consultants. It would be well, however, to remark that where there is no question of monetary compensation there is often, among highly sensitive persons a keen desire to please that portion of the public to whom sittings are gratuitously given. Thus there is no hard and fast line which can practically be drawn between professionals and non-professionals. Those who condemn mediumship all in all are not to be pacified or won over by seeking to indulge them in some matters so as to abate their hostility. Temporizing and fencing always proves poor policy; it is far better to

that charge is substantiable, then you are indeed acting unrighteously, and you are herewith called upon to immediately mend your ways. But we do not credit anything like the whole of the accusation brought against you, at the same time we admit that some of you are on dangerous ground, especially those whose advertisements reveal the fact that they do seek to assist in bringing about results not altogether compatible with a due consideration for the general well-being of humanity. However, gentlemen of the hypnotizing fraternity, you may well afford to laugh at the inanity of the anonymous person who condemns you, for he clearly states in his address to the Bench and Bar (pages 373-4) that when the public mind, through the agency of his strenuous efforts and that of the "School of Natural Sciences," has been sufficiently awakened to the enormity of your crimes, "it is not only possible but probable that criminals of every class will endeavor to excuse their crimes upon the ground that they were committed at the hypnotic suggestion of some one else." That is precisely what they will do, and for once in his life, your arraigner has seen the inevitable result of resuscitating devil worship. Beyond telling members of the legal profession that to cope with this fresh and very serious problem "will call for the exercise of their best intelligence and finest discrimination" they are given no advice whatever, as to how, in the interests of society, they may counteract your foul machinations. Messrs. Hypnotists, it appears that to condemn you is to play into the hands of the vilest scoundrels on earth, but then if you are such villains as you are painted, all we can do in any case is to play into the hands of iniquity, because the destructive principle in nature is always the dominant force in a dualistic system of philosophy. You can well afford to turn away with sneers of contempt from a writer who claims by his own confession, that he is promulgating a dangerous doctrine, of which every criminal can quickly take advantage, but you members of the hypnotic fraternity cannot justifiably refuse to heed a reasonable call to purge yourselves from the offence of some unrighteous

advertising, and you will do well to be on your guard in the future, more than you have been in days past, against giving plausibility to wholesale attacks upon you and all your practices. We are not afraid of you, nor do we consider you as a class, a set of blacklegs, or impostors, but we would recommend to you a more excellent way than the path which many of you are now treading.

Permit a word of friendly counsel couched in moderate language:

I. Never seek to gain undue advantage over a weaker fellow-being.

II. Never advertise to assist in bringing about results which cannot bear the most rigid moral scrutiny.

III. Acknowledge that you take upon yourself considerable responsibility when you invite easily led people to follow your every suggestion, and as you are men and women with hearts to feel as well as minds to think, we urge upon you the paramount necessity of looking well to your motives and so revising your methods wherever revision is required, that the stigma now attaching to the terms you employ may, by your own good conduct, be effectually and finally removed.

TO THE HYPNOTIC SUBJECT: Some good advice is given to you on pages 350-1, so if you have read the book to which we are referring, you may profit by much that is told you about your lack of individual self-assertion and self-control. In all probability your chief need is to cultivate more self-reliance and self-esteem. Most hypnotic subjects are altogether too servile in their general mental attitude, far too ready to follow fashions, and generally too timid to tread any path which runs counter to established precedent and prevailing sentiment. We advise you to study mental science with a view to gaining a fuller knowledge of your own inherent powers; you need to learn to depend far more upon yourselves and to be far less easily swayed by other people. If you imagine that you require to be controlled by some one else, or in any way to come under the dominion of any outside influence, you are mistaken. Practice mental co-



operation and employ all such elevating mental communion as may be open to you but do not permit yourself to believe that you can be coerced or led to do, say, or even think anything not in harmony with your own volition. We advise you to steer clear of all persons who promise to do great things for you if you will but submit yourselves to their dictation. Quite true is it that human beings are endowed "with certain distinctive and exclusive attributes and characteristics" which distinguish them as superior to animals. Bear this well in mind and never permit your emotional susceptibilities to over-ride your reason. Remember you are properly at all times your own masters and never allow yourselves to believe that any influence seen or unseen can compel you to do aught that your own judgment and volition would rebel against. If you wish to take part in any so-called hypnotic experiments for the demonstration of a scientific proposition, suggest to yourselves exactly what you are willing to do and co-operate, if you please, with a reputed hypnotist to carry out what you jointly wish to accomplish. We recommend no one to think of himself as a "subjective" to any operator. Mental co-partnership is reasonable and dignified, but blind unreasoning subjection of one human entity to another is unworthy of the dignity of human nature. This is where the line can be drawn between willing, rational obedience, and unwilling, irrational submission. Heroes can obey; only cowards submit.

TO THE GENUINE MEDIUM: "All that has been said by way of admonition or suggestion to the hypnotic subject applies with equal relevance, materiality, logic and force to you." The above paragraph is quite sensible provided that only sane and sober words have been addressed to hypnotic subjects, among whom are to be found many genuine mediums. A great mistake is made, however, by the same author, when he tells you that "it is not a question of motives or intentions at all" as to the results which the exercise of mediumship will produce. Such a saying is one of his very weakest and most misleading, and proves his utter lack of real knowledge

of the law which binds us to the unseen universe. Your motives and intentions have a vast deal to do with the class of influences you will draw to you, and with whom you will associate if you are a genuine medium, consequently, we urge upon you most seriously, the supreme necessity for centering your affections exclusively upon what is noble, avoiding all envious and other ungracious dispositions and determining to become a magnet to attract only what will be of service in the elevation of humanity. When the author says that "no true religion ever has demanded nor in the very nature of things, ever will demand of you the surrender of your individual responsibility, nor your moral accountability, nor your power of self-control, nor any of the faculties, capacities and powers upon which you must depend for the achievement of your individual immortality," we can utter no word of protest, indeed, such a statement can but receive the unqualified endorsement of every sane and fearless thinker and again, we must express our entire sympathy with another paragraph (page 354). "However desirable it may be under right conditions to obtain definite knowledge of a life beyond the grave, this cannot be justly nor rightfully, nor lawfully done by any process or means which involves the sacrifice of individual life, or the surrender or suppression of any of the individual and material rights and powers of the soul." What follows is by no means so excellent because your critic does not allow that you can be a voluntary medium. Some good advice is given you, but its influence is greatly weakened by the ignorance of the one who gives it concerning a genuine medium's ability to determine whether he will or will not submit to extraneous guidance. The unfortunate word "control," to which a large percentage of Spiritualists cling with leech-like tenacity, has given very great reason for opposition to Spiritualism on the part of many who rejoice in the thought of spiritual intercommunion. "When your controls are lofty in expression and exalted in thought, you, as their instrument, lend yourself to the harmony of thought and expression. It is then that you appear to greatest advantage. When

your controls are frivolous, coarse, or vulgar, their spirit and intent reflect themselves through you, and it is then that you appear to great disadvantage." While the above quotation embodies a manifest truth, its author makes two stupid blunders. The first, by declaring that all mediumship is depraving, which it cannot be in the first set of instances he has cited. The second, in supposing that because you are a genuine medium you are obliged to take whatever comes from the unseen, and though at one time you are under very high influences, at another time you must be under equally low ones. Clear thinking on this subject will soon disperse this cloud and we urge upon all genuine mediums to remember that you must keep your own desires and thoughts upon the high, pure level if you wish to be permanently protected against all undesirable incursions from unseen realms. Nothing can be more nonsensical than to teach that pure and wise "controls" (we like the word "guides" very much better), will injure a medium by expressing themselves through him, or that because one may be a genuine instrument, for such one certainly may be, voluntarily, that he is thereby compelled to yield to any coarse or vulgar influence which may at some time be in the sphere of his surroundings.

**TO THE SENSITIVE:** It is indeed true that because you are possessed of an unusually delicate organism in some specific ways, you are liable to be exposed to more subtle temptations and difficulties than though you were of blunter fibre. For this cause you have the manifest capacity for greater enjoyment and equally for greater suffering than the ordinary, but while your extreme sensitiveness could prove your bane, it can be made to prove your greatest blessing. We very strongly urge upon you the high necessity of paying no unnecessary attention to the miseries and vices of the world around you. It is not for one so delicately organized as you are to enter into cesspools of iniquity for the purpose of cleaning them out. Such work belongs to those who are cast in Herculean mold and you are above all else adapted to receive and transmit the softer melodies of life. In musical

parlance you resemble an Eolian harp far more than you resemble a trumpet. You must learn to use and dominate your sensitiveness so as not to be used or dominated by it. You are naturally predisposed to take on and even to absorb the conditions of feeling about you. Your psychological surroundings are therefore very liable to influence you to a greater extent than is desirable. Never encourage a tendency to feel people's ailments, or to become dependent when others are depressed. At the same time you can do very much useful work by diagnosing conditions sufficiently to be able to prescribe a remedy for the afflictions of your companions. There is an immense difference between becoming aware that certain conditions are existent, and that certain methods are required to improve a situation, and falling a victim to an unpleasant state of affairs one's self. Do not seek to diagnose disease, but seek rather to discover how to minister to paramount necessities so that causes of distress may, by wise treatment of a sufferer, be eradicated and a new and healthy condition of mind and body be established through wise compliance with the law which governs all expressions.

Though mediumship in and of itself is nothing to be deplored or avoided, it is unwise and even dangerous to sit in promiscuous developing circles, or submit to the dictation of any person who may offer to develop your clairvoyance or any other faculty dormant within you or incipiently manifest. Without at all agreeing with any one who pronounces mediumship itself a destructive process, we may well quote the following excellent advise which, if it stood alone, could well be heeded by every sensitive the world over. "You must use your reason. You must maintain the highest possible measure of self-control over all the faculties, capacities and powers of your own individual being." A very good exercise for all who wish to make intelligent use of their psychic possibilities is to train the senses one by one until all five are entirely subject to the command of their trainer. Make the resolve that your sight, hearing, tasting, touching, and smelling shall be completely subservient to your demand to the

end that though every faculty grows increasingly acute, you are not compelled to see, hear, taste, touch, or smell anything because it is in your vicinity, for you can open yourself to an influx or close yourself against it at your desire. For example: You may be sleeping in a room into which the sounds of feline music often enter at night. There are many cats in the neighborhood and frequently they make loud and strange noises after midnight. Being very sensitive alike to harmonies and discords and constitutionally, perhaps, a very light sleeper, you are greatly disturbed by these nocturnal sounds which jar your nerves and grate upon your susceptibilities. There are only two practical courses open to you; one is to put yourself into sufficient harmony with the cats to be simply amused at their vocalization and therefore not disturbed by it. The other course is to entirely shut the noise out of your consciousness by deliberately concentrating your thought on something which is so agreeable and engrossing that mental pre-occupation soon, with this selected theme, becomes so intense and complete that nothing outside can arrest your attention. In either case you go to sleep if you need sleep and are not disturbed by unpleasant dreams, nor do you suffer next day from nervous irritation. Take some such simple illustration as the foregoing and apply the teaching it conveys to situations in general, and though we do not rashly promise that you will all at once gain complete possession of your nerves and entire conquest over your impressibility, we can conscientiously assure you that with every renewed performance of so sensible and practical a mental act, you will find yourself possessed of added self-control and thus increasingly well-equipped to stand secure amid the many discording mental currents which you are certain to encounter in the general world.

**TO THE SPIRITUALIST:** Though the author whose strangely unbalanced book we are still reviewing fails lamentably to discriminate between mediumship which is rational and desirable, and mediumship which is irrational and undesirable, he says to all of you something you can do well to heed, and the best of his exhortations

are in the following paragraph. "If Spiritualism is to become a permanent living factor in the moral and spiritual evolution of our race, you who represent its best brains, wisest thoughts and highest morals, must come to the front and assert your independence."

But following that statement (page 363) is a very wild and foolish dictum, at which all veteran Spiritualists will certainly laugh at the expense of the ignorance of the man who pronounced it. "You must insist upon the entire abandonment of every phase, form and degree of mediumship." Such a sweeping statement loses all ethical value because it stands to reason that the very people to whom it is addressed will positively refuse to even consider it, whereas, if you as Spiritualists are called upon by a friendly critic of past and present methods to set to work to revise what needs revision, you may be assisted to do much that you are both willing and anxious to accomplish, viz., to elevate the practice of mediumship to a higher moral and intellectual level than that whereon a great deal (though not all) of it has long stood and still stands. The consecration of mediumship is the only antidote to its desecration. It cannot be blotted out but it can be judiciously encouraged and devoted to noble ends. Here is a very serious question for leaders in Spiritualism, if such there be, to answer in such a manner as to prove to the world that Spiritualism is truly a beneficial philosophy and that those who have embraced it are moved by truly philanthropic impulses.

**TO THE MINISTER:** You gentlemen of the ministerial profession (and ladies also) are generally engaged in exhorting others, but occasionally you are in turn exhorted and you must confess if you are thoroughly honest, that, regardless of denomination, your attitude toward Spiritualism has been, as a whole, rather weak and unsatisfactory. Eliminating certain honorable exceptions, you as a body of public educators have been rather afraid of Spiritualism, and sometimes some of your number have displayed execrable taste in denouncing it unsparingly without having adequately investigated it. Occupying,

as you do, a prominent public position, you are reasonably supposed to investigate all matters pertaining to religion and morality, which are affecting the communities in which you work. You ought, therefore, to be prepared to say something intelligent and intelligible upon the matter concerning which you are sure to be questioned at some time by members of your congregations, or by your fellow townspeople who regard your opinion with respect. There are probably among you many agnostics, to some extent, and you may conscientiously feel that on some subjects your light is dim and your knowledge small, even though on many other points of practical doctrine pertaining directly to practical morality, you can speak with definite conviction.

The author of "The Great Psychological Crime" has performed a dastardly act by hitting one of your number anonymously, and he ought to be forced to appear before some of you and make good his insinuations. An anonymous author generally needs instruction in the very rudiments of literary fairness, and we read (on page 366) about "a prominent minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church" who was then and is now "the honored pastor of one of Chicago's conspicuous and prosperous churches." The denomination should insist upon his name being given for two necessary reasons. 1. That suspicion should be lifted from those in the same communion to which it may be unjustly attached. 2. That the gentleman himself may have an opportunity of rebutting charges brought against him, if they are, in any measure, unfounded. It is quite worthy of an anonymous coward to strike namelessly, and thus shield himself from all counter-attack while attributing to a man from whose opinions he has a perfect right to dissent, the most unworthy of motives. If attacks are to be made by you upon others, or by others upon you, then let us all unitedly insist that there be no suppression of name, no innuendos, no backbiting, no unctious moralizing on the part of nameless moralizers behind closed shutters, but open straight-forward declaration of principles. If charges and counter-charges are in order, then let all be open as the day

so that the public may see that ministers of religion are at least brave and honest, no matter what may be the special theological trend of their thinking. Quite true is it that ministers of religion have been altogether too ready to blink questions they need to face, and one cause for the lessening influence of the ministry in many places is that people have had some justice on their side when they have complained that educated and salaried teachers of religion have not fairly and squarely faced the vital problems with which the public mind is wrestling.

Spiritualism is in your churches, and you must awaken to a knowledge of this fact. You should stand ready to deal with it calmly and dispassionately, and be prepared to give sound, helpful advice to the sensitive and inexperienced who come to you for counsel, and who may be easily led into foolish and even dangerous courses by following the lead of unscrupulous persons who pose as Spiritualists when they are often only money-grabbers trading on a community's unbalanced love of sensationalism. You must also refrain from practising or countenancing unduly emotional methods for arousing religious feeling, for experiencing the direful after effects of hysterical revivalism, many people turn a deaf ear to all your ministrations and denounce the entire church as a foe to progress and a promoter of dementia. The hysterical diatribe of the author who lets his fanaticism oftentimes lead him to the very verge of insanity, says (page 370) "To admit that mediumship is a fact does not admit that it is right, any more than to admit the existence of murder is an admission that murder is right." Such utterly stupid diatribe can influence only simpletons, provided readers are possessed of dictionaries or know a little of etymology. Murder is a direct and violent perversion of force and cannot in common sense fairness be placed in the same category with the expression of natural sensitiveness which is all that mediumship often is. Murder must be a deliberate act performed with an intention to destroy, and thus to characterize mediumship in its simplicity is the height of absurdity. If you ministers of religion make such wild as-



sertions from your pulpits, as you are recommended to make by the author who evinces utter ignorance of the very meaning of the word "mediumship," in its uncorrupted form, you will make yourselves laughing stocks. But if you will soberly and good-naturedly discriminate between the use and the abuse of mediumship as between the consecration and desecration of all else also, you will certainly largely increase your usefulness and greatly add to the respect and admiration you will win from the most thoughtful elements in all communities.

TO THE BENCH AND BAR: As you of the American Bench and Bar are very highly complimented in the book to which we must still refer, you may perhaps be very ready to listen attentively to the awful indictments of hypnotism poured into your ears, but, learned gentlemen, you are surely too wise to be caught in the trap thus flatteringly baited for you, for no sooner have you been instructed how to proceed against all hypnotists than you are told in unmistakable language that it will be the most deeply criminal element in the population who can and will take advantage of your obedience to the instructions of the sciolistic and in some instances, distinctly nescient "School of Natural Sciences." That august institution by its own mouthpiece confesses its inability to ward off calamity, if you follow its nonsensical teachings.

A compliment to your superior wisdom may be very polite, but it seems unmistakably to show the hollowness of the source whence that compliment proceeds. Listen and consider well the import of these words (pages 373-4).

"It is not only possible but probable that criminals of every class will endeavor to excuse their crimes upon the ground that they were committed at the hypnotic 'suggestion' of some one else." That is exactly what they will do, if you allow yourself to be influenced by scarecrowism, and you are far too cautious and intelligent a body of men to be thus influenced. Hypnotism does need regulating and it is for you to righteously repress the abuse of it, in common with all other abuses, when it can be demonstrated that injury has been inflicted on any one, through any agency. The professional

hypnotist may be a very excellent man, or he may be a rascal. Hypnotism exists, but it is by no means entirely criminal. Wise legislation is certainly required in many instances, but the adult American population will never submit to such extreme paternalism in government as, if it were enforced, would give to a few people supreme power to dominate all the rest of this entire democracy with absolute autocracy.

TO THE PHYSICIAN: You, ladies and gentlemen of the medical profession, richly deserve much of the eulogy pronounced upon you, but you know well enough, that as a whole you are neither better nor less good than members of other professions, therefore, you will smile no doubt, at the flattery which is poured into your ears by an author who evidently thinks he can induce you to use your influence in spreading his "School of Natural Science." The sickly compound of flattery and pomposity in his address to you has no doubt awakened your risibilities if you have taken time to read it. Knowing as you must that hypnotism is a very wide word, and that some of your number approve, while other disapprove, its use; and knowing also, as you must, that good is often done outside as well as within the ranks of your ancient honorable profession, the wisest among you are giving, and in the future will give to a far greater extent than in the past, attention to the practice of suggestion, especially for overcoming deep-seated neurotic disorder and for the ultimate conquest of insanity. A great deal of highly condensed information is contained in "Practical Hypnotism" by O. Hashnu Hara, published in London, which will give those of you who may need it in your busy lives, the utmost amount of fact in the smallest possible compass. As many of your number, good doctors, are thoroughly level-headed, we expect you to display discernment and discrimination when dealing with all psychic or mental, as well as other curative and healing processes. If you are true to the Esculapian Oath you can well afford to be undogmatic on many questions, but ever open to embrace whatever remedy or method can prove of benefit to sufferers.

TO MASTER MASONS: As you are no doubt quite competent to conduct the affairs of your ancient and illustrious organization, without suggestions from the outside, and as there are among you, without doubt, Spiritualists, as well as persons of many other phases of religion, scientific and philosophic, our comment upon what has been addressed to you shall be very brief. As a powerful body of earnest men you can do much to promote the cause of human liberty and we feel quite well assured that, as a body you will not allow yourselves to become the tool of any man or "school" in his or its attack upon any portion of society whose rights and liberties are as sacred as those of any other man or "school." All organizations in America may claim equal legal protection, if duly incorporated, but it is surely an outrage upon the constitution of the United States to endeavor to employ every conceivable agency, invoke its aid by flattery, to bolster up the claims of a certain sect or cult which has not even the bravery to stand side by side with other denominations and institutions publicly in view of the world's approving or disapproving gaze. Masonry has done good and has had a noble record and it does not seem probable that it will now become the tool in the hands of some despotic clique whose ignorance of fair play and the laws of honest controversy is colossal to the point of insanity.

THE GENESIS OF DOGMA, which supplements "The Great Psychological Crime" is on the whole, far more temperate and rational than the book itself and as in this, we are promised another volume, presumably from the same author on the more inspiring theme of individual achievement under and in accordance with the sound principle of "Self-control, the principle of Mastership in Individual Life," this volume will also be in the "Harmonic Series." If that book had been issued first, the author or "School" would probably have shown better judgment, for what we all most need to learn and take to heart, is the need of showing a higher way rather than denouncing a path along which many people quite as worthy as ourselves are conscientiously traveling.

Dualism has its innings far too long; a supposititious "Destructive Principle in Nature" alias Devil, has altogether too long captured the fears of the human race. One God and no Devil will certainly be the faith of the future. Simple Theism in religion, and undiluted Optimism in philosophy will give us exactly what we need to develop and maintain—one true individuality. Florence Huntly's postscript is about the best that any one could write at the end of such a book as "The Great Psychological Crime," which, no matter from what standpoint dualistic teaching, the effect of which upon the average mind is invariably bewildering and depressing.

As Spiritualists and particularly mediums are assailed it may be judged is a plain setting forth of pernicious together with all hypnotists by this pessimistic drivel, even though relieved occasionally by lucid and valuable advice concerning the needed development of individuality, we leave it to those most interested to take up the many points we have perforce neglected, and compile a volume of equal dimensions which shall completely answer the wild effusions of the "School of Natural Science."

... has its ... in ...  
... in ...  
... the ...  
... in ...  
... will ...  
... and ...  
... is about ...  
... as ...  
... which ...  
... the ...  
... and ...

... and ...  
... and ...  
... in ...  
... by ...  
... by ...  
... of ...  
... to ...  
... and ...  
... of ...  
... of ...

...

THERE IS NO DEATH

is the Message of Spiritualism  
inscribed upon the pages of the

# BANNER OF LIGHT

The Oldest Spiritualist Newspaper  
in the World

Established in 1858

---

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, \$2.00

---

If your newsdealer will not furnish you, give us his  
name and address and we will send you a copy free

BANNER OF LIGHT PUBLISHING CO.  
204 Dartmouth Street, Boston

