Light:

A Journal of Psychical, Occult, and Mystical Research.

"WHATEVER DOTH MAKE MANIFEST IS LIGHT."—*Paul.* "LIGHT, MORE LIGHT!"—*Goethe*

No. 566.—VOL. XI. [Registered as a Newspaper.] SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1891. [Registered as a Newspaper.] PRICE TWOPENCE.

CONTENTS.

Notes by the Way 541
Mesmerism and Hypnotism at the Westminster Aquarium ... .543
Notes from My Spiritual Diary 543
Psychic Force 544
The Analysts: A Fancy 544
"Bible's Own Account of Itself"..545
The Psychical Society's Ghosts....546
Personal and Impersonal 547
Universal Kindliness 548
A Still Further Remonstrance 548
Black is White, &c. 550
Cause of Colour in Animals 550
"Esoteric Basis of Christianity"..550
Do Two and Two Make Four 551
The Feminine in the Divine 552

NOTES BY THE WAY.

Contributed by "M.A. (Oxon.)"

Woman is coming to the front rapidly in this which has been called her age. I will not refer once again to the senior wrangler's superior: nor to the lady bracketed equal to the senior classic: nor to the rapid success in many professions that has been gained by the sex that has only recently been educationally emancipated. No one can say that women have not made the best of their lately acquired opportunities. The fact is woman was never properly educated until lately, and now we are surprised at the results she commands in open competition with the other sex. The Speaker of the House of Commons, speaking at Leamington, warned boys that they must look out if they want to maintain their position. The examination lists (he was distributing the prizes to the Girl's High School) showed, he said, that in at least three departments girls were equal if not superior to boys. That speaks well for High School training. And yet, when the School Inquiry Commission examined the system under which women were then educated, they found it slovenly, superficial, showy, and given over to "accomplishments." In this sense it was that they reported upon it. Under the new and better system Mr. Peel is of opinion that "if the girls have scope and verge enough they will beat the boys on what has hitherto been considered to be the exclusive ground" of the latter. There is nothing like competition. I, for one, have believed that the nimbleness of intellect, the intuitive power of mind, aided by powers of application greater and more free from distraction, would produce high results. The new *regime* will materially affect the old, whether for good remains to be seen. Mr. Peel seems to think that the social position of woman as wife and mother would be rather improved than otherwise by this higher education. Be this as it may, it is a duty which should be recognised when we are confronted with it, to develop to its highest potential the faculties of every soul, whether it chances to be enshrined in a male or female body, seeing only to it that zeal must be according to discretion. I do not discuss many points that bear on the question, for they have no bearing on the subject with which "LIGHT" is concerned. But Spiritualists will agree that each soul should have its opportunity of highest possible development.

There is on my table a pamphlet presenting another aspect of the woman question. It is called "Womanhood and the Bible," by Libra. (Theosophical Publishing Company.) It is an attempt to set forth in twenty-three pages the principle of the Divine feminine in its perfect equality with the masculine as discovered by a certain interpretation of some passages of the Bible. What is said is by no means new. Writers of books, more or less inaccessible to the mass of us, have set forth various aspects of the same idea. But this little pamphlet puts into small compass what has been before stated in more abstruse form. It is not possible to deal here with the whole argument for the essential unity—or biunity—of man and woman. I pass over the argument from the Old Testament and come to the words of Jesus as here interpreted. Marriage it is claimed, was regarded by Him, in reference to the higher life, as a concession. "In the beginning it was not so." "They were not twain, but one flesh." Few, He implied, were prepared to receive what He had to teach. "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it." To the question regarding the seven brothers who had all married one wife the reply was stern and clear. "The Kingdom of Heaven is within you," He had taught. And so, in strict accordance with this teaching, "the true resurrection was the emancipation of the soul from spiritual death into which it sinks from desire, and the God of Abraham was the God of those spiritual souls who had linked themselves to the Divine life, and not of those who had merely paid the debt of nature and entered into a passive existence. Death to one was not the same as death to the other. In the former state was "neither marrying nor giving of marriage." These words taken literally bear a different meaning from that which the writer gives them by spiritual interpretation. Enough has been written to show the drift of the argument, which I must leave to the judgment of my readers.

"Lucifer" discusses, in the editorial, the subject of "Theosophy and Christianity." The article is mediatorial and pacific. Is Christianity the teaching of the Christ? Then we have no quarrel with it. His teachings on brotherhood, forgiveness of injuries, non-retaliation, poverty, self-sacrifice, purity of thought, equal stringency on sexual morality for man and woman—these we entirely accept. But is Christianity the doctrine of the churches? Then we break off. They "have made the Word of God of none effect by their traditions." This is, briefly put, the position assumed. It is not new, but it is a note of the new age of frequent utterance. In the same article the editor objects that the doctrine of the subjection of women is in antithesis to the complete equality of the sexes as taught by Theosophy. "The human self is sexless, and incarnates successively in male and female bodies during the long cycle of incarnation, gathering human experience in both alike." Mr. Mead writes on "Theosophy and Occultism." It is an able and exhaustive paper, and I can only briefly summarise its conclusions. Theosophy is not Occultism: neither is it Occult Arts. The "obtrusive spirit of the age, which would thrust its grimy and offensive person into every sanctuary," will find that "Occult Wisdom is no harlot that loves to display her charms to the first comer; she is, on the contrary, a chaste virgin, and he who would win her must do so by unselfish love and compassion, and not with the heat of passion. Let us bear

in mind the inscription at Sais in ancient Egypt, which told the worshippers at the shrine of Isis, "I am all that hath been, and is, and shall be, and my veil no mortal hath hitherto raised." And why? Because he must become immortal and conquer death before he can rend the veil of the temple of Nature in twain. In other words, he must live in the consciousness of his immortal Self and be at one with it, even as Jesus was at one with His Father." "My Unremembered Self" is a story with a purpose worth reading. Mrs. Besant continues her exposition of the "Seven Principles in Man." Mr. Archibald Keightley also contributes a thoughtful paper on the old phenomena of "Life and Death."

"The Arena" chiefly concerns us by reason of a paper on "Healing by Mind," for with the well-worn story of Adyar and Madame Blavatsky I decline to meddle any more. Mr. Moncure Conway has no new light to give, and his prepossessions are such as to render one careful about accepting his conclusions. I am bound, however, to say that his article is very interesting and his estimate of Madame Blavatsky is less coloured by prejudice than I should have expected to find it. The lady fascinated; the subject repelled. The question discussed in the article on Healing, "Can disease be healed through mental treatment?" is one of the first importance. I wish we could have articles of this description in our first-rate English magazines. The worst of it is that I can give no fair idea of it here. Starting from the idea that man is a spirit and his body only the means of correlating him with his surroundings in this state of existence, the writer refers the scepticism with regard to mental healing to the materialism of the age. Man believes only in the effect of that which he can touch, handle, and cognise by his senses. Mind-healing is not intellectually discerned, but spiritually; therefore an essentially intellectual age will have none of it. Yet it is making such progress that its various schools are soberly estimated to number over a million adherents. With reference to the assertion that these systems do not appeal primarily to the intellect or to the intuitions, the writer notices the fact that they originated with women, whose intuitional and spiritual senses are keener than those of men. They have not so often been blunted by persistent contact with the affairs of the material world, dulled by intellectual strife, and, as too often is the case with the sterner sex, dwarfed and stunted by being ignored. All analogy shows that undivided attention directed to one of two faculties leads to the strengthening of the one and the paralysis of the other. So it is that woman remains intuitional, while man has suppressed his inner faculties by an almost exclusive attention to those which he finds useful in dealing with material things.

Coming to the question of the action of the mind on the body, the writer points out that it is abundantly recognised by exact science as exemplified in the action of the passions and emotions on the body. Acute fear will paralyse the nerve centres, and sometimes turn the hair white in a single night. A mother's milk can be poisoned by a fit of anger. Mental states are mirrored in the body. Mind translates itself into flesh and blood. So much is admitted. What, then, is the method of mind-healing? "There are two distinct lines of treatment which may effect a cure. One by intelligent and persistent self-discipline and culture; the other through the efforts of another person called a Healer." These are often combined. It is said that the power does not lie in the personality of the Healer, nor in the exercise of his will; he is only an interpreter. "The Divine recuperative forces which are latent are awakened and called into action." "He is but a conduit through which flows the Divine repletion." (Or, as a Spiritualist might prefer to put it, he is the vehicle for external agencies who find in him their medium. This, however, is not the view of the writer of the "Arena" article.) All depends on the attitude of mind, if you are trying to cure yourself. Let your thoughts be elevated. "Look upon the physical self as only a false claimant for the Ego." Fix the mind on health, not on disease. (This is Prentice Mulford over again.) Do not peer into the dust for new supplies of life which are stored within you. If a Healer operates, yield a passive mind filled with the same ideals.

Such, very imperfectly summarised, is the contention of the writer. It seems to me that it is reasonable and logical. I would add to what he says that it is conceivable to me that a new age may need a new treatment of its diseases. Orthodox medicine has steadily advanced from those drastic methods of blood-letting, bolus-taking, and the administration of masses of drugs, which we should now give only to a horse or a cow, to the milder and more temperate treatment of the present day, of which the avoidance of unnecessary dosing with drugs is a prominent characteristic. The race has grown more sensitive; the soul within finds its way more easily through a body which has become less dense. May it be that in the near future we shall regard disease in the body only as the externalisation of an ailment of the soul, and treat the case accordingly. The pages of "LIGHT" bear ample testimony to the liberal insertion that I have given to cases of alleged healing of various kinds. I regard the matter as one of great importance, which may well engage close attention and invite prolonged experiment.

"The Review of Reviews" announces its Christmas number of "Real Ghost Stories" for about the middle of November. As the issue will be limited to a hundred thousand copies my readers should see that they secure a copy, for it will sell rapidly. The character-sketch in the October number is Mrs. Besant, a personal friend of Mr. Stead's. The account of her life is the best I have seen, and gives the most vivid picture of the varied influences under which she was brought. Though the chief facts in Mrs. Besant's chequered and eventful career are generally known, there is some additional light thrown on her character in this article. I understand that the sketch in the November number will be A. J. Balfour. This number also contains a case of Faith-healing, related by Archdeacon Wolf in the "Church Missionary Intelligencer" for October. Mrs. Besant's warning against Spiritualism in "Lucifer" is also quoted. But the editor has already told us in his sketch of Mrs. Besant—a sketch occupying eighteen closely printed pages—in a single sentence: "It was about this time that Mrs. Besant with Mr. Herbert Burrows began to investigate at regular séances the phenomena of Spiritualism." That sentence in the midst of the eighteen pages seems to represent Mrs. Besant's knowledge of the subject that she attacks. For the rest a high standard is maintained in Mr. Stead's magazine.

"The Nineteenth Century" has a more than usually silly article on "The Psychical Society's Ghosts," dealt with elsewhere. There is also a curious article on the "Christian Hell," and James Sully writes on "Is Man the Only Reasoner?" Of the articles that do not pass out of interest with the passing month there may be mentioned: "The Emancipation of Women" (Frederic Harrison in the "Contemporary"), "The Mahatma Period" (W. Earl Hodgson in the "National"), and doubtless many that I have not seen in the course of my wanderings.

LIFE should be a constant vision of God's presence.—A. MACLAREN.

MESMERISM AND HYPNOTISM AT THE WESTMINSTER AQUARIUM.

There is now to be seen at the Aquarium an exhibition of mesmerism by "Professor" Germane, which is worth attention. Mr. Germane, by all accounts, is an extremely successful operator. He not only mesmerises his subject with ease and completeness, but he renders parts of the body impervious to pain. One is not much surprised, therefore, that over a thousand medical men should have accepted an invitation from the management to test his powers and witness his performances. From these gentlemen a committee was formed for the purpose of giving Mr. Germane opportunities of displaying his powers in some of the London hospitals. In consequence, however, of the fact that the British Medical Association had already appointed a committee for the investigation of mesmerism and hypnotism especially in reference to the healing of disease and anæsthetising for surgical operations, the above committee confined itself to recommending the association to employ Mr. Germane.

The appointment on the stage at a place of public entertainment of a committee of professional men to (as Dr. Owen Coleman put it) advertise a showman, gave mortal offence, as various letters in the "Times" clearly indicate. It is beyond the comprehension of the ordinary layman why this should be. The subject of hypnotism is engaging a large share of public attention. Here is a man whose powers are claimed to be unique, sufficient, at any rate, to secure him a profitable public engagement. He offers to place himself at the disposal of a committee selected from over a thousand doctors, not on the stage but in a hospital, and there to show the bearing of his art on medicine and surgery. Why should Dr. Coleman fume at that? If this committee —this "very strong committee appointed by the British Medical Association which has not yet reported"—wants to go into the matter fully, what is more reasonable than that they should avail themselves of the best possible opportunity (so alleged) before they report? If the man is an impostor they can say so. If he is not they will miss an opportunity by declining his offer to submit himself to their critical investigation.

This, we say, is to the ordinary lay mind incomprehensible. It is essentially a different thing to make such purely scientific experiments under skilled supervision in a hospital from exhibiting tricks for money on the stage of a place of public entertainment. Many will object to the latter, and, as we hold, with great show of reason. We cannot understand any man or any body of men, already committed to the investigation of hypnotism, declining to avail themselves of such an offer as has been made to them without laying themselves open to a charge of unfairness, which will go far to discount the value of their report.

The "Times" (November 9th) sums up the discussion in a characteristic article. The writer trots out the old stories of fifty years ago, and we are once more introduced to Elliotson, Ashburner and Braid. The name of Charcot is, indeed, once mentioned, but it is only to find place for a sneer and to say that he "has not added to his high reputation by his dealings with phenomena which are always on the border-land of deception." There is not any trace throughout the unusually long article that the writer of it has ever read the recent books on hypnotism or even the papers on the subject published in the "Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research." "Fifty years ago" is the ostrich cry throughout. If the late Dr. W. B. Carpenter had been still alive, the methods of treatment are so like those favoured in controversy by him, that we should have unhesitatingly put the authorship down to him. As it is, he seems to have left a worthy successor and close imitator.

BOOKS AND MAGAZINES RECEIVED.

"Things to Come."—Elliot Stock, 6s.—[To be noticed shortly.]

"The Mystic Quest."—W. KINGSLAND.—George Allen, London and Orpington—[For review.]

"The New Review."—(Longmans, 9d.).—[Contains Part I. of Carlyle's "Excursion to Paris"; full of keen observation and mannered as was his wont. "Thrown on Paper when Galloping from Saturday to Tuesday, October 4-7th, 1851." One can feel the jolting of the horse as one reads. Also Professor Garner's researches in the language of apes and monkeys, Part II. Part I. has already been noticed in "LIGHT." This instalment is not less striking. Other articles make up a good number.]

NOTES FROM MY SPIRITUAL DIARY.

By F. J. THEOBALD.

XV.

[The following extracts from messages I had long ago are, I think, especially interesting, taken in connection with these mystical teachings about the Fourth Dimension. I remember how puzzled I was at the time when they were given to me. Upon sending them to a friend he told me they referred very clearly to what is called the Inner Breathing, of which I knew nothing beyond the name, in its connection with T. L. Harris. I have published some of these teachings before, but so long ago that it is very improbable that any of those who read these "Notes" will have seen them. The first I had was about]

THE THREEFOLD LIFE IN MAN.

There are three breaths of life in the threefold man.

The first is purely bodily, from the immediate atmosphere.

The second, or soul-breath is the breath of learning or intellect, but is distinct from the third, the interior breath, which is the spirit-life.

This third breath has nothing to do with the immediate surrounding air, but is borne in upon the spirit, and absorbed by it, from whichever sphere—higher or lower—is sought by the spirit-life of man.

The time has yet to come for the full life-consciousness of the interior breathing to be fully developed; for when it is so, the spirit may become so conscious of the sphere-breath it is breathing as to live a conscious life in that sphere, even whilst the body is leading its own separate and earthly life—and the scientific wise man his soul-breath life of learning . . . . . The highest possible development of true life is when the three breaths or lives are all in unison and full play. Such perfectness cannot be attained until evil is subdued, and the Kingdom of God is established in your earth, as in Heaven.

Of the three lives it is the most difficult to teach of the soul in its separate existence, for it is intimately connected with the spirit-life.

The soul being the *body of the spirit* leaves the earthly body with the spirit at actual death, and gradually unfolds and grows into the spiritual body. But whilst on earth in the earth-body it has a separate existence, in just the same way as the spirit and the body are distinct, and yet in one. The soul-life is not developed in its separateness, except where the intellect is widely expanded.

It belongs to deep knowledge—science, as distinguished from the deeper philosophies which appertain to the spirit-life.

Thus a scientific man is often utterly blind to the things of spirit-life. His soul is developed largely, whilst his spirit-life is contracted, closed up, in his intense materiality.

Whilst in a little child, the spirit-life may be open, and out of the mouth of babes and sucklings words of spirit-wisdom may flow.

Death cannot actually occur until the soul-life in the body is removed.

This is what draws the body and spirit together, as the connecting link; from it issues the silver cord visible to the seer, and which is only snapped asunder when the spirit and soul are finally freed from the earthly body.

[Some time after this came, a friend being with me and speaking about these subjects, in reply to some remark, was written:—]

Every human being has the germ of the Divine Spirit as its essence, or Life could not be.

It is a distinct life, and also a distinct entity from the life-spirit of the man, which afterwards becomes, when in the spirit land, that spirit which manifests or speaks. . . .

[A question was put as to what is really meant by the "Inner Respiration," or "Interior Breathing":—]

When the Holy Germ of Divine life is swelled up in the interior life to the outer, then is the man the vehicle of the Holy Breath, and *Logos*.

In Christ this was the whole life, and He possessed that in its entirety.

This made Him God only!

"Do you mean that He is the only one man who possessed the Fulness of the Godhead bodily?"

"Yes. He was the BREATH OF GOD. You are all children of God, but with Christ, as God only, there was no separate man-spirit."

"What is Internal Respiration?"

"It is the inbreathing of the Holy Spirit. The uprising of the inner germ to meet the outer essence."

"What do you mean by the outer essence?"

"God in the Universe meets the God in human, as distinct from the spirit-life of man alone."

"Can anyone possess this gift?"

"Not if the whole spirit-life is not in harmony with the Divine. . . . .

"The indwelling of the Holy Ghost is the return of the God-life to the fallen Child of God.

"The renewal of his nature from its state of sin, to one in harmony with the Loving Father."

CHRIST'S WORK ON EARTH.

Christ's work on earth was to bring about this very condition . . . .

By His personal life on earth came the descent of the Holy Ghost to dwell on earth, to be received into, and to baptise afresh to Holiness the earthly child of God. To raise him from his low estate to make him at one with God. Long has the world resisted the glorious gift, and in exceptional cases only has it been vouchsafed. But the great outpouring is now abroad. Christ's reign has commenced by the more universal outpouring of the God-spirit into man. . . . .

PSYCHIC FORCE.

There is now in London a Mrs. Abbott, who exhibits some remarkable experiments similar in kind, but far exceeding in degree, those shown in private some twenty years ago by a Mrs. Fisher (we think her name was), known as the Infant Magnet, a name given to her from the fact that the same power had resided in her from childhood. Mrs. Abbott is a little vivacious lady of some nine stone weight, and she gave her preliminary exhibition without apparatus, "subjects," or associates, in the presence of such well-known men as Professor Fitzgerald, Mr. Crookes, Dr. Oliver Lodge, Dr. Myers, Dr. Lloyd Tuckey and others. There is no unusual muscular development in her arms or shoulders. There is no apparent exertion when she performs her feats, nor is she in any abnormal state.

What are those feats? Such as these:—

1. Dr. Tuckey was asked to take up a wooden chair in his arms and hold it against his chest. Mrs. Abbott touched the legs with the tips of her fingers, and pulled the doctor forward or pushed him backward at will.
2. Holding a billiard cue horizontally across her chest, between her thumb and the balls of her fingers, and standing on the heel of one foot, she invited anyone to take hold of the cue and try to push her backwards. One tried: two tried: then three: lastly four. All attempts were fruitless.
3. Mrs. Abbott placed her elbows to her sides. Four strong men failed to lift her. The force used was such that the doctors feared dislocation of the shoulder joint. *When, however, the sleeve of the dress covered the flesh of the arm, she was lifted with ease.*
4. Mrs. Abbott, having defied the efforts of four men to lift her, proceeded to lift four men. A gentleman of some fifteen stone weight was lifted, chair and all, some inches from the ground. Next two gentlemen were similarly lifted. Lastly four, packed somehow on the top of one another, were lifted with the most perfect ease.

The doctors declare that the pressure exerted by the lady seemed to be of the very slightest nature. One of them held her hand so that she could not grasp the chair, in one of the experiments, and the pressure was no greater than occurs in an ordinary shake of the hands.

The experiments, we are glad to notice, are engaging the attention of men who have the ear of the public. They are thoroughly competent experimenters, and will be able to tell us whether psychic force has been run into a corner at last.

THE ANALYSTS: A FANCY.

HOW I CAME TO ANALUSIS.

Once, I know not how, methought one came to me and said: "Come, for the Lord hath need of thee. Come, and I will take thee to the work that thou shalt do for Him, and for thyself."

So we passed in thought from earth and came at length to a world that, as we neared it, looked cold and sterile. And the angel said, "Cast thyself on yonder world and endure whatsoever shall befall thee. Also be not afraid in aught, for thou shalt be upheld, nor shall a hair of thine head be harmed. And as for thy reward thou shalt return when thy mission is over, bringing it with thee."

Then the angel vanished, and I found myself lying on that earth outside what seemed to be one of the cities in which its inhabitants dwelt. Here I lay for some time, as exhausted by the journey. Meanwhile many of the inhabitants of the place came about me and marvelled much—so I guessed by their gestures—as to what sort of creature I might be.

These people were to my eyes men, having all the general characteristics of humanity and yet with a certain sense of difference for which, at the moment, I could not entirely account. As I watched them, however, and observed more closely, I began to detect certain peculiarities. Everyone of them wore over one eye, one ear, and over the mouth a curious instrument. That over the eye was shaped like a small microscope, fitted with a triangular nose-piece carrying three powers. I afterwards found that by an automatic connection between the nosepiece and the tube the focal length of the microscope was self-adjusted to whichever of the three powers might be in use. The instrument over the ear resembled a small ear trumpet and that over the mouth a speaking-tube of curious construction. The second eye was closed, I never saw it opened in a single instance, and the second ear was all clogged and closed up with wax.

I spoke to these people and asked where I was, but they did not seem to understand me, and I was at first just as far from understanding them. They talked eagerly among themselves, evidently with reference to me, and it seemed to me that each speaker spoke for a very long time and was incapable of making a short remark. The first one who spoke said, evidently to his fellows: "Doubleyou aitch a te pom i es pom te aitch i es pom te aitch i en ge pom." This language of theirs I, after hearing it for some time, suddenly discerned to consist of a laborious spelling, letter by letter, of very word, as if each letter in the word were itself a word, the monosyllable "pom" being employed to indicate the end of a word, as our comma indicates the end of a sentence.

They stood around me for some time with an air of waiting for something; and soon, indeed, I heard a sound of wheels, and saw a sort of closed conveyance advancing, which was drawn by several of these beings, and pulled up close to where I lay. Thereupon four of the strongest of them lifted me from the ground and placed me in the conveyance, and I noticed that they were saying one to another: "El e te pom u es pom be ar i en ge pom aitch i em pom te o pom o you ar pom aitch o you es e pom o ef pom el i ge aitch te pom." (Let us bring him to our House of Light.)

It would be far too tedious for me to narrate all that was said in their own cumbersome system of saying it. I shall therefore, from this point onwards, translate their awkward analytical language into our more condensed synthetical method of speech.

And here, while I am on my way to the House of Light I will mention some facts about the life and ways of these people that fell under my observation during the journey or were learned later on.

They all appeared to me well dressed in warm and comfortable clothing, made of cloth of an excellent quality, of which more will be said anon. Almost every one of them carried a book, sometimes two or three books, which they seemed to be constantly consulting; and I noticed that in reading, or whenever they wished to look at anything, they either brought it near to the nosepiece of their microscope or brought their microscope near to it. They seemed never to use their second eye, and to be incapable of seeing anything save by the aid of the microscope. Their ear trumpet seemed to be capable of rather more general hearing, and

when one was speaking they never, or but very rarely, took the trouble to do more than slightly turn their trumpet in the direction of the speaker or the sound. When we arrived at the city I noticed that the houses looked always well-to-do, and sometimes luxurious; but I saw also that they had no windows and no chimneys, and I found out afterwards that these people not only do not use, but are utterly ignorant of, the presence of what we call daylight; and see by the light of small lamps furnished with powerful condensers, whereby a strong but tiny spot of light is thrown upon the particular point they wish to examine. They see only separate parts, at least if the whole be of any size, and are incapable of what we should call a general and inclusive view. This arises, of course, from the fact that they see only what they can examine through their microscope. As to the absence of chimneys, I learnt that they are entirely ignorant of fire as we know it, and seem to obtain all the artificial heat they require from the combustion of their myriads of microscope lamps.

However, to return to my story. At length the conveyance stopped, and I was carried out, and up a flight of steps into a large room very much like a lecture theatre. Passing through this we entered a small room opening immediately from it; and here I was made to lie down on a couch, and one of my bearers was left, evidently to take charge of me. The others withdrew, saying, as they went out, that they would send food for me immediately, and bidding my gaoler—as I suppose I must call him—see that I took it.

I was not sorry to hear this, for, indeed, I was getting rather hungry. Judge, then, of my surprise and consternation when, very soon after, a man (I call them *men*, not knowing what else to call them) entered bringing an assortment of needles and thread, scissors, thimble, and a great quantity of small pieces of cloth of different shades, but all as closely as possible resembling the colour of the clothes I was wearing. These he placed before me and then retired.

I stared at these in open-eyed wonder for some time, but soon noticed that my gaoler was looking uneasy. Seeing that I was in some uncertainty he came towards me, and by signs tried to urge me to begin. "What!" said I, "am I to devour these?" At length he seemed to hit upon the fact that I did not know what the things were for, so he gave me an object lesson. He held up one of his arms and scrutinised every accessible portion of it with his microscope. Soon he triumphantly pointed out to me a small abrasion of the cloth; not quite an actual hole, but a worn spot. Selecting then a piece of cloth of the exactly same shade, he, with the utmost skill and neatness, inserted a patch over this, and so neatly, that when the operation was finished, it was quite impossible to tell where the patch was.

This proceeding greatly astonished me; and, adopting their way of spelling out every letter of a word as though it were a word itself, I said to him: "Is this what you call food, eating?" "Why, what else would you have?" he replied; "do we not eat to supply the daily wear and tear of our bodies?" "Yes," I answered, "but surely my clothes are not my body!" "Why," returned he, "is not your body that which I see, and" (putting his hand upon the sleeve of my coat) "am I not now touching you?" "You ignoramus," I cried, "you are touching not me, but my coat! See!" (Here I took his hand and placed it on my cheek.) "Feel that, does not that feel different from what you felt when you touched my coat?" "What do you mean?" he replied. "I cannot now feel anything at all. You are holding my hand in the empty air, and telling me I am touching your body."

I thus discovered this curious limitation on the part of these people. Their microscope eyes seemed incapable of discerning anything which was not, so to speak, "manufactured," and through this limitation of vision their sense of touch had suffered correspondingly, and had never been properly developed. Afterwards I found that they wore perpetually rough gloves on their hands, and so I understood at once how this limitation of touch was accounted for.

I began trying to explain the truth about these matters to my gaoler, or guardian, or whatever he was; but he seemed very uneasy so long as I had not in his sense of the word *eaten*. At length crying out: "If you will not eat of your own accord I shall have to make you," he called in another man, and the two compelled me to lie down on the couch while they examined my coat and all the external portion of my clothing, where, finding, by aid of their microscopes, certain abrasions, they patched them over with the same neatness and dexterity that my gaoler had before shown.

(*To be continued.*) G.W.A.

"THE BIBLE'S OWN ACCOUNT OF ITSELF."*

This pamphlet consists of twelve chapters, originally written for the "Agnostic Journal" at the editor's request, giving an account of the Mysticism of the West, in distinction from that of the East.

The title sufficiently indicates the drift of the pamphlet, which is of remarkable interest and suggestiveness, giving in concise and (in the main) clear form an account of such interpretation of the Bible as can alone satify those who are convinced that the spiritual is the only real, and such, too, as the Bible itself demands. For Mr. Maitland clears the way by pointing out with great force that Orthodoxy on the one hand, and Agnosticism on the other, are but contending for and against that literalism against which the Bible itself utters its own constant and uncompromising protest. Its own appeal is to an interior and intuitional faculty in man: events and persons are but the outward clothing, the "veil" that wraps the substantial truth. For "that with which the Bible, esoterically regarded, deals, is not persons, but principles; not men, but man; and this man considered, not as a material and phenomenal, but as a spiritual and substantial being." (p. 27.) The subject-matter, then, of the Bible is the creation and evolution, redemption and regeneration of man, who is substantially God, destined to reach the perfection, or full manifestation, of his Being, and this by a process of inward purification. The truths concerning himself, God, and the universe can, in the nature of things, only be discerned by the soul, or Divine substance, which is destined to reach its regenerate or Christ-state. In Jesus, the process of the Christ "had attained its fullest development, and this by the method counted the highest, being that which is from within outwards." (p. 59.)

To give in small space an abstract of Mr. Maitland's elaborate and systematic account of the constitution of man and of the universe is not possible. We touch only on one or two points, desiring at the same time heartily to commend the pamphlet to the attention of all seekers after truth. What is perhaps most characteristic, and is not on the first reading quickly apprehended, is the distinction drawn between the unmanifest and manifest Trinity, representing respectively the static and the dynamic aspects of Deity. Mr. Maitland regards the duality of Being in God as a necessary truth not generally recognised. These two potencies, "subsisting in the unity of original being, and by virtue of which creation alone is possible," are termed energy and substance, and represent the masculine and feminine respectively. Their mutual product, or expression, is the "Word" or "Son," in which is the sphere of the manifest. Hence the proposition that "every entity which is manifest"—and this holds good for every plane or sphere of being—"is manifest through the evolution of its Trinity." In the unmanifest Trinity the Spirit of God (the Divine energy) moving on the face of the waters (the Divine substance) generates the Word. In the Word, or sphere of manifestation, there are generated the macrocosm and the microcosm. Every entity is of four-fold constitution, which forms the "vehicle" of Divine manifestations. These are energy, substance, astral ether and matter in the Kosmos; spirit, soul, mind and body in man. Again, the universe and the individual are elaborated through a sevenfold co-operation, represented by the seven spirits of God, &c. All this is consistently symbolised in the Scriptures, of which Mr. Maitland gives many interesting illustrations.

Re-incarnation forms an integral part of Mr. Maitland's exposition. He confesses it to be only "implicit" in the Bible, and we are not satisfied that the Bible confirms the doctrine. We would raise the question whether a fuller development of the truth of the organic unity of man would not modify its statement. If the experience of each is the inheritance of all we see no need for Re-incarnation; and, indeed, the coming *back* to conditions once passed through is, to ourselves, not a conceivable thought.

For the rest, the key that Mr. Maitland presents to us unlocks many chambers in the Bible, and leads us to much wealth of interpretation. The interpretation of Jos. xv. 15-19 on p. 14 is worth attention.

*"The Bible's Own Account of Itself." By EDWARD MAITLAND. Stewart and Co., 41, Farringdon-street, E.C.

OFFICE OF "LIGHT,"
2, DUKE STREET,
ADELPHI, W.C.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The Annual Subscription for "LIGHT," post-free to any address within the United Kingdom, or to places comprised within the Postal Union, including all parts of Europe, the United States, and British North America, is 10s. 10d. per annum, forwarded to our office *in advance*.
The Annual Subscription, post-free, to South America, South Africa, the West Indies, Australia, and New Zealand, is 13s. *prepaid*.
The Annual Subscription to India, Ceylon, China, Japan, is 15s. 2d. *prepaid*.
Cheques and Postal Orders should be made payable to Mr. B. D. Godfrey, and should invariably be crossed " —— & Co."
All orders for papers and for advertisements, and all remittances, should be addressed to "The Manager" and *not* to the Editor.

ADVERTISEMENT CHARGES.

Five lines and under, 3s. One inch, 5s. Column, £2 2s. Page, £4. A reduction made for a series of insertions.

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

"LIGHT" may also be obtained from E. W. ALLEN, 4, Ave Maria-lane, London and all Booksellers

Light:

EDITED BY "M. A. (OXON.)"

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 14th, 1891.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.—Communications intended to be printed should be addressed to the Editor, 2, Duke-street, Adelphi. It will much facilitate the insertion of suitable articles if they are under two columns in length. Long communications are always in danger of being delayed, and are frequently declined on account of want of space, though in other respects good and desirable. Letters should be confined to the space of half a column to ensure insertion.

Business communications should in all cases be addressed to Mr. B. D. Godfrey, 2, Duke-street, Adelphi, W.C., and not to the Editor.

THE "PSYCHICAL SOCIETY'S" GHOSTS.

Under this heading a Mr. Taylor Innes, apparently a Scottish lawyer, has published an article in the "Nineteenth Century." Among the feeble endeavours to explain away the existence of another state outside this, the attempt of this Scottish lawyer is perhaps the feeblest.

With such writers as Mr. Innes one fact is always prominent, their want of accuracy of information about their subject. Mr. Innes is no exception. In the most complacent way he calls the Society for Psychical Research by a name borrowed from some evening journal or peradventure from the "Saturday Review," and then, as if to emphasise his ignorance, he proceeds to attribute to Dr. Myers, instead of to his eloquent and able brother, Mr. F.W. H. Myers, the credit of the good work done in conjunction with the late Mr. Gurney. Such mistakes are of no particular consequence in the slip-slop of popular journalism, but they are unpardonable in what is intended to be serious writing by, presumably, a serious man.

Mr. Innes very properly praises the energy of "Dr." Myers and Mr. Gurney in giving us "what is undoubtedly the best book of ghost stories" in the English language, "the best, because the best authenticated." But it is this authentication at which the writer girds, indeed he says the authentication does not exist. He quotes from an earlier paper of his own in this wise: "How many are there of these 700 cases of psychical research—how many even of the 350 first class narratives of our letter-writing age—in which the indefatigable editors have seen or ascertained a letter or document issued at the time by the narrator, so as to prove his story to be true? *The answer must be, not one.*" It is difficult to see how anyone can "ascertain" a letter, but that perhaps may go with "Dr." Myers and the "Psychical Society," and the interpretation be discovered in the context. From this context it appears, then, that "seeing and ascertaining" letters or documents means seeing and ascertaining them in such a way as to make certain of their existence at the time when they were said to have been written. To this challenge, propounded in 1887, Mr. Edmund Gurney replied that "even in a letter-writing age, many people will omit to commit their startling dream to the custody of paper, and that many others, even when they receive such a document, will throw it into the fire when they have wondered sufficiently." This Mr. Innes very properly terms "an exceedingly reasonable reply," and then proceeds to say, "It is no doubt true, and may balance the fact that there are some people who will write down, and others who will preserve, an experience of that kind, when they would not take the same trouble about anything else." On what does Mr. Innes base his assumption of the existence of this *fact?* That many would write now, when there is no longer risk to one's reputation for sanity in believing that dreams may be of some importance, is true enough; but does not Mr. Innes know that to take any serious account of such matters was reckoned, till very recently, characteristic of a degraded superstition to which no *respectable* person would willingly plead guilty? To write down such things for preservation would be the last thing people would do, and to say, as Mr. Innes does, that "the strange and ominous thing would be if human nature, so various and reckless in other matters, should in this alone turn out to be cautious, and uniform, and that in one direction only—the avoidance of evidence," is to testify to a singular ignorance of the circumstances of the case. Men, however various they may be, *are* uniform in their care for their reputation as to honesty and sanity, and such documents as Mr. Innes wants might very easily put one or both of these in jeopardy. That because an event is "startling" it is most likely to be recorded is very likely, as long as the "startling" nature of the event is not connected with the so-called supernatural, but a supernormal event is just the event where the chances are *not* in favour of some document existing. The fear of being considered ridiculous even in one's own circle is a potent factor enough, but when that fear is combined with the scorn of a more than sceptical world, the potency becomes almost irresistible.

That there are discrepancies in very many stories is quite true, but no more than are met with in testimony as to events occurring in all the circumstances of life. Mr. Innes is accustomed to hearing evidence,—did he ever find two people agree as to the *details* of an event, even when there has been no doubt of the existence of that event? He is himself an example of this inaccurate way of noting things, for in the Mountain Jim story he quotes the author of that story in the paragraph beginning "In September, 1874, I was lying on my bed about 6 a.m. writing to my sister, when looking up I saw Mountain Jim standing before me," and ending "In due time news arrived of his death, and its date, allowing for difference of longitude, coincided," and then goes on triumphantly to state that Jim "died from his foeman's bullet not at six in the morning, but at 2 p.m. in America, or at what would be in Switzerland ten at night." Now the merest tyro would see that no assertion is made that Jim died at 6 a.m., for the difference of longitude is spoken of at the end of the paragraph. If Mr. Innes, a trained expert, makes such a blunder as this, what can he expect in the matter of observation from people who are not experts? The ugly accusation that the author of the Mountain Jim story was not writing at all at 6 a.m. will, it is to be hoped, be dealt with satisfactorily by "Dr." Myers.

It must be frankly admitted that the story of Mrs. Conner, quoted from the "Society for Psychical Research Proceedings," Part XVIII., is a curious one, and one that requires very serious verification, noting the discrepancy as to the time. The story is this:—

A lady in Washington writes, on a Monday evening, to a Mrs. Conner, also of Washington, a letter in which she describes that about two o'clock on that day she had had a vision of her friend "falling up the front steps in the

yard," and the circumstances of the fall are detailed. "Mrs. Conner received the latter on Tuesday morning, and Dr. Elliott Coues reports that a few hours later she verified it to him, if not in every particular, at least in every essential particular." Mrs. Conner, however, states that the time of her tumble was within a few seconds of nineteen minutes to three, that is about forty minutes before it happened. Mr. Innes might well have argued that the extreme accuracy of Mrs. Conner as to the time throws doubt on the whole story; he does not do that, but goes out of his way to propound this remarkable theory which he puts in question form, "Is it not possible that Mrs. Conner, who has faith in her friend's visions, may have been so much impressed by the vivid description of the letter as to believe *ex post facto* in her own stumble?" or, as an alternative he proposes this, that as the two ladies lived only a mile and a-half of each other "in a town presumably traversed by horse cars" the rumour of the stumble had gone round to the "percipient," who, giving the reins to her imagination, at once wrote to her friend a lively description, but making a bad shot at the hour. This story *is* nevertheless backed up by the documentary evidence on which Mr. Innes insists, and one is forced to ask how much more credence wou'd he, and such as he, give than he does now to narratives even when supported by such evidence since he is put to such pitiable shifts to explain away the documents when they are given?

Take for instance the case of the English lady dreaming of her husband's arrest as a spy during the Franco-German war, and sending him a rough sketch of one of his assailants. The letter containing the sketch was burnt, but what evidential value could possibly have attached to it, seeing that if all other means of explaining it away had failed, the accusation that it was a forgery would immediately have been made if not directly, at least by implication? What a generally hazy notion of the value of things Mr. Innes appears to possess is shown in his observation that "if such a letter exists, with contents and postmark undisputed, it is worth a thousand guineas in the market." Neither the "Psychical Society" nor "Dr." Myers need fear much from the criticism of a man who cannot distinguish between evidence and the instrument of that evidence.

ASSEMBLIES OF THE LONDON SPIRITUALIST ALLIANCE.

On Tuesday next, at 7.30 p.m., the Rev. G. W. Allen will deliver an address at 2, Duke-street, Adelphi, on "Our Eastern Theosophists and what we are to Say to Them." We trust that many will avail themselves of the opportunity of discussing such an interesting subject.

A SUCCESSFUL MIRTH PROVOKER.*

One of the most diverting books we have ever read. It is a skit on the present craze, the Theosophical boom which we owe to the "Daily Chronicle." It is certainly flippant, except when, with a grave irony, hardly distinguishable from serious belief, it sets forth the beliefs of modern Theosophy. It owes much of its sensation to the fact that the author has evidently read his Rider Haggard. We have the regulation lion hunt, the long march across the desert, with raids of robbers, and so forth. The author has caught the Moorish jargon, that strange periphrastic way of speech, to perfection. He is versed in ordinary Theosophical lore, quotes Blavatsky, Sinnett, and Lady Caithness; and concludes with an ironical dissertation on certain deeper occult mysteries and Laurence Oliphant's sympneumatic love. It is a strange mixture, but the author has contrived to make out of his mixed materials a very amusing book. We will not betray any of the secrets of manufacture, which are most skilful. The flippant dealing with beliefs that many share may be distasteful to some, but few will refuse to laugh over some of the scenes.

* "The Brethren of Mount Atlas." By H. E. M. Stutfield. (Longmans, 6s.)

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

Personal and Impersonal.

SIR,—Nearly enough, I think, has been said by others—at least, on my behalf—on the personal occasion of the partly interesting article in this week's "LIGHT," entitled "The Ground of Universal Kindliness." I am grateful to my friends, and particularly to Mrs. Hankin, than whom I know no one better qualified to start the theme of your article. But I have to point out that any judgment to be formed on Mrs. Besant's imputation may be entirely dissociated from any estimate, friendly or otherwise, of my general character. What Mrs. Besant did say exactly about me at the meeting at St. James's Hall I don't know, and have not taken the trouble to inquire. I understand she classed me with slanderers. Well, she had already let me know that that was her opinion of me, and whatever indignation I thereupon felt completely evaporated after I had written to her the answer I thought called for. I also felt what you urge, that large allowance was to be made for Mrs. Besant on account of her friendship for Madame Blavatsky. But, unfortunately, the fact I especially referred to in my "slander" does not admit of an answer, and none has been even attempted. That being so, I have no occasion to offer "evidence to character'' in refutation of a charge too silly on the face of it to be possibly injurious. Mrs. Besant could not answer the fact I had adduced; she was very angry; and having a fine gift of invective, uttered the first "wild and whirling" words that came uppermost. That, I imagine, will be the judgment of most sensible people.

Turning now gladly to the more general question raised by your article, I should like to say that it seems to me quite possible to find a "ground" of "universal kindliness" without going into the ultimate metaphysics of "good and evil." For the fact is, we shall have to go on saying—or rather feeling—with Mrs. Hankin that "good *is* good, and evil *is* evil," that is conditionally, and in relation to consciousness. It seems to me evident that you and Mrs. Hankin are at cross-purposes. She is speaking of the actuality of evil as a phenomenal state, and you are looking at the order which is alone essential and absolute, but which for us is an ideal, attainable only at the grand evolutionary consummation of the world and of the individual. But as she recognises "positive" evil—not therefore necessarily essential evil--in an imperfection which presents itself to us as that, and which, if it did not so present itself, we should never discover to be imperfection at all, this seems to you an assertion of unconditional evil. Whereas you, I think, must seem to her to be denying moral distinction altogether, and the ground of all moral judgment. And that must seem to many the proximate result of your position that evil is not only conditional merely, but even an illusory appearance, the things we call evil having their undiscovered uses in the Divine Economy. Granting, however, that Economy to require that every phenomenal fact should have its use, conducing to realisation in consciousness of the one only true and perfect order, just therefore is it evident that every phenomenal moment comes up for judgment, and it is this very judgment which establishes consciousness on a relatively higher or truer stage. That which is "condemned" is thus indeed the necessary occasion by which the self-consciousness of the world determines or posits itself in a moral ascent. But then the "condemnation" is thereby, and for that purpose, also necessary, for it is that which is the act of superior self-determination. Even on an already established plane of moral consciousness, judgment subserves evolution, because in bringing to full manifestation all the quality implied in its own degree, it reveals or excites the deeper needs of thought and feeling, and thus prepares for a new departure. Just so our "judge made law," which is nothing but the evolved logic of the Common Law and old legislation, ends in provoking the higher functions of the State, in fresh legislation to answer resultant requirements. The new *moral* legislation is a new "principle" of judgment, and realises a distinct evolutionary advance. Now such a new principle of judgment is "Charity"; not because it sets aside the moral tribunal, or asserts the indifference of good and evil, but because it discovers the distinction between "persons" and "states of personality." To be charitable towards the latter would be to spare and perpetuate them; it would be to arrest the development of consciousnses. And in fact--at

least some of us find it so—charity originates in the judgment of our own states. The attempt to realise the distinction which charity makes, to conceive others as only accidentally and provisionally what they appear to be—so far as they are even that—is prompted by the sense that all hostility to others* on the surface is an evidence that we are on just the same surface ourselves, because otherwise there could be no collision; and there is no surer way of rising above that plane ourselves than the refusal to see others upon it. Certainly the attempt, according to its degree of success, brings with it a great peace, and helps us to conceive the highest plane, and highest peace, of all—that of Deity, "of purer eyes than to behold evil." In most of us, however, our moments of charity are few and far between; we cannot give subjective effect to the distinction we acknowledge. Yet a principle of thought may often belong to a higher plane than the habitual consciousness attains, for we are all on two planes of consciousness emitting very different spirits. We pass from one to the other and back again, and I doubt if the reproach of insincerity is often well founded. Such things are only proofs of non-atonement. We conceive an ideal intellectually, and love it, long before it becomes a will-spirit in us. And this interval is probably the most trying time in all spiritual experience, being one of the most constantly recurring humiliation and conscious failure. But to sum us up, and identify us with the unatoned self, on account of its manifestations, is a judgment only a degree less gross and material and unjust than would be a characterisation from physical aspect or manner. If the "Spirit of Christ" has indeed claimed us all, because finding in all the latent basis of its operation—for otherwise there could be no redemptive operation—then who shall dare to identify a personality† so highly destined with the quality of an already doomed will in it?

C. C. M.

Universal Kindliness.

SIR,—The more distinct exposition of the doctrine of the moral irresponsibility of man, which appears in the leading article of last week's "LIGHT," makes me feel that my former words, far from being unduly harsh, were not harsh enough.

I can conceive of such a creed as congenial to those whose natures, though set on licence and self-pleasing, yet retain a glimmer of conscience which can be satisfied with a shadowy sanction, but, believing as I do, that man is placed on the temporal plane in order that his mortal body may become the Temple of the Holy Spirit of God I entirely dissent from it.

If there is nothing to be resisted or blamed in "all the evil which is done under the sun," why does "LIGHT" transform itself into lightning over the "blatant religious jingoism of the Salvationist?" Surely it is as pernicious to direct "torrents of invective" against honest men at public meetings as to "roar aloud 'Ell and Damnation' in the streets"—which it appears is alone forbidden by the canons of the philosophy of irresponsibility.

M. L. HANKIN.

A Still Further Remonstrance—Theosophy.

SIR,—With regard to the letters written in the "Daily Chronicle," &c., I saw few that were of the slightest value, except one signed "An Original Member of the T. S."

I was glad to find from "LIGHT" that this was the valuable and reliable authority, "C. C. M."

It appeared to me, who am also one of the original members (being initiated into it in 1879) a just and true explanation of the "situation."

There *are* earnest Theosophists who have never wavered from their allegiance to "the cause," who yet hold the position admirably described by Mr. Massey, being full of allegiance, to "H. P. B.'s" astounding intellectual gifts and capacities, to her greatness, even grandness of character, placing her immeasurably above the ordinary run of womanhood or even manhood, and yet who did not believe in her "morality" regarding the occult phenomena.

And here comes the crux of the question. As Mr. Massey truly says, and all advanced thinkers own, "morality is relative."

As students advance in occult knowledge, more and more is it convincingly seen that morality is a case of conventional jurisdiction.

The first aspect of this assertion is, to the unprepared student, that it is eminently immoral. Having, however, heard the assertion they must be prepared to advance on these metaphysical lines or retreat to their former conventional views. No harm is, however, done.

Harm however, immense harm, is and can be done by the prepared or unprepared student at this standpoint proceeding to action. Occultism may prove that morality is conventional, but as society is not held together by occult but by conventional laws, we are bound in honour to respect these laws, in order to have common understanding with each other. If, however, from the higher planes of occult science we feel *we* understand the conventional value of, let us say morality, we have, however, no right to act on those lines, or we are placed in unfair relations with this society, unless we frankly use them.

The real value of morality lies in the final result on the "classes and the masses." If the result be good, even though the aspect be proved to be "shifting" and "conventional," it is clear that this aspect is "in order," and as it is generally understood by all, it should also be loyally obeyed by all. The time will come, all in due season, when this conventional morality will shift on to a higher plane, as the public mind is prepared. Until it does, advanced thinkers have no right to proceed to action on other lines.

To unadvanced minds, what are generally called "inquirers," seeing the results of action touching morality on unconventional grounds, great injury might be done, and many might have the impetus they were wanting to go off at once on what is called the black magic lines. Such students would naturally drift then into suitable circles always ready for fresh comers.

Therefore, the difficulty which certain members of the Theosophical Society felt was their *in*ability loyally and honestly to defend "H. P. B." from what at least they considered unwisdom in action.

Mrs. Besant deprecates in strong language all such conduct on the part of members of the Theosophical Society, but each (I think) of us did what we thought best, and those of us who were not able to render the exacting service required, would not join the branch that was termed the "Blavatsky Lodge."

Besides, there was another point at issue. Those who reserved themselves entirely to the study only of Eastern philosophy disagreed with us, and listened only to "H. P. B.," and her teaching was such as almost to close the door on anything approaching Western occultism, which many of us felt was most deserving of study, in fact, which we were distinctly doing wrong to ignore.

Subsequent study leads one to the overwhelming and convincing conclusion that *in esse* they are both the same, varying in expression and in form. That the Eastern is the mother, and the Western the child, the son, culminating in the new gospel which was taught by the Divine Master to His initiates, but I dare not digress here, except by saying that the Eastern and Western philosophies most admirably blend the one in the other. The Eastern gives order and form to what on Western lines had a tendency to digress into utter metaphysical confusion and evaporate in expansiveness when the radii from the focus are lost sight of.

"H. P. B.," however, distinctly objected to the early members of the Theosophical Society even studying the Hermetic doctrines which then came to the front on the publication of "The Perfect Way." In later times, she was compelled to admit other "occultism" than her own, simply because the literature of Theosophy was the first to lead. And in this it has done grand work. It rightly shows one way, but some of its members are misinformed in continuing to say and think that esoteric thought is confined to the members of the Theosophical Society.

Now the original members of the Theosophical Society only ceased to take an active part in the society because they said the time was come for enlarged activity, and that their time for work had ceased, but they did not leave or wish to leave it.

They had had to bear the long dreary period when the society was looked upon with dislike, suspicion, or simply utterly ignored and despised.

*Condemnation of *persons* is always hostility to them, even when nothing that is commonly called "personal feeling" is possibly involved. For moral condemnation cannot but be coloured by feeling, when its object is a person.

†In this use of the word "personality," the larger sense sometimes preferably denoted by the term "individuality" is intended.

This period lasted until the brighter time set in, when Mr. Sinnett's admirable "Esoteric Buddhism" came well to the fore, and finally, when he became president, the first flush of real life dawned, and much was done in those days, the value of which the society can never overestimate.

However, it is reserved for these later days, when Mrs. Besant is president, to alter the occult rules of *non*-propaganda.

Certainly Colonel Olcott was always opposed to that matter, being heart and soul an ardent propagandist. "H. P. B." was also, and Mrs. Besant has unmistakably adopted the same course.

This was another difficulty to some members, myself among them, and at the risk of being an extremely unworthy member, I could in nowise agree to the wisdom of the propaganda system, and one fell outside the propagandist circle not from want of interest or of respect, simply from incapacity of honest agreement.

Mrs. Besant has such remarkable and splendid mental gifts, besides the rare and beautiful executive one of oratory, one is tempted to think that no one could be more able and fit to become a leader of the Theosophical Society than she is.

In this I agree, as long as the society remains as it was, for the study of Theosophic and philosophic truth, and because she takes rank thereby as simply a student herself.

The law of silence, and of not teaching publicly until you yourself are "taught," is irrevocably broken by Mrs. Besant; her gifts of speaking are a stumbling block to her own growth, because she speaks in haste, and with the emotion of the hour upon her; that which is her mental status of the moment, she expounds with magnificent vigour, but with the vigour of the still undisciplined and still unsteadied soul.

This is proved by her strong selfhood, eminently clear in the autobiography of herself, which I have just read in the "Review of Reviews." She has so much to learn about this selfhood that when she has settled this deep question, which usually takes a lifetime entirely to solve, her speech, if she has still the admirable gift of a silver tongue, will indeed be golden.

As it is, there is far too much of the dross of the personality to be wise or needful, and though it undoubtedly aids in the "boom" of Theosophy, I cannot see that in the long run it will really do much more than "popularise" Theosophy.

Some people will say that this is in itself excellent. I am, however, doubtful, though I do not wish to be a "Jeremy," for there is no doubt that we are going through a similar period of spiritual influx to that which occurred a hundred years ago.

The state of society and of religion was very much as it is now. Anyone, for instance, who has read the Theosophic correspondence between Baron Kirchberger and St. Martin will be struck with the extraordinary parallel.

After a time the excited state of the public mind calmed, and people resumed their normal condition, and cared for none of these things.

The question is, will this interest in things occult also die away, and will the Theosophical Society die much in the same way as similar publicly occult societies did a hundred years ago?

I am inclined to say Yes, if this undue excitement, this eager spirit of propagandism, fostered to white heat by Mrs. Besant's great eloquence, is to continue.

People now rush at Theosophy; we see the subject has, to use a cant expression, "scored a success," it will therefore attract many who care for nothing about it, but because "It is talked about."

Now, Theosophy is eminently unfitted for the non-philosophic or non-religious mind.

In one aspect, it is dark and deadly cold. To all unripe minds this side would infallibly do harm.

In Theosophy it is taught that "there is no forgiveness of sins." This means that the results of sin cannot be changed, and many weakly minds would only see despair in this. The forgiveness of sins, the exoteric doctrine commonly taught and understood only veils the real doctrine, but it helps the weaker brethren.

This sounds Jesuitical! We have been very proud of our hatred to Jesuitism, but in fact it has been generally practised for centuries by all parties; and the teachings of Theosophy are the first symptom of the raising of the veil publicly!

"The whole responsibility lies with those who raise it!" The truth is not to blame, but truth to unprepared minds is dangerous as error.

The great work of Christ lay in preparing the moral nature of man—imbuing him with stern principle that would never shift however society might alter, and the result of His work is still so incomplete, that I cannot help thinking that though Theosophy taught publicly may do good, it will also be infallibly mischievous to more.

I feel there is such an immense difference between trying to force the truth of Theosophy as Mrs. Besant does, and the legitimate means of influencing the cultured and prepared thought of the day through its literature.

Madame Blavatsky did a noble work in writing "Isis Unveiled," "The Secret Doctrine," and others; but Mrs. Besant speaking to a large public audience at St. James's Hall does a very different thing. In the one the personality is veiled and retiring; in the other the personality and emotions are really thrust on the public. It was doubtless painful to Mrs. Besant to think that anyone should doubt her word when she gave it to prove the existence of the Masters, but she must surely learn to bear the fate that has been the lot of most people who are Spiritualists or Theosophists. As a rule no one believes in any one but themselves in these matters—a curious instance, as Mrs. Boole proves so well, of the entire want of logic in the mind of society at large.

It is intensely offensive to Mrs. Besant that any one should doubt her. It is, however, a form of offence which is equally painful to all who have to endure it. As a rule it "has to be borne," unless a person confines him or herself to society of like mind and belief.

Now the chiefest good that will arise from this dragging to the light of all these matters will be, I think, that "other lights" will be found quietly shining.

The Theosophical Society does not hold all the occult thought of the day, or time, and perhaps it may be that Mrs. Besant may, unknowing to herself at present, prepare many minds to follow a road she may not now see, but a road that is unquestionably opening out from the gate which is not Theosophy, as so-called now. I think a good many of my readers may infer what I mean.

I would like, however, to say this—I do not mean that a person is never to write or speak for fear of doing either unworthily. That would be an equal mistake; the only thing is that one must shrink from anything like *ex cathedrâ* argument. In spiritual matters, as a rule, the growth is gradual but certain, and what is a crude thought of one year may be the refined judgment of the next, and there is no harm done, when there is not too much haste, and full knowledge assumed when partial is only the case. Expansion of thought it should be, not change of opinion.

Too much haste in teaching before complete saturation is attained is indeed eminently shown, as Mrs. A. J. Penny so well points out, by the exponents of "Christian Science," notably by Mrs. Helen Wilman. Here is a similar case somewhat of the unwisdom of propaganda.

Mr. Mulford states an esoteric law somewhat boldly, it is understood in the letter, by most, and the consequence is the rash, and as Mrs. Penny says, the "hot nonsense" of Mrs. Wilman and others who think because they violently half conceive a theory, that they must pour it out still further into the empty minds who alone could receive it.

If, therefore, instead of trying to force Theosophic inquiry only along certain lines, Mrs. Besant would pause awhile before she insists on every hearer believing in the Masters and "H. P. B." as their only accredited messenger, and herself as the most worthy of expounding this message, the cause would, I think, *not* be retarded, the "boom" would not have occurred, and neither would the reaction from it. This reaction will come. It is always the old story of Luther and Erasmus. As long as the Luthers of the day reign, esoteric knowledge must remain in the shade. Here I quote a well-said sentence from "G. W. A.'s" "rejoinder" on "The Esoteric Basis of Christianity" (October 31st). "The Universalist believes in unfolding or evolution. The propagandist believes in destroying and in evil as an actuality," and in the propagandism of esoteric thought called Theosophy, I at present cordially disagree.

ISABEL DE STEIGER, F.T.S.

Fern Grove, Sefton Park, Liverpool.

Black is White, &c

SIR,—In your paper there is generally something to be found which leads to a pleasant train of thought. Sometimes, too, it may happen that ideas are ready, but it seems almost impossible to communicate them to others until a chance word in "LIGHT" serves as a peg to hang them upon. Such an opportunity was afforded by the recent mention of the unity formula—x + *not* x=1. If we accept this law there is no difficulty in saying "x is *not* x, and *not* x is x," although the realisation of this idea should precede the unity formula by rights. Let us call x white, and *not* x black. Then we must imagine three precious stones on a very exalted plane, having nothing but their appearance in common with earthly jewels. On the left is a ruby, on the right a sapphire, in the centre a diamond. In this combination the diamond is x, or white, the ruby and sapphire, not being white but red and blue respectively=*not* x, or black. Now the ruby and sapphire become an amethyst, or a jewel of a violet colour, combining both red and blue. As every painter knows, violet, by deepening the colour, becomes black. The amethyst then, a black stone, has become like a speck of carbon. The diamond is so large, such a great circle of light. The amethyst looks like a point in the circle. It is so bright, surely it is light, and there is no darkness at all, or x + *not* x=x. LEO.

The Cause of Colour in Animals.

SIR,—Since writing to you on the above subject I have learned a few more particulars, for which I shall be glad if you can find a corner.

It seems to be now a well-established fact that, as the old Syrian herdsmen believed, colouring in animals is produced through the eyes. Thus fish are sometimes met with of a dark colour in spite of the light sandy surface where they are found, and these fish are always either blind or going blind, their darkness of colour being in proportion to their blindness. They cannot see their surroundings, and therefore cease to have the colour of their surroundings. The explanation offered for this strange fact is that "the colour is caused by reflex action set up by the animal seeing the colour," and it is on this explanation that I should like to offer an observation or two.

"Reflex action," if it exists at all, must be a "constant quantity" and have the same effect on all animals, at least all of the same species, that live together; for they all look on the same colours. "Reflex action" is therefore inconsistent with the doctrine of Natural Selection, which accounts for all colours by supposing a series of accidents and chances. Moreover, how does "reflex action" produce different colours in male and female birds living together? They both look on the same colours and ought to be coloured alike, if "reflex action" were the cause of their colouring.

It is well known that colours generally fade in disease and weakness, while "robust health and vigour add to their intensity." Now this fact would seem to point to the animal spirits as the cause of the colour and not to "reflex action." And the fact that in the breeding season, male birds become as a rule more brilliant than at other times, would seem to point in the same direction. The males of some birds are as sober coloured as the females, except at this particular season, when they become quite gay and gaudy. Now, as colours are produced through the eyes, it must follow that at this season the male bird sees all things in a rosy light. It is through his exalted state of mind that the effect is produced and not through "reflex action," and therefore the cause is a psychical one.

It is well known that singing birds have no finery, and fine birds no song. The song and the finery are only two different ways of externalising the feelings of the heart, and either way is sufficient. Birds of rich plumage, Mr. Wallace informs us, have a "surplus of energy," and he instances birds of paradise and peafowl. Of humming birds it is the ornamented species alone that are fierce and pugnacious and afraid of nothing. They dart about attacking all they meet as if they looked on the world as their own. Life to them is one ceaseless intoxication of delight. And this is just what we should expect if we regard their plumage as an outward manifestation of their inner life.

In some species of birds the male attends to the hatching of the eggs, and in such cases he is, as we should expect him to be, clothed in very sober livery. What of the joy and sunshine of existence can ever reach his melancholy heart as he dreams away his days and nights on his solitary nest? His lady, however, having thrown all her household cares on her husband's shoulders, blossoms forth in all the radiance of a jubilant life. Her glad heart cannot manifest itself in song, but it does what it can do—it covers her wings with silver and her feathers with gold. It is the heart, sir, the inner life that does it all. Even the poor fish show that they are capable of feeling sorrow and gladness, for as Mr. Poulton tells us in his book on the "Colours of Animals," they "become much brighter while they are feeding." It is just as a hungry dog sometimes yelps his delight while eating his long deferred supper. The poor fish cannot yelp their delight, but they show it in their own way. Ay, and the darkness of the fish that are becoming or have become blind, may also be traced to a psychical cause. It is well known that eyeless fish living in dark caverns are often found white. Now why don't these become dark as plaice and trout do when surrounded by darkness? Is it not because they are in their natural surroundings? They are happy where they are. Their inner life is not darkened by sorrow. Let these same fish, however, be transferred to an aquarium where they cannot altogether escape the light, and they will become dark. The light makes them feel unhappy. It darkens their inner life and they externalise the darkness in their colour.

All living creatures naturally haunt the localities which they like best. They attach themselves to certain surroundings and certain colours. Those colours and surroundings become objects of their affection, and as our great poet puts it, "affection, mistress of passion, sways them to the mood (colour) of what it likes or loathes." It is of things on a different level that another writer is speaking when he tells us that by beholding a certain glorious Object as it were in a glass we become gradually changed into the same image.

GEORGE HARPUR.

"The Esoteric Basis of Christianity."

SIR,—With reference to the rejoinder which appeared in "LIGHT" of October 31st, and to the question addressed to me, will you kindly permit me to say: (1) That I am not "prepared to affirm the truth of the conclusion of the syllogism" stated therein, but, on the contrary, am prepared to deny it. (2) I have never anywhere stated in words or in effect that "Theosophy *as taught by us* contains all that is true in Christianity and in Buddhism."

As to Point 1. There are some persons who still, for old acquaintance sake probably, remain members of the "Church," but who believe in the Esotericism of Christianity. Nevertheless the Church, as a body, has no esotericism in it. Let me illustrate "G. W. A.'s" "syllogism."

The Church is a body which does not believe in the facts of Spiritualism.

"G. W. A." is one who is a member of the Church.

Therefore "G. W. A." does not believe in the facts of Spiritualism.

The fallacy is apparent! He may be a member of the Church and yet believe in Spiritualism, although there is no Spiritualism in the Church. He may be also an electrician, though the Church as a body may not teach electricity. And in like manner he may believe in the Esoteric Basis of Christianity without my assertion being interfered with.

Point 2. Who are included in the description "us"? Not the Theosophical Society, for as a society it holds but one doctrine, viz., Brotherhood. Not the individual members, for each member is of either a different religion, or a different shade of religion. Or it may be, like myself, of no religion—that is, no formulated creed. But I firmly believe (though it would take too much space to demonstrate the grounds of that belief now) that Theosophy, as taught by Madame Blavatsky in her published works, does contain all that is true in every exoteric religion, and a great deal more. Further, it is said that, comparatively speaking, only a very small part of Theosophy has been publicly taught—quite as much, however, as the average investigator can assimilate. What I maintain is that Theosophy or Divine Wisdom, and Truth being one, all that is true wheresoever it may be found—whether in religion, science, or philosophy it matters not—is Theosophy.

In conclusion, I heartily reciprocate the sentiment of brotherhood and tolerance in the concluding remarks of "G. W. A." Individuals of every sect, church, or creed I

regard as brothers, but as to some of their doctrines and some of their organisations, as such, I'm agin 'em.

5, Rhyl-street, N.W. THOS. GREEN.
November 4th, 1891.

[The fallacy above is in the first premiss as Mr. Green gives it. I do not admit that it is true to say that "the Church is a body which does not believe in the facts of Spiritualism."—G. W. A.]

SIR,—I trust you will permit me to say a few words in reply to the "rejoinder" by "G. W. A." in your issue of the 31st ult., because I have not yet succeeded in making it clear to my critic that I am at one with him as regards premisses, but that I do not admit his conclusions. The real question, however, is not so much as to premisses and conclusions, but as to definitions.

The criticism to which I mainly took exception was the following:—"A true Universalist is never a propagandist," because "the true Universalist cannot see disorder anywhere. All is to him one—one order, from the transcendent point of view." I objected to this on two grounds: (*a*) Because I think that a true Universalist can be a propagandist; and (*b*) because I think that we have to admit disorder when we do not look at matters from a transcendent point of view; or, in other words, that good and evil are relative terms.

Now as to our definitions. A "true Universalist," according to "G. W. A.," is "one who has discerned that order *is* and disorder only seems." That is exactly my position; therefore I am a true Universalist according to definition; and I am also in agreement with my critic as to the premiss that the universe—"from the transcendent point of view"—is order and harmony; or, in other words, that evil is not "an actual positive thing."

Now as to the term "propagandist." According to "G. W. A." a propagandist is not one who *does* something, but one who *feels* something. He says: "The propagandist *feels* that everyone who differs from him must be wrong, and is most eagerly anxious to convert him." And again: "I do not call that man a propagandist who works cheerfully, lovingly, and sympathetically for the truest that he can see." In this definition I must differ from my critic. To me a propagandist is simply one who "propagates"; that is, one who works to spread or extend the knowledge of something. It does not seem to me that it makes any difference in the term as to what may be the man's motive, or what he may *feel* in respect to his work. It is true that in a secondary and purely conventional sense the term may be associated with bigotry and intolerance, but we have no right to take this as its primary meaning. I am afraid that "G. W. A." looks upon me as a "propagandist" in the light of his own definition; but I can assure him that since I recognise that right and wrong are relative terms, I do not feel that everyone who differs from me must be "wrong," nor am I "eagerly anxious" to convert anyone. I simply work for "the truest that I can see," as the instrument of a higher power, with whom is the result—not with me.

From this I think it will be made clear (*a*) why I think that a "true Universalist" can also be a propagandist.

Now with regard to the second point (*b*), as to the existence of order and disorder, and their relation to each other. There is here more apparent than real difference between us. "G. W. A." thinks that I have "not quite caught the point" for which he was contending in his review of my book. Perhaps I have not quite caught the "point," but I am certainly in agreement with him when he says: "The whole being (as I must believe) an order, there can be no part or aspect of it *really* out of order, but only seemingly so." I do not think I have said anything different from this, though I have put it in other words.

My proposition was, that disorder "does exist relatively" but not absolutely. I really do not see the difference between this and the proposition that it exists "seemingly" but not "really." "G. W. A." admits that he is "earnest in desiring to promote all sorts of reforms"; from which it follows that there are some things which are, "relatively" to him, standing in need of reform, or which are, in other words, "disorderly."

I hope that "G. W. A." will now admit that the question between us is not one of premisses, but of definitions and conclusions; and though he seems to object to the term "fallacy" as applied to his reasoning, the term is correct according to his own definition, in so far as I differ from his conclusion that "a true Universalist cannot be a propagandist"; and also because a false definition produces a fallacy in argument. How much this is the case may be seen from the following sentence: "The propagandist believes in destroying and in evil as an actuality." Now, "G. W. A." admits that he is a reformer. But reformation implies the destruction or discontinuance of some existing order of things. In what respect, then, does "G. W. A." differ from a propagandist, for I deny altogether his right to assert that a propagandist believes in evil as an actuality? I do not believe this, yet he calls me a propagandist; and, moreover, the term does not carry with it in any sense a definition of what a man does or does not believe "from the transcendent point of view." Hence the fallacy. W. KINGSLAND.

[As Mr. Kingsland has so handsomely met me half way, I will meet him in a like charitable spirit. Let us grant the principle—Nature proceeds by growth. In all things at times a point is reached where, not so much reform, as new form, new organ, structure, process, is requisite. The Universalist is (in my apprehension) one who predicates that if the old order could continue one day, nay one moment, beyond the time when the new ought to take its place that would be evil; but that is a thing that can never by any possibility actually happen. It is more likely that we should be wrong in our idea of when this time has come than that nature should be wrong about it. The man whom I have called a Propagandist, but for which I will substitute the term Non-Universalist, to avoid contention about words, is one who does not recognise this truth of the impossibility of any real mistake; thinks, on the contrary, that old institutions and old ideas often overstay their time, and is very grieved, and sometimes angry, about it; and strains every effort to rush in and save the situation. These men and their efforts are most invaluable. They are the means Providence uses for bringing about the changes necessary. I would not for one moment desire them to cease their efforts. I only wish that, for their own sake, they could work, not less earnestly, but more cheerfully and confidently; and know that, when they fail, it is not because evil has overmastered good, but because—not seeing the whole process and the true end aimed at—they are a little premature. The man who by his efforts does prepare for a change, even though he himself fail to accomplish it, has done just as real good and useful work as the man who is the direct instrument of effecting the change. I find myself very often falling into a sort of indignant impatience that things do not go quicker, and I gladly admit that Mr. Kingsland's expression, "Alas for the illusion of forms and formulas; how shall we teach men to escape from it?" was such an entirely forgivable temporary forgetfulness of a Universal principle which I am delighted to find he recognises in theory as fully as I do. If, however, Mr. Kingsland will not admit the position here taken up, and asserts that a Universalist *may* logically get pessimistic about the slowness of the rate of progress, and the little effect visible as a result of his own efforts, then, I fear, there is no more to be said. We must try to agree to differ. —G. W. A.]

Do Two and Two make Four?

SIR,—Is it necessary, as "Leo" thinks, to wait for entrance into the fourth dimensional sphere, which, in point of fact, is that spiritual state in which all dimensions are transcended, to find that what are regarded as certainties are only relatively so? Do two and two really make four in this our three dimensional state? Certainly, dealing with abstract numbers it is needful and right for commercial purposes to assume that $2+2=4$, but in such case there is no real addition, except of symbols. Take four separate pieces of putty or dough, place them in pairs, and make a real addition of them, and it will be found that two and two make one. So with the addition of all homogeneous substances; while in the case of chemical affinities two compound substances when united will make five, or a fifth, as oxygen and hydrogen form a third—water; the two elements still remaining, as they can be separated, when the third becomes non-existent. "As sure as two and two make four," is a rough and ready proverbial expression, which, like many other such

expressions, will not bear close consideration. Yet conventionally, and for practical purposes, it may still be maintained that 2 and 2 make four—except when they make 22!

J. W. F.

The Feminine in the Divine.

SIR,—In your issue of October 31st, speaking of my letter, which you did not give *in extenso*, you say, "It seems to me a very materialistic view to suppose that in the Divine the masculine and feminine elements are distinguished as they are with us." Your sense of justice will, I am sure, allow me just space enough to say that such an idea was as far removed from me as possible. The only distinction I ever meant, or now mean, is as power and gentleness, as wisdom and love, as giver and receiver, as Abba our Father, and Amma our Mother.

I. O.

SOCIETY WORK.

CLAPHAM JUNCTION, 16, QUEEN'S PARADE. ENDYONIC SOCIETY.—Mrs. Mason, of Shepherd's Bush, has kindly promised to give a benefit séance for our library fund, on Sunday, November 15th, at 7.30. We hope to have a large muster of friends. A developing circle has been started on Wednesday evenings, at 8 p.m.; a few more sitters wanted.—UTBER W. GODDARD.

KING'S CROSS SOCIETY, COPENHAGEN HALL, 184, COPENHAGEN-STREET, CALEDONIAN-ROAD.—On Sunday evening next, Mr. F. W. Read will give an address on "Some Recent Investigations in Clairvoyance," with an account of the valuable reports of certain members of the Psychical Research Society on Mrs. Piper, an American clairvoyante. To commence 7 p.m. Admission free.—S. T. RODGER, Hon. Sec.

MR. HOPCROFT'S BENEFIT.—A special séance was given at 24, Harcourt-street, Marylebone, W., on Thursday last for the benefit of Mr. Hopcroft. Mrs. Mason, medium, generously gave her services and the committee kindly granted the use of the rooms, There was a large assembly, and the proceeds, amounting to 21s., have been forwarded to Mr. Younger.—H. MASON, Cor., 14, Orchard-road, Shepherd's Bush, W.

24, HARCOURT-STREET, MARYLEBONE.—Mrs. Slater gave an Inspirational discourse on Sunday on "Spiritual Freedom," exhorting all to a true and spiritual course of life as befitting them for happiness here and hereafter. Sunday next, at 11 a.m., Mr. D. B. Dale, "Mind"; at 7 p.m., Mr. Wyndoe, "Man in his Dual Aspect, Natural and Spiritual." Thursday, at 7.45 p.m., Mrs. Mason. Saturday, at 7.45 p.m., Mrs. Treadwell.—C. WHITE.

14, ORCHARD-ROAD, SHEPHERD'S BUSH, W.—At our service on Sunday Mr. Portman's guides gave us a beautiful discourse upon prayer, urging all to use that powerful weapon for the enlightenment of dark humanity. Many interesting questions were answered by Miss E. Mason's guides at the close. Sunday, at 3 p.m., Lyceum; at 7 p.m., Mr. Humphries; Tuesdays, at 8 p.m., séance, Mrs. Mason; Saturdays, at 8 p.m., select circle. November 22nd, Mr. Emms; November 29th, Mrs. Treadwell; December 6th, Mrs. Hawkins.—J.H.B., Hon. Sec.

LONDON SPIRITUALIST FEDERATION, ATHENÆUM HALL, 73, TOTTENHAM COURT-ROAD.—Last Sunday Mr. J. Maltby gave his free lantern lecture which was very interesting. The pictures of important séances fairly astonished many amongst the audience. Next Sunday, at 7 p.m., Miss Todd will lecture on "The Phenomena of Spiritualism," before which Mr. Desmond Fitz Gerald's Experiences in Spiritualism will be read. These he gave at a soirée of the London Spiritualist Alliance, and all readers of "LIGHT" ought to hear them.—W. F. TINDALL, A.T.C.L., Hon. Sec.

WINCHESTER HALL, 33, HIGH-STREET, PECKHAM.—On Sunday morning an address was given by Mr. Keats, and in the evening Mrs. Treadwell's guide gave an instructive address on the need of furnishing good conditions and also answered many questions satisfactorily. Last quarter's balance-sheet shows receipts, £34 4s. 8d.; expenses, £28 13s. 6d.; balance in hand. £5 11s. 2d. Sunday next, at 11.15 a.m., Mr. Humphries; at 7 p.m., Mr. Butcher. Monday, at 8 p.m., members' circle; Thursday, at 8 p.m., free concert; Friday, at 8 p.m., free healing.—J. DALE, 4, Sidney-road, Stockwell, Sec.

CONCERT AT WINCHESTER HALL.—On Saturday last a concert was kindly given by Messrs. Hubbard. The overture was well rendered by Mrs. Robotham. The following artists, Mr. and Mrs. A. J. Hubbard, Messrs. Edwards, Roberts, and Chevalier, jun., gave some excellent glees and songs. On every Thursday, at 8 p.m., we intend holding "Social Evenings;" anyone willing to assist at these entertainments will please communicate with Paul Breton, 33, High-street, Peckham.—JNO. T. AUDY, President.

SOUTH LONDON SOCIETY OF SPIRITUALISTS, 311, CAMBERWELL NEW-ROAD, S.E. (NEAR THE GREEN).—The committee have decided to discontinue the Sunday morning public service, and in future a meeting for experimental purposes will be held for members only. Sunday evening next, "The Thought-body of Man." Discussion on the same subject on Thursday, at 8.30. On Sunday last, some personal experiences of "spirit identity" were related by the chairman, Mr. J. W. Perry, and Mr. Long. Clairvoyance brought to a close an interesting meeting, which was well attended. Sunday, November 22nd, at 7 o'clock, address by Mr. W. E. Long on "Theosophy." Solos and musical selections during the evening.—W. E. LONG, Hon. Sec.

FOREST HILL, 23, DEVONSHIRE-ROAD.—On Wednesday, the 4th inst., we had a most successful concert. We had an excellent programme and our rooms were crowded to their utmost capacity. On Thursday, November 5th, a lecture was given by Captain Pfoundes on Theosophy, when many facts were given which were calculated to deprive Theosophy of any attractions it may previously have had for those present; our rooms were again filled with a highly intelligent audience. On Sunday the Rev. Dr. Young preached to a crowded audience, on "How I Became a Spiritualist, and Why I Remain One." For more than an hour he held his audience almost spell-bound by his eloquence and interesting facts. Sunday, November 15th, at 7 p.m., Mrs. Treadwell. Thursday, November 19th, Captain Pfoundes, at 8 p.m., subject "Theosophy."—H. W. BRUNKER, Sec.

ETHICAL SPIRITUALISM.

We are asked to state that Captain Pfoundes (whose address is 29, Doughty-street, W.C.) desires to open discussions at Spiritualistic Societies or in private rooms, kindly lent, where a few earnest, thoughtful inquirers after truth and light may be gathered together. The subjects he desires to deal with are those vital and highly interesting points that have come uppermost during the recent controversy: Spiritualistic and Ethical.

[ADVERTISEMENT.]

TESTIMONIAL TO MRS. J. B. MELLON.

TO ALL SPIRITUALISTS.

Friends! owing to the sudden departure from England to Australia of Mr. and Mrs. Mellon and family, on account of Mr. Mellon's continued ill health, his medical advisers having ordered his immediate departure to a warmer climate, it has been decided at a meeting of Newcastle Spiritualists to present to Mrs. Mellon a purse of gold, as the most suitable testimonial under the circumstances, in recognition of her long and faithful services as a "medium" for physical manifestations and materialisation.

The Committee for the furtherance of this testimonial, while regretting the sad necessity for their departure, believe that Mrs. Mellon's numerous friends in many parts of England and Scotland would like to embrace the opportunity of showing their apprecation of her great and continued services to the cause of Spiritualism in this country.

Mrs. Hammarbom, of 155, Northumberland-street, Newcastle-on-Tyne, has kindly consented to act as treasurer to the fund.

All friends desiring to contribute will kindly remit their donations promptly to the treasurer, who will duly acknowledge the same in the spiritual papers.

14, Alexandra-terrace, Derwentwater-road, Gateshead, Tyne. ROBERT ELLISON, Hon. Sec.

The following subscriptions have been received:—Dr. and Mrs. Hardinge Britten, 10s.; Mrs. Hammarbom, £1; Mr. H. A. Kersey, £1; Captain T. J. Ranton, £1; Mr. Hutchinson, 2s. 6d.; Mrs. T. Jackson, 5s.; Collection, 8s. 2d.; Mrs. Fenton, 2s. 6d.; Mr. T. Moore, 2s.; Mr. W. H. Robinson, 2s. 6d.; Mr. W. Kerr, 2s. 6d.; Mr. J. Petrie, 5s.; Mr. R. Cairns, 1s.; Mr. W. C. Robson, 5s.; Mr. Lewis Hall, 5s.; Miss Kersey, 2s. 6d.; Miss Bacon, 2s. 6d.; Mrs. Taylor Robinson, 2s. 6d.; Mr. Rostron's Séance, 9s.; Mr. Joseph Hunter, 5s.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

OWING to pressure on our space several articles and letters are crowded out. They will appear in our next issue.

J. H. K.—The stupid statement recklessly made by Dr. Winslow to the effect that 10,000 persons were confined in lunatic asylums in the United States, driven off their balance by Spiritualism, was long since utterly confuted by Dr. Eugene Crowell, of Brooklyn, U.S.A. The refutation has repeatedly been published. There is no truth whatever in Dr. Winslow's statement, and he has never, when challenged, brought forward a shred of evidence in its support. As a matter of fact religious mania very largely fills asylums. Spiritualism does not. We should like to see the pamphlet of which you speak.