

# SPIRITUALISM VINDICATED, AND CLERICAL SLANDERS REFUTED.

---

MY FRIENDS.—

As the subject matter of my present address is designed for publication, and therefore requires a report of more accuracy than could be obtained from phonography—as I am determined, moreover, neither to be misunderstood nor misrepresented—I shall depart from my ordinary custom of extemporaneous speaking on this occasion, and endeavour as far as possible to confine my remarks to a written statement.

I candidly confess that I am entirely unused to this method, and as it may prove difficult for me to limit my remarks to a prepared address, I beg to add that a reporter is present, from whose phonographic report any accidental departure from my MSS. will be faithfully corrected before sending it to press.

The object of my appearing before you to-night is to answer the attacks of Mr M. W. Green, a Christian minister of this city, who, in a certain hand-bill now before me, and in a series of four lectures, full reports of which have been furnished me, has grossly slandered the whole body of persons calling themselves Spiritualists, discourteously nicknamed *Spiritists* by Mr Green.

It may be asked, of what possible consequence can the statements of this gentleman become to masses of believers in Spiritualism, who by thousands, and even by millions, are scattered all over the civilised world, and who, with the exception of a comparatively small number now resident in this city, can scarcely be likely to hear

the name of Mr M. W. Green at all, and if the accidents of time and chance should ever make them acquainted with his opinions, would only laugh at them, and wonder how the enlightened inhabitants of a British colony could beguile their time by listening to such nursery tales of "old Bogey," and what he was going to do with naughty infidels.

To this very rational objection I answer: I am not moved to make this address in behalf of my cause, which an army of such preachers as Mr Green, given a metropolitan pulpit in the largest cities of civilisation, could not affect; but my short residence in Dunedin has made me acquainted with a brave band of Spiritualists and Free-thinkers, whose intellectual ability and respectable lives have placed them in the front ranks of private worth and public influence. Now I find this Christian minister, whilst he is not brave enough to attack these excellent persons openly—show them wherein they are wrong, and in his superior enlightenment endeavour to set them right—is yet forward enough to libel and insult them through an impersonal attack on multitudes, whom he can safely use as a breast-work, behind which to shoot arrows against the fair name and fame of his fellow citizens. As a proof of the monstrous allegations brought against many respectable citizens of this place, and that under the cover of *safe generalities*, I invite you to listen to the recital of the hand-bill by which this gentleman solicits the patronage of his Christian brethren. On the 10th of June he announces a lecture with the following synopsis:

"Spiritism unworthy of confidence—impossibility of identifying spirits—Spirits are deceivers—their teachings irrational and irreligious."

His next programme reads—

"Spiritism opposed to all law, Human and Divine—destructive of morality and of all distinction between right and wrong."

His next—

"Dangers of Spirit-mediumship—destroys individuality and power and self-control—an incentive to the commission of crimes."

and his final announcement informs mankind that—

“Spiritism is Atheistical—destructive of human accountability—the enemy of marriage—the forerunner of social and political anarchy.”

As a specimen of the mode in which Mr Green deals with the subjects thus announced, I give you his words spoken in my own hearing last Tuesday evening, when he declared that “Spiritism was a worship of all that was base and damnable. It was the most accursed system under the heavens, the most damnable system ever advocated on earth.”

I might pause here, and having presented you with these samples, both printed and oral, of Christian sentiment and gentlemanly language, hold myself excused from entering the arena of argument with such an antagonist; but I must confess my deep indignation overcomes even my contempt, and determines me to expose some of the gross fallacies which accompany the language I have cited.

I need hardly say my task is not a pleasant one, for independent of the tone in which this gentleman's warfare is conducted, its argumentation seems to carry me back into the dark ages, and compels me to fight legions of goblins, whom the civilisation of the 19th century has long since consigned to the realms of old time superstition.

When modern Spiritualism first made its mark on this generation, many of the clergy, whose calling it threatened—just as the dawning of Christianity threatened to ruin the trade of the image-makers of Ephesus—after using all their arts of denial, threat, persecution, and anathema maranatha in vain, at last fell back upon the once popular but now fast-fading superstition of a personal devil, who, having been summoned from the realms of an antique pandemonium, was re-habilitated with all the wierd attributes of horns, hoof and tail, and set loose upon the ocean of public opinion, to scare off our dear spirit friends and lash those who dared to give them a welcome into the realms of freshly-lit fires and newly raked up embers of half-burnt brimstone. For a time the Spiritualists, Free-thinkers, and Rationalists of the age fought this contemptible scarecrow as if it had been a reality.

Twenty-five years ago it really did play its part on the stage of a certain kind of public opinion, and provided the scene of the Satanic craze was sufficiently far from the railroad to ensure an audience of backwoodsmen, and other simple folk who had not become acquainted with the mythical origin of theological legends, as revealed by modern travel and scientific discovery, the fire and brimstone fable was revived with good effect; but when a very little learning, and very little common sense, was brought to bear upon these clerical utterances, their value as a rod for frightening grown-up children was placed in its historical absurdity. The Satanic theory melted away into the dim legendary shades from whence it came, and the growl of some devil's sword, instead of being merely blunted, shivered into pieces in the light of modern intelligence, leaving only such petty fragments behind as serve for nurse-maids' rods and infants' rattles.

Of late years the more enlightened of the clergy have prudently become silent, some doubtless believing their creed would last their time; others waiting to see which way the wind of popular favour was likely to blow, and not a few earnest and reverend men deeming it their best course to follow the advice of Gamaliel, believing, as I believe, that "if this work be of men it will come to nought, but, if it be of God, man cannot overthrow it." The more belligerent, however, finding the old Beelzebub story gone out of fashion, as their next best resort opened their arms to travelling conjurers and tricky expositors of the obnoxious new faith, who, by the aid of a little conjeracy and legerdemain, undertook to rout the whole army of angels, archangels, spirits, and demons, and prove that all who believed in spirit communion—even upon the testimony of their senses—were either fools enough to be deluded, or knaves enough to become deluders like themselves.

Still these, like many other attempts to conquer a world-wide movement with hobgoblins and conjurers, have become things of the past, of which most of the actors have become heartily ashamed. My friends, therefore, may judge of my surprise when I find in this brave little City

—this bright, progressive centre of British civilization—the long defunct Satan *in propria personæ* disinterred from the shades of oblivion, materialized in all the grim horrors of the far-famed roaring lion, and placed with open mouth and rampant paws on this very Garrison Hall platform by a Christian minister as the monster that is going to devour him and all his flock of lambs; pull down all the churches of Christendom; stamp the Bible out of memory; upset Exeter Hall with its world-wide mission of Bibles and moral pocket-handkerchiefs; sweep away every king from his throne; substitute for monarchy a reign of defunct materialised Nihilists, Socialists, and Communists; destroy every memory of a personal Jehovah, leaving not a wreck behind of his threats, repentings, promises, and recantations; abrogate marriage and proclaim a general do-as-you-please law to all mankind—and all this, and much more of the same kind with which Mr Green threatened the world last Tuesday evening will be the result of Spiritualism, until Mr Green arises, and with a mass of garbled quotations selected from our spiritual literature, and a mass of denunciations, of which you may find a fair specimen in this handbill, succeeds in restoring a distracted world to its senses; batters the devil's sword out of all shape; reinaugurates the worship of the Bible—the personal God—who sends men strong delusion and a lie to beguile them to their destruction (*vide* 2nd chap. Thess. 2nd verse); the vicarious atonement for sin, and the wholesome fear of a personal devil, who has hitherto gone roaring about seeking whom he may devour in the diabolical, revolutionary, and impious form of spirit-rappings and dancing tables! I trust this description of the wrath to come, taken almost literally from Mr Green's last lecture, will plead my excuse for the reluctance I feel to enter upon a warfare which appears to me so eminently ridiculous that if it were not for the monstrous assertions of this handbill, and the insulting slurs it casts over many an honoured resident of this city, I should deem the whole attack utterly unworthy of notice.

Since my duty to my present associates, however, compels me to re-enter the field of by-gone time skirmishes,

I will commence by taking up the first of this gentleman's announcements. He says:—"Spiritism unworthy of confidence," "*Impossibility of identifying spirits.*" To this statement, the very existence of Spiritualism as a world-wide cause gives a blank denial, seeing that tens of thousands, and even millions of believers have identified spirits to their perfect satisfaction. If Mr Green has failed to do the same that is no reason why he should invalidate the testimony of millions of his fellow-creatures, and all I can say is, he has not been as fortunate in his company, or as careful in his investigations as the said millions who are convinced. He adds:—"Spirits are deceivers—their teachings irrational and irreligious." In reviewing this paragraph, we must call upon you to notice that our friend actually acknowledges the existence of spirits and their power to communicate. What, then, does he complain of? He admits that spirits can communicate in Dunedin in 1879 just as he acknowledges that spirits communicated in Canaan two and three thousand years ago.

Can he pretend that all the spirits that came to the Jews of old, including the spirit that put a lie into the mouth of Ahab's 400 prophets, were good, and the spirits that come to comfort and instruct, heal and bless us to-day, are all bad? What can our Heavenly Father be about when He opens the door to angels only in ancient Judea, and to devils only in modern America and Dunedin?

It is not that I or any candid Spiritualist would attempt to deny the existence of bad spirits, or to refuse Mr Green his monopoly of them. The fact that we believe the spirits to be the souls of humanity is the best proof that there must be bad as well as good spirits.

It is one of the fundamental teachings of good spirits, that until the enfranchised soul has outgrown its earthly evils and criminal tendencies, its teachings will correspond with its nature; and, again, if none but true and good spirits communicated with earth, however we might be disposed to consider the visitation as coming from a higher world, we could never

recognise it as a world of human spirits. The fact that *some* of the spirits are deceivers, and their teachings irrational, should be to a candid mind one of the best proofs that they have gravitated to the spheres from human sources. Are there no deceptions, irrationality, or irreligion in this mundane world of ours? Let our gaols, gallowses, law courts, and police records answer; and having done so, ask common sense whether we must abjure the world, and keep out of its way altogether, because it is full of deception, irrationality, and irreligion? No one can deny to Mr Green the privilege of communicating with bad spirits only, but surely our friend will not presume to gauge the experience of millions of his fellow-creatures only by his own? The universal experience of believers in spirit communion is that like attracts like; that, as the spirit world is inhabited by human spirits, there are both good and bad, and we, by our own habits, proclivities, and tastes, may fairly calculate upon attracting spirits of a kindred character to ourselves.

On the 17th of June Mr Green gives another complimentary review of Spiritualism in the following astounding terms:—*Spiritism opposed to all law human and divine—destructive of morality and all distinction between right and wrong.* Having paused to take breath and partially recover from the effect of this staggering blow, we would humbly ask Mr Green what *ALL* the laws human and divine are, and *when*, in his infinite wisdom, he managed to gauge them all?

As yet—and that after a careful review of all his arguments—I find he has failed to show any law to which the Spiritualism he nicknames Spiritism is opposed. I claim that there is no law known to any man (save only to Mr Green, of course) which prevents him from hearing a knock, seeing a table dance, viewing a spirit when one appears, listening to a voice and comprehending an intelligent message whether rapped out, tipped out, written, spoken, symbolised in vision, communicated in trance or dream, or depicted in drawings or pantomimic action; and when the message thus given identifies itself with the spirit of a human being whom we know to have lived on

earth, a human being like ourselves, only freed from its mortal envelope, every law now known to man, whether human or divine, would stamp us as fools and imbeciles if we refused to listen to the said message, and attribute it to the source with which alone it can be identified.

Of course, no one is supposed to know ALL that Mr Green knows; in fact, it is very doubtful if any one but himself can prove which laws are human and which divine. Certain it is, that Mr Green must be prepared to show the law, aye, and demonstrate its force, before he can expect us to yield obedience to it; and until he does this, I am afraid we shall be compelled to take his assertion as a figure of speech, savouring far more of bombast than reality.

As to the statement that *Spiritualism is destructive of morality and all distinction between right and wrong*, I must either suppose Mr Green's own views of right and wrong are somewhat mixed, or yield my emphatic denial to every syllable of this statement. It is now time that we should enter somewhat more in detail concerning the true genius of the great movement which this gentleman so recklessly defames. Spiritualism consists of four, and only four, well marked and universal points of agreement.

*First*: It proves, by a set of curious and obviously supermundane phenomena,—unsought, in the first instance, by mortals, and poured out with a power and universality beyond man's capacity to resist,—that a world of invisible intelligence is communicating with us.

*Secondly*: It demonstrates by an immense array of test facts, given all over the world, under circumstances that forbid the possibility of collusion or human contrivance, that the communicating intelligences are identical with the souls of mortals who have once lived on earth.

*Thirdly*: It shows by an universal coincidence in the intelligence communicated, that every living soul is in judgment for the deeds done in the body, and reaps the fruits of its good or evil life on earth, in conditions of happiness or suffering hereafter; also, that there is no



remission of sins, and that the goodness of one spirit, however pure or exalted, can never affect, much less atone for, the wrongs committed by another, and that the evil doer can only become good and happy by personal atonement and continued growth in good.

*Fourthly* : All the communicating spirits of the new dispensation coincide in declaring that the life immediately succeeding mortal dissolution is not a final state, but one which manifests innumerable conditions of *progress*, all of which are open to every soul, according to its will to do good and its personal conquest over evil, and these four propositions, I emphatically protest, are the all of Spiritual facts we know,—the all that is absolutely proved.

These are the only points of agreement which bind together the immense varieties of persons that make up the ranks of Spiritualism. And now I would ask, what can any sane mind find in these propositions *destructive of morality and all distinction between right and wrong* ?

If I were to say to the murderer on the gallows,—as has been said hundreds of times by Christian ministers,—“My brother, no matter how great a sinner you have been ; Jesus died for sinners ; believe in Him, and you go straight from the gallows to heaven.”

Were I to go into your streets and read to the robbers, cheats, swindlers, bank defaulters, house breakers, garroters, and criminals, who swell the bulk of every Christian city's population, the contents of a card put into my hands last Sunday as the catch-word of a Christian congregation's belief,—namely, “Though your sins were as red as scarlet, they shall be washed as white as wool in the blood of the Lamb,” truly in either case I might be accused of preaching doctrines *destructive of morality, and all distinction between right and wrong* ; but when I say there is no remission of sin, except through the abandonment of sin, and the practice of virtue ; there is no vicarious atonement for sin here or hereafter ; every soul must pay its own penalty and earn its own reward. Commence your progress here, oh human spirits, else will you have to commence afresh and live your lives over again hereafter.

When I go from land to land—as I have done, and heaven helping me, mean to do for the rest of my earthly career—and preach such doctrines as these, the censor who presumes to tell me my doctrines are destructive of morality and inimical to the laws of right, either does not know right from wrong himself, or utters sentiments beneath criticism.

On the 24th of June, our Christian brother puts forth another announcement to the following effect:—*Dangers of spirit mediumship—destroys individuality and power of self-control—an incentive to the commission of crimes.*

If Mr. Green is actually sincere in the doctrines he promulgates, it would be rather a curious subject of enquiry to find what kind of mediums he has been in the habit of associating with. I can only say that he ought to be in a position to afford illustrations of so monstrous an assertion. Being a medium of many years' standing myself, and acquainted with mediums, both public and private, by the thousands, I would like to know if this gentleman can point out one score of well-marked cases in which mediumship has destroyed individuality, or led to the commission of any crime whatever. A charge like this is rather too serious to be hurled against a whole class of the community under the specious shelter of generalities. Where are the imbeciles whom spirit mediumship has destroyed? Where the criminals whom it has goaded on to the commission of crimes? Surely our friend can give us one poor score of such instances, especially as I, on the other hand, can point to hundreds of cases in which mediumship has strengthened the weak-minded, cured disease, reformed criminals, instructed the ignorant, and converted unbelief into religious hope and trust.

I myself commenced my Spiritualistic career as a public test medium, in New York, sitting free for all comers, consequently having twice as much work to do as any professional medium. At that time I was consumptive, weak, and nervous, having visited America chiefly in the hope of benefiting what had been pronounced an incurable throat disease. I am now well and strong; neither will I be hypocrite enough to call myself a "miserable sinner," or

allow  
on the  
broug  
revela  
M  
tranc  
poetr  
Spiri  
at on  
she v  
aid.  
lovin  
to ex  
of th  
M  
mor  
"Th  
our  
quo  
spin  
unf  
so v  
cele  
got  
Sp  
wo  
gu  
qu  
du  
of  
he  
fin  
ye  
ye  
er  
th  
G  
th  
c

allow any other person to do so. I could write a volume on the beauty, use, and good which spirit mediumship has brought to me ; for its evil side, I still await Mr. Green's revelations.

Miss Sprague, one of our best and earliest American trance mediums, the authoress of some most charming poetry—which Mr. Green, in his voluminous quotations from Spiritual literature, unfortunately omitted to notice—was at one time totally blind, but when she became a medium she was cured by spirits, wholly independent of any human aid. She is now a spirit herself, and in the pure and loving realms of spiritual existence, doubtless knows how to excuse Mr. Green for attempting to cast a stain on one of the most spotless records that ever woman left behind.

Mr. Francis H. Smith, a well-known merchant of Baltimore, and the author of an admirable little work entitled "The Footprints of a Presbyterian"—another specimen of our literature from which Mr. Green has forgotten to quote—was also blind for some time. Having sat in spirit circles until his own powers of mediumship became unfolded, he, too, became entirely cured by spirits—a cure so well attested, and so candidly related in Mr. Smith's celebrated pamphlet, that it is quite a pity Mr. Green forgot to quote from it.

Professor S. B. Brittan, the brilliant editor of several Spiritual journals, and the author of a very celebrated work entitled, "Man and his Relations," another distinguished work that Mr. Green unfortunately forgot to quote from, was once an Universalist clergyman, and during a fit of illness so severe that his life was despaired of, he suddenly fell into a twelve days' trance, from which he recovered entirely well. Professor Brittan has been a fine seeing and writing medium for the last twenty-five years. I have known him intimately for more than twenty years, during all which time he has been so highly esteemed both in public and private life that I think it would take something more than Mr. Green's assertions to convince the American public that his mediumship has led him into the commission of crime, and destroyed his admirable powers of self-control.

The Rev. William Fishbough, author of a splendid standard work on Spiritualism, entitled "The Macrocosm and Microcosm"; the Rev. and most noble old Unitarian minister, poet, and author, John Pierpoint; the Revs. R. P. Ambler and W. Fernald, all authors of great distinction in our ranks, and from whose works Mr Green again most unfortunately forgot to quote, were acknowledged mediums, and, wonderful to relate, still bear the reputation of having been remarkably good men. Dr Eugene Crowell, of New York, whose very popular and voluminous works have also been singularly omitted from Mr Green's list of authors, gives numerous accounts of mediums whose gifts, so far from leading them into the commission of crime, have benefited their health, strengthened their minds, educated their intellects, and made them better men and women every way. Dr H. F. Gardner, of Boston, and Chas. Partridge, of New York, both public men of high standing, have publicly declared, and recorded their declarations in our Spiritual journals, that *their* gifts of mediumship had enabled them to conquer many of the tendencies of vice, which American fast society is apt to lead to. In Mr Chas. Partridge's standard journal, the *Spiritual Telegraph*, he strengthens his own confessions by citing a large number of cases in which spiritual mediumship has conquered inherent and obstinate tendencies to vice. I do not undertake to say that this is invariably the case. This is a very sinful and degenerate age, and of course Spiritualists and spirit mediums are as fallible as the rest of humanity. If they are so however, depend upon it the world is sure to hear of it. That, as a rule, Spiritualists and spirit mediums are better rather than worse than their fellow creatures, even the few examples I have been able to cite would prove. The persons I have named are all well known public characters, writers and mediums, and hundreds of others, similarly well reported of, hurl back this slander on its author's head.

Out of the thousands of Christians who are daily arraigned at the bar of human justice for crime, can Mr Green show me a fair percentage of spirit mediums or Spiritualists? Can he show me spirit mediums or be-

herers in jails, penitentiaries, or condemned cells? Except in the rarest and most exceptional cases can he find them in the commission of crime, or cited to the bar of human justice on any count? or can he disprove my assertion that on the average they are amongst the most peaceful, well-disposed, and orderly persons of any community in which they are found?

And now I arrive at my fourth and last count in this abominable list of charges, and first, "*Spiritism is atheistical*," and as an evidence of this charge the gentleman commences by citing me—me, who of all the Spiritual lecturers have most persistently maintained the actuality and existence of a Supreme Being! By way of erecting a mountain of error on a single grain of truth, my accuser brands me as atheist because I entitled one of my lectures "*Magnetism, or the Soul of the Universe*," and then grossly misrepresents a passage in my own "*History of Modern American Spiritualism*." In respect to the lecture alluded to above, all who heard me will remember that on that occasion, as on many others, I claimed that magnetism is the life, force, and soul principle of the inanimate world, as spirit is the interior soul essence of the animated kingdom: but why should I try to explain that which every child familiar with psychological ideas understands, and which this gentleman could only have laid hold on for want of other subjects to pervert? In dealing, however, with the citation he makes from my book of history the perversion of truth to which he resorts could scarcely be credited by those who had not followed his assertions. I cannot in this long reading trouble you with a quotation from the work in question, it is enough to say that in order to illustrate a very remarkable phase of mediumship, I quote a communication spoken by a spirit voice, in which, in answer to questions concerning the spirit spheres, the communicating intelligence, after attempting to describe electric, magnetic, and other imponderable fluids, speaks of an illimitable realm, which he locates in the centre of the universe, supposed to be filled with an unknown but all pervasive fluid, the interior principle of light, heat, electricity and all

forms of force. This element he calls, for want of any known word in our language to describe it, the *subtler fluid*, and the grand central realm, impenetrable to any being known to the communicating intelligence, by the typical title of "the Throne of God." Now this communication, rendered as it is in modest phraseology and choice language, Mr Green perverts into the assertion that I—not the spirit I quote—teach of a Throne of God, and dare to call God Himself *subtler fluid*. As for the sweeping charge of atheism which Mr Green makes against Spiritualists, it is as false as the rest of his statements. Nearly all our public speakers and writers teach of the existence of God, and commence their addresses with invocations as full of piety and devotion as any that ever fell from ecclesiastical lips. As for the character and personality of the Being whom Spiritual speakers address, the worst that candour can allege against them is, that they do not accord with the God who makes man in his image and then repents that he has made him; who begs Moses to let him alone, that he may make an end of all his chosen people, and then is persuaded by Moses to spare them, lest the Egyptians should hear of it. Of the God who first says, "Thou shalt do no murder," and then commands Moses and Joshua to slaughter men, women, children, and even babes and cattle, because the people's form of worship does not suit him. Now if any enlightened critic finds fault with Spiritualists for choosing to adore a God of love, wisdom, power, whose attributes are best manifested through his works, rather than bow down to such a Deity as corresponds with the above Biblical description, I can only say the Spiritualists can well afford to let their enlightened critic's opinion pass for what it is worth. In return for his criticism, however, I, as a Spiritualist myself, beg to tender him this piece of advice. Provided you do not carry the Biblical commands into modern application, like the Christian father in Massachusetts, who has just offered up his little five years' old daughter as a sacrifice to Jehovah; provided, also, you don't mistake the modern Spiritualist for the ancient Amalekite, and do your God service by enacting the part of Moses or Joshua

his behalf, we shall not quarrel with you for worshipping your God in your own fashion, and expect you to accord to us precisely the same privilege.

On the other hand, if Mr Green objects to this very reasonable proposition, and Nebuchadnezzar-like, insists upon all men falling down and worshipping the image that he sets up, at least he should publish abroad who, what, and where his God is. Let him define Him beyond all chance of mistake, and having done so, let him give proof positive—proof from which there can be no appeal—that he is right and everyone else is wrong, and then—but not then—may he attempt to rouse popular indignation against the Spiritualist who refuses to bow down before his special God.

It is very easy for Mr Green to shout "Atheist!" but let him remember that the Spiritualists are as much justified in crying idolater to him, as he is in branding them infidel. Who is Mr. Green that his God alone is the object for worship? and who made him the censor of millions of his fellow-creatures, who happen to differ from him and that on a point which must ever remain to finite mortals unknown and unknowable?

Precisely the same position does this great self-constituted authority take on the marriage question. He says Spiritualism is *the enemy of marriage and the forerunner of social and political anarchy*. Indeed! Probably to Mr Green's views the present marriage relations are all perfect. In the eyes of others, they are not so. Thus many able writers, regarding this matter from a different standpoint, venture to propound theoretical speculations for the world's consideration, when lo! Mr Green, like the divinely-commissioned guardian of the present existing marriage laws, hurls epithets at them, which good taste forbids my repeating, but which do not seem much in character with the disciples of Him who taught that "he who called his brother *fool* is in danger of hell fire."

But, says Mr Green, take Dr William Potter's letter to the Cleveland Association, take Mrs Britten's own address to three thousand listeners in Boston Music Hall in 1873. Do not both these parties, representative

Spiritualists too—tax home tree love doctrines upon the Spiritualists, and that in the most forcible terms? Were I to answer yes or no to this position, its true meaning could never be understood as Mr Green's sophistry presents it, hence it is that I must again pause to remind you of my emphatic declaration that Spiritualism consists of four points of universal agreement only: to wit, the belief that the phenomena now poured out upon the world is the work of spirits; secondly, the belief that these spirits are identical with the souls of those who had once lived on earth; third, the belief in the doctrine of personal responsibility for good or evil both here and hereafter; and fourth, the belief in the doctrine of progress throughout eternity.

Once more, I re-affirm this is the Alpha and Omega of Spiritualism. All else is such philosophy as spirits in and out of the mortal body think proper to teach, and all else is no more binding upon human action, when taught by a spirit out of the form, than when it comes from a mortal. And still farther. I would ask—have Communism, Socialism, Atheism, Free-loveism, and all manner of social, political, and religious vagaries only been known since Spiritualism commenced? or have they not flooded the world, and especially attached themselves to every new reform since civilization begun?

All through the progress of Spiritualism, the greatest drawback it has had to contend with has been the fact that it had to take mankind just in the vicious and unregenerate state in which Christianity has left it; and since Christianity has been unable to make mankind good, true, chaste, and honest in 1800 years, it is somewhat too much, methinks, to expect that Spiritualism should convert and purify it in 30 years.

It is just because Christianity has left the rank weeds of Socialism, Atheism, and every species of immorality corrupting society from heel to head, that I. and Dr. William Potter, on the occasions referred to, were compelled to protest against the association of any ideas but the fundamental facts and philosophy of spirit communion with its good and holy name. It is precisely for that that



and many another prominent Spiritualist, whom Mr. Green has forgotten to quote, have again and again insisted that we would not and could not allow Spiritualism to be confounded with Spiritualists; that I knowing better the vilest of the community, as well as the purest, would believe in facts and phenomena, have protested against the identification of any fanatical ideas, or bombastic assumptions of spiritual authority, with that simple and concrete movement, which had no more to do with human opinion than it had with Presbyterianism, Mormonism, or the perversions which Mr. Green tries to fasten upon it. With his accustomed sophistry, this gentleman wholly omits to notice the occasion and causes which drew from me the denunciations of Free-loveism which he alludes to, and he cites my remonstrances—not as a protest against the association of bad people and unholy ideas with a pure and holy movement, but rather as a specimen of the movement itself—a mode of attack which I emphatically repudiate.

On the occasion of Mr. Green's last lecture, after pouring out four evenings' diatribes against Spiritualism on the testimony of a few personal witnesses, he suddenly thought him perhaps that his own faith would scarcely stand the same method of analysis, when, instantly, we bore our *righteous judge* protesting against indulgence in personalities, and claiming that no cause could be legitimately judged of by personal standards. Considering that Mr. Green's entire case had been made out on the citation of personal opinions recorded in the writings of Spiritualists, it seems a pity that he had not remembered and acted upon this method of judgment before; but if he meant to stave off the possible results which might accrue from the application of personal standards of fruitage for his own faith, then Mr. Green's all too tardy show of justice won't serve his purpose.

Independent of the fact that Christianity has been 1800 years exerting its influence over the race—long enough one must admit to judge of that influence by its fruits—there is no parallel between Christianity and Spiritualism in respect to their claims to authority.

Christianity has its text-book, labelled with the claim of being *the infallible word of God*. Spiritualism has no text-book, and all its Scriptures claim to be nothing more than the opinions of fellow-mortals, or the spirits of mortals.

Christianity claims to be a divine revelation from the Creator of the Universe in person, whilst Spiritualism, shrinking with horror from such blasphemous and impossible pretences, claims only to be a scientific mode of telegraphy by which the disembodied spirits of men can communicate with their still embodied friends, and give them correct information concerning the life hereafter.

Christianity claims the right to exert arbitrary and unquestioning authority over the human soul; Spiritualism allows no individual's opinions, whether written or spoken, given by spirits or mortals, to be of any authority unless they are in conformity with law, reason, judgment, and well-proved truth. Christianity has burned alive, slain, and tortured millions of its own ranks for questioning what its priests chose to call divine revelation. Spiritualism has never harmed the hair of a single mortal's head.

Christianity has its thousands of creeds, faiths, dogmas, and articles of belief, many of them as contradictory as light and darkness.

Spiritualism has no creeds, no dogmas, no authoritative articles of faith, beyond the four points of universal agreement I have before defined, and which every Spiritualist on earth will agree with me in defining as Spiritualism; and to conclude, Christianity has been in existence 1800 years, Spiritualism 31 years, and yet, were I to imitate the course which Mr Green has adopted, how would Christians appear in personal contrast to Spiritualists? Supposing, for example, I were to take the average of all the criminals throughout the civilised world, for one day only, what percentage do you think I should find were Spiritualists, and what Christians? From absolute knowledge, I dare to say, I should scarcely find one Spiritualist a week arraigned for criminal practices, whilst I challenge the obstinate testimony of statistics to disprove that at least ninety per cent. of our criminals in every city domi-

noted by Christianity are professing Christians, or have been educated in Christian dogmas. Were I to try Christianity by its fruits, and require Mr Green to show me where all the murders, thefts, adulteries, swindles, deceptions, and crimes, which disgrace humanity came from, I think this all-prevailing and dominant faith of eighteen centuries' standing could hardly come out of the enquiry with very clean hands; and yet this gentleman tries to arouse the city in a clamour of indignation against a new, experimental, scientific system of spiritual telegraphy, because it has not swept clean in 30 years the Augean stable, whose moral corruption has been accumulating for 1800 years. Before closing, and whilst the limitation of this one night's address compels me to pass over multitudes of items elaborated in Mr Green's four lectures, I must not entirely omit to comment on his remarkable methods of deriving proof against this movement by the literature of some of its believers.

Whilst again reminding you that the Spiritualists have no other points of agreement than the four well-defined facts before referred to, I cannot do justice to my subject without calling attention to Mr Green's mode of selecting his witnesses. In the first place, he borrows largely from Judge Edmonds; taking care, however, to quote only *those works* which were written in the very earliest dawn of the movement, and most injudiciously published before time and experience had enabled the writer to distinguish between scenes and visions in the spirit world and clairvoyant perceptions of what was passing on earth.

Like Swedenborg, Judge Edmonds was a clairvoyant, and, like Swedenborg, evidently mistook many of the scenes he clairvoyantly beheld transpiring on earth, but especially allegorical visions presented to him of spirit life, for realities.

Had Mr Green's candour been equal to his sophistry, he would have also quoted Judge Edmonds' works, written twenty years later, in which he not only candidly confesses his error, but shows why he was thus misled.

For 1800 years the world's appointed spiritual teachers had been repeating the charge, "Now concerning spiritual

gifts, brethren, we would not have you ignorant," yet when Spiritualism came, men had been kept by their priests so deplorably ignorant that they have had to buy all their spiritual experience step by step, and that chiefly through their mistakes, and the erroneous opinions they had conceived of spirit life and spiritual gifts. Judge Edmonds' *first* writings were printed then—like most of our earliest experiences—in ignorance of the subject he was dealing with. With honest and manly candour, he confesses his mistakes, and with the more matured knowledge of twenty years experiences corrects these errors in his later lectures—a course which Mr Green might have imitated, with no loss of honesty or manliness, but with some considerable loss to the shadow side of the picture he is so emulous to present.

We next have our friend borrowing largely from the writings of Allan Kardec, the French Re-incarnationist, or, as he himself elected to be called, the Spiritist, a title which Mr Green shows his lamentable ignorance of the subject he tries to deal with by applying to the great mass of Spiritualists. Now, very few of the Spiritualists believe in re-incarnation. Like myself, the majority consider it to be opposed to the very fundamental principle of Spiritualism, consequently, in attempting to fasten the opinions of a Re-incarnationist, or Spiritist, upon Spiritualism, Mr Green proves that he does not know the very A B C of the movement he pretends to criticise.

Again, Mr Green has been advised more than once, and that by men who are thoroughly informed on American Spiritualism, and on terms of intimacy with A. J. Davis, that he believes in spiritual existence and the power of spirits to communicate, but his views, both of spirit life and communion, differ as widely from those of the majority of the Spiritualists as do those of Swedenborg. I name Mr Davis in my work on American Spiritualism as I do many other phenomenal persons who do not assimilate with our views, but though I have distinctly informed Mr Green that Mr Davis is a "Harmonial Philosopher," the founder of that school, and as such opposed to many of the opinions Spiritualists hold, this

candid censor will insist on quoting Davis's works as specimens of Spiritualism, and forces Davis's opinions on his hearers as representations of the very faith the writer disclaims.

Another of Mr Green's favourite text books is called "Flashes of Light." This is a collection of communications given at the Banner of Light circle, which was expressly established by the advice of our spirit friends, in order to give all classes of spirits from various spheres an opportunity of representing themselves. The object thus aimed at was to show the strictly human character of the spirit world, the various grades of mind which inhabited its spheres, and the folly of human beings attempting to derive authoritative teachings from spirits on any points which do not conform to the highest sense of right and judgment in the recipient.

Whilst the principal aim of these communications, therefore, is to show too credulous mortals that they should accept of no authority but that of truth, Mr Green deliberately presents these teachings as an authoritative sample of what Spiritualists believe in.

Mr Green next indulges in profuse quotations from John M. Spear's "Educator," premising to his listeners that it is a widely-circulated and authoritative book, and then makes the same plea for the writings of Moses Hull. Now, if Mr Green has not thoroughly studied the history and character of the American Spiritual movement, he had better remain severely silent before he presumes to speak upon the subject. If he has made himself even partially acquainted with it, he knows that the writings and characters of both these persons are ignored by quite a large number of respectable American Spiritualists. Since, however, this gentleman has persisted in dragging these two writers into prominent notice, and that evidently for the purpose of destroying the cause he associates them with, he compels me to show what deep obligations that cause owes to Christianity when she favours our ranks with an irruption of her own obnoxious ex-ministers.

Mr John M. Spear, the author of the "Educator," had been at one time an Universalist Minister. At that

advanced period of life when the world would naturally look to him both for good precepts and holy examples, Mr Spear's Christian experience led him to withdraw from the clerical ranks, and after drifting about amongst various other new movements, he—most unfortunately for the good reputation of Spiritualism—saw enough of the spiritual phenomena to become convinced of its reality. Announcing himself to the world as a medium of the most wonderful and authoritative character, he proceeded to harness his own peculiar hobbies of free love and inflated egotism upon the great new movement. That Mr Spear and his free and easy views of the marriage relation, found no countenance from the great majority of the Spiritualists, several of the journals and periodicals of the time will amply prove, Mr Spear's associates, movements, and teachings being especially denounced in the work of mine from which Mr Green has quoted, namely, "Modern American Spiritualism." There Mr Spear's true character and standing is fully revealed. Why it did not suit the gentleman to quote this part of the work as well as the spirit communication he attempted to caricature, is best known to himself. But independent of this, Mr Spear's notions, proclivities, and doings are fully exposed and emphatically repudiated in Partridge's wide-spread and authoritative journal "The Spiritual Telegraph."

Of the same school of morals and the same standing amongst a large majority of the American Spiritualists is the *Rev. Moses Hull*, another ex-Christian Minister, whose pronounced and open advocacy of Free-love doctrines were not only publicly denounced by myself and other spiritual speakers and writers, but during the notorious Woodhull controversy, the very raid of licence and immorality which drew from me the Boston address, denouncing Free-love and its followers—a *part only* of which it has suited Mr Green's purpose to quote—Mr Moses Hull's shameless and obscene writings were fully proved. Let it ever be remembered, however, that the strongest denunciation of the *Rev. ex-Christian Minister's* practices and views came from Spiritualists themselves, especially from the editors of the *Religio-Philosophical*

*Journal*, whose thorough exposure of this man and his doctrines Mr Green cannot be ignorant of. I can find no excuse, therefore, for Mr Green's attempt to palm him off as a representative Spiritualist save the same wilful determination to injure his neighbour, which I was compelled to rebuke in Melbourne, when he (Mr Green) cited the sayings and doings of two other most notorious characters, whom all decent Spiritualists had combined to taboo. Again, Mr Green quotes largely the writings of Dr. A. B. Child, a kind, good-natured Optimist, whose infatuation in advocating the old doctrine of "Whatever is is right," made him remarkable long before he entered the ranks of Spiritualism, neither was this doctrine ever put forth by him as growing out of that belief. But what can we think of such selections when Mr Green has entirely passed by a far more widely known and numerous class whose works have an equal right to be taken as a faithful representation of the cause and its status. As a proof of this, I ask why he has failed to quote from the writings of Robert Dale Owen, Prof. Hare, Governor Tallmadge, Dr Eugene Crowell, Professor Bush, Professor S. B. Brittan, the Rev. Adin Ballou, the Rev. John Pierpont, the Reverends R. P. Ambler, W. Fernald, W. Richardson, and Wm. Fishbough, Messrs Chas. Partridge and Eppes Sargent, Col. Danskin, and the beautiful poetesses Helen Whitman, Lizzie Doten, Achsa Sprague, the sisters Alice and Phoebe Cary, Wm. Cullen Bryant, and Prof. Longfellow. All these, and hosts of other American Spiritualists, have left writings far more widely known than those Mr Green quotes. Why are they tabooed from his list? But Spiritualism and its literature is not confined to America only. Since Mr Green was addressing European audiences, why did he not cite some few at least decent and honourable European authorities? There is no lack of them in any country.

Spiritual papers are now published in Holland, Spain, Belgium, Italy, and France, besides others in Great Britain. And again: we have in France Cahagnet's splendid work, "The Celestial Telegraph;" the Baron Dupotet's "Modern Magique;" Mons. de Billot's "Reve-

lations from another world:" and Kerner's famous "Seeress of Prevorst," all published even before the advent of the "Rochester Knockings" in America. If Mr Green wanted to find still later and still more widely circulated literature from the land of our own nationality, why has he forgotten the writings of the pure and noble-minded Wm. and Mary Howitt; of Mr and Mrs S. C. Hall; of Professors Wallace, Crookes, De Morgan, and Mrs De Morgan, Thos. Shorter, the Rev. Stainton Moses, Professor of Oxford and the London Universities; of the Baron de Guldenstube, Gerald Massey, the poet; C. C. Massey, the Queen's Counsel; Sergeant Cox; Flammarion and Huggins, the astronomers; the report of the Dialectical Society: the writings of the Countess of Caithness; Lord Adare, the Earl of Dunraven, the Baroness Adeline Von Vay, and hosts of other respected and respectable believers in, and writers on, Spiritualism; and finally, why—since this gentleman insists on confounding the writings of Spiritualists with their faith, and I am on the spot to prove or disprove my statements—why does he not quote from my own recently published work on the "Facts, Faiths, and Frauds of Religious History?" No matter how contemptible the gentleman's opinion may be of me, I can only feel honoured in living under his ban: in the meantime he knows, if he knows anything of the movement he defames, that this work has already been in the hands of hundreds of those capable of judging of its contents, and is certain to pass into the hands of hundreds, quite possibly thousands, more. The writings which Mr Green quoted so abundantly were chiefly metaphysical propositions of no authority save with those who sympathise in the views propounded, but the very title of "Faiths, Facts, and Frauds of Religious History" should be sufficient to provoke another handbill as redolent of *Christian* wrath as this one (holding up bill): besides, here is a book of *facts*, remember—stubborn facts—and assertions so daring that they scruple not to allege, and that upon the most indubitable authorities of the age, that every iota of the Christian faith is a direct and unmistakeable plagiarism from the myths and legends of far



older religions. And again, wherefore the sneer with which Mr Green answered one of his questioners last Tuesday evening, who enquired why he did not read my ten commandments and ten laws of right as samples of spiritual literature? Those edicts came direct from the spirit world through my mediumship, and their widespread influence may be judged of when I state that they have been translated into French by the order of the late Emperor of the French; into Russ by the amiable Prince Emil Wittgenstein for the use of the Czar. They are also published in German, have been translated into ten different Hindostanee dialects, for the use of the Free Religionists of India, besides being hung up in honourable places on the walls of many American and English homes, and occupying the same honoured station in more than one dwelling of the most respected of your citizens in this place, and yet Mr Green, after quoting the writings of John M. Spear and Moses Hull, as representative specimens of Spiritual literature, dismissed the demand for my commandments with the sneering remark that what was original was not worth notice, and what was not, was all plagiarised from the golden rule of Christianity. Now, whilst I defy Mr Green to convict those lines of one single plagiarism, can he say as much for the originality of his widely-vaunted golden rule, which, so far from being original with Christianity, is acknowledged by many a profound scholar to be a direct plagiarism from the Greek, Chinese, Persian, and Hindoo writers? Time will not permit me to recite these commandments to you now, but as each one can receive a copy of them on passing out, you may judge for yourselves how far they merit this Christian gentleman's insulting rejection. Of course I am not surprised that Mr Green would not avail himself of these commandments when his purpose was to malign the cause whose literature they illustrated. Let Mr Green remember, however, that he is not the only preacher who claims to understand what morality, virtue, religion, and rationality are. Let him remember that others are judging him, and his creed, and the fruits of his creed, by far sterner and far more prac-

tical standards than he can bring to bear upon a class of harmless, speculative, and philosophic metaphysicians. I am collecting from a vast range of historical sources materials for the record of what this same divine and all-authoritative scheme of ecclesiastical Christianity has done for mankind during the eighteen centuries in which it has been dominating over the human mind; and amongst one of the very latest, and amongst one of the most abominable samples of the literature of that movement, is the parliamentary debate of only last session, when Lord Redesdale insisted upon pressing upon the attention of Parliament the publication of a book called "The Priest in Absolution," a book put forth by a body of seven hundred Christian clergymen, many of whom Mr Cowen, the member for Newcastle, declared were clergymen of the Church of England.

Of this book the Home Secretary declared that "No one could read it without a blush, and it was a disgrace to any body of clergy to use it." The Earl of Harrowby considered "that the heads of families should not allow any members of the clergy who used this book to enter their houses;" and the Attorney-General said, "If the work were circulated, in his opinion those circulating it ought to be proceeded against for the publication of an *obscene and disgusting book*." This is the last hint my time will allow me to give to Mr Green, that whilst he is looking after what he deems the stray sheep of a flock that neither desire nor require his assistance, he is pitifully unconscious that the substance of the wolf whose phantom he is pursuing is at his own door and making havoc with the good name of his own flock.

Mr Green, and many another Christian minister, may urge that with respect to the last case against Christianity I have cited it would be unjust to tax upon the whole body politic of Christendom the publication of an infamous and obscene book, itself the work of one offshoot only from the great tree of Christianity. But I need not remind any intelligent listener that this objection would open up the whole question of which sect of Christianity was the trunk and which the offshoot, or why with one text-book and one Founder only there

should be any off-shoots at all—but I already repeat, and that on the authority of the Parliamentary debate of which I have the copy, that the disgusting and obscene book—the theme of that debate—was put forth by a society of English Christian clergymen numbering in their ranks nearly 700 members, many of whom belonged to the high and authoritative Christian Church of England.

Spiritualists and Freethinkers, when you can find anything in the teachings of the spirits, or the literature of the spirits, that equals in obscenity and demoralising tendency the last great work put forth by Christian ministers, as their rule and guide of conduct—a work openly denounced by the Parliament of the land as too shocking and obscene to be read without a blush, when you can find one line in the whole range of the Spiritualists' literature as bad as this, I advise you to abjure all communion with the souls of your ancestors—seek annihilation rather than spiritual existence, and throw the spiritual commandments into the fire. In the meantime, let my Spiritualist friends remember that however much we as brethren of a common humanity are bound to excuse each other's faults and cover them in all kindness with a mantle of charity, there is nothing in the genius of Spiritualism, or one iota in the definition by which alone we can gauge its present status, to justify our shouldering our vices and follies either upon Spirits or Spiritualism. Here, as wherever else I may be privileged to speak on this great movement, I will persist in drawing the line of demarcation between Spiritualists and Spiritualism; and in view of the unanswerable reasons for this course I have laid before you to-night I shall hold all who insist upon confounding the two as amenable either to the charge of gross ignorance or wilful falsehood. And to you, my Christian friends—if, indeed, there be any such present—I beg to say if your chosen minister can find no better employment for his time than running about from place to place picking up slanderous gossip, and retailing it out again to the injury and insult of those who do not happen to worship God in *his* fashion, I strongly advise you to turn minister to your

minister, recommended him to desist from preaching Christian love and charity until he has fully studied the ninth commandment, and if that won't do, commend to his notice the following few items of advice from his own great text-book, the Apostolic writings:—

"Bless and *curse* not:" "Be not wise in your own conceits:" "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour:" "Wherefore, putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour, for we are members one of another. Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking be put away from you, with all malice; and be ye kind to one another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you."

These words being all taken from Mr Green's own text-book, the infallible *Word of God*, might, I should humbly hope, be of some service to him when he makes out his next handbill. As I, being a Spiritualist merely, have no other text-book but that which commends itself to my highest sense of right in any and every book, I shame not to declare I will now and henceforth so live, think, act, and speak, as to bring my life in harmony with the first and last of the spiritual commandments which I now read as follows:—

"I.—Thou shalt search for truth in every department of being—test, prove, and try if what thou findest *is* truth, and then accept it as the Word of God.

"X.—Thy first and last duty upon earth, and all through thy life, shall be to seek for the principles of right, and to live them out to the utmost of thy power; and whatever creed, precept or example conflicts with those principles, thou shalt shun and reject, ever remembering that the laws of right are—in morals, JUSTICE; in science, HARMONY; in religion, THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD, THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN, the immortality of the human soul, and compensation and retribution for the good or evil done on earth.



# THE SPIRITUAL COMMANDMENTS

AND

## THE TEN LAWS OF RIGHT.

GIVEN BY SPIRITS THROUGH THE MEDIUMSHIP OF  
EMMA HARDINGE BRITTEN.

*London, 1871.*

I.—Thou shalt search for truth in every department of being—test, prove, and try if what thou findest *is* truth, and then accept it as the Word of God.

II.—Thou shalt continue the search for truth all thy life, and never cease to test, prove, and try all that thou deemest to be truth.

III.—Thou shalt search by every possible means for the laws that underlie all life and being; thou shalt strive to comprehend these laws, live in harmony with them, and make them the laws of thine own life, thy rule and guide in all thine actions.

IV.—Thou shalt not follow the example of any man or set of men, or obey any teaching, or accept of any theory as thy rule of life that is not in strict accordance with thy highest sense of right.

V.—Thou shalt remember that a wrong done to the least of thy fellow creatures is a wrong done to all; and thou shalt never do a wrong wilfully and consciously to any of thy fellow-men, nor connive at wrong-doing by others without striving to prevent or protesting against it.

VI.—Thou shalt acknowledge all men's right to do, think, or speak, to be exactly equal to thine own; and all

rights whatsoever that thou dost demand, thou shalt ever accord to others.

VII.—Thou shalt not hold thyself bound to love, or associate with those that are distasteful or repulsive to thee; but thou shalt be well bound to treat such objects of dislike with gentleness, courtesy, and justice, and never suffer thy antipathies to make thee ungente or unjust to any living creature.

VIII.—Thou shalt ever regard the rights, interests, and welfare of the many as superior to those of the one or the few; and in cases where thy welfare, or that of thy friend, is to be balanced against that of society, thou shalt sacrifice thyself or friend to the welfare of the many.

IX.—Thou shalt be obedient to the laws of the land in which thou dost reside, in all things which do not conflict with thy highest sense of right.

X.—Thy first and last duty upon earth, and all through thy life, shall be to seek for the principles of right, and to live them out to the utmost of thy power; and whatever creed, precept, or example conflicts with those principles, thou shalt shun and reject, ever remembering that the laws of right are—in morals, justice; in science, HARMONY; in religion, the FATHERHOOD OF GOD, THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN, the immortality of the human soul, and compensation and retribution for the good or evil done on earth.

### *The Ten Laws of Right.*

I.—TEMPERANCE in all things, whether physical, mental, moral, affectional, or religious.

II.—JUSTICE to all creatures that be—justice being the exercise of precisely the same rules of life, conduct, thought, or speech that we would desire others to obey.

III.—GENTLENESS in speech and act—never needlessly wounding the feelings of others by harsh words or deeds; never hurting or destroying aught that breathes, save for the purpose of sustenance or self-defence.

IV.—TRUTH in every word or thought spoken or acted; but reservation of harsh or displeasing truths where they would needlessly wound the feelings of others.

V.—**CHARITY**—charity in thought, striving to excuse the failings of others; charity in speech, veiling the failings of others; charity in deeds, wherever, whenever, and to whomsoever the opportunity offers.

VI.—**AMMOLIVING**—visiting the sick and comforting the afflicted in every shape that our means admit of, and the necessities of our fellow-creatures demand.

VII.—**SILENCE-SACRIFICE**, wherever the interests of others are to be benefited by our endurance.

VIII.—**TEMPERATE** yet firm defence of our views of right, and protest against wrong, whether to ourselves or others.

IX.—**INDUSTRY** in following any calling we may be engaged in, or in devoting some portion of our time, when otherwise not obliged to do so, to the service and benefit of others.

X.—**LOVE**.—Above and beyond all, seeking to cultivate in our families, kindred, friends, and amongst all mankind generally, the spirit of that true and tender love which can think, speak, and act no wrong to any creature living; remembering always that, where love is, all the other principles of right are fulfilled beneath its influence, and embodied in its monitions.

We should ever hold the above-stated principles of right to be obligatory upon all men, as they are the deductions evolved from the laws of being; and, therefore, in strict harmony with the divine order of creation. All views of science are dependent on human intelligence and the unfoldments of intellectual knowledge. All views of theology are dependent upon intuitive perceptions, faith, or testimony arising from varying sources—hence, man's opinions concerning science and theology are subject to change, and dependent on the circumstances of nationality, intellectual training, or incidents peculiar to personal experiences; but the religion of right, morality, and love, and the commandments of life-duty, originating from the fundamental principles of inherent life and being, can never change until man ceases to be, or the harmonies of the universe are themselves changed or annihilated.

## NOTE BY THE REPORTER.

---

On the evening of July 8th, 1879, Mrs Emma Har-  
dinge-Britten delivered the above address to an im-  
mense meeting, which completely packed every seat and  
corner of the Garrison Hall. The Hon. Robert Stout,  
late Attorney-General and M.P. for Dunedin, occupied  
the chair. Mrs Britten was frequently interrupted by  
hootings and hissings from the followers and friends of  
her Christian opponent, and vociferous and long-con-  
tinued cheering from her own supporters.

Mrs Britten bore the storm with unflinching forti-  
tude, deliberately and firmly repeating the sentences  
which called forth the hootings of the Christian minis-  
ter's allies, whilst Mr Stout, with indomitable good  
humour and serenity, quelled the tumult, and insisted  
upon fair play and justice to both sides. At the close  
of the address Mr Green asked some questions and  
made some remarks, which the reporter failed to under-  
stand; their gist, however, appeared to be an attempt to  
reiterate the assertions of his previous lectures. Mrs  
Britten's lecture occupied over two hours in delivery,  
during which, and despite the prevailing excitement, she  
was listened to with never-flagging interest and atten-  
tion.