

never seen any thing to justify this charge. I conclude, therefore, it is the offspring of a distempered imagination.

5. *Enormous Evils, great Social and Moral Derangement.*—So far from this charge being true, the reverse is the fact. And the great good to result from these manifestations, as we are told from a high source, "is to bring mankind together in harmony, and convince skeptics of the immortality of the soul." These results have been already signally evinced.

6. *To give to this Monster, Adoration due only to the Father of Spirits.*—This charge has not the least shadow of foundation to support it. On the contrary, there is not to be found in all Christendom such devoted and unadulterated adoration to the Father of all Spirits as characterizes the believers in "spiritual manifestations."

After the above brief analysis, one is lost in wonder and astonishment that men's minds can be so wrought up about nothing, absolutely nothing. If there ever was a monomania in this world, it is on the part of those who, without investigation and without knowledge, undertake to denounce these "spiritual manifestations."

Let me scan this subject for one moment, and present one simple view, which, it seems to me, comprises the whole in a nut-shell. It is the belief of all Christian denominations at the present day that departed spirits revisit the earth, that they attend us, that they impress us to go or not to go, to do or not to do, for our good. Every one's experience will satisfy him of the truth of this remark. What then follows? If spirits visit us, attend us, and impress us for our good, what is the objection to believing that a mode is now discovered by which they can communicate with us? There can be no possible objection provided the facts justify that belief. If the one is for our good, the other is still more for our good. If the facts justify it, the conclusion is both reasonable and philosophical. Do the facts justify it? I undertake to say they do. I undertake to say, too, that no intelligent mind that investigates with a sincere desire to ascertain the truth, and has the opportunity so to do, can come to any other conclusion. What, then, is the result of all this mighty outcry, as if heaven and earth were coming together? Why, simply, that it has been ascertained that spirits can communicate with us, in addition to impressing us! This is the whole length and breadth of it. "It hath this extent, no more."

Very respectfully, yours, N. P. TALLMADGE.

## POSTSCRIPT.

*Messrs. Editors*—Since writing the above, my attention has been called to an article in the *Intelligencer* of the 24th instant, headed "Spiritual Manifestations," which, in the multiplicity of business avocations, I entirely overlooked. The writer, it seems, is the author of the article to which I alluded in my first communication, and which I assumed could not have been written by you.

As I then remarked, I have in this, as in all other matters since I retired from public life, endeavored "to avoid public observation." I have never had any desire to engage in a public discussion of this mysterious subject. I have been willing that all shall enjoy their own opinions and express them in any proper manner most agreeable to themselves. And I never should have troubled the public with any remarks of mine but for the atrocious doctrines put forth by this writer, and his unmeasured and vindictive denunciations of all engaged in the investigation of the subject. When such sentiments were promulgated through your widely-extended journal, with the apparent sanction of your names, I thought it due to myself to enter my solemn protest against them. And to vindicate myself from the aspersions of this writer, I requested you to publish my letter to the Hon. James F. Simmons, containing my views on this subject—a letter written in the confidence of private friendship, and couched in the mildest and most charitable language toward all who differed with me in opinion. I do not object to any argument which this writer or any other gentleman may see fit to put forth on this subject. For aught I care, he may have the whole field of argument to himself. I have no wish to proselytize. But I will not stand by and tamely submit to the wholesale denunciations of this writer, and the low and vulgar epithets of others, because I have seen fit to exercise the right, guaranteed by the constitution under which we live, of investigating, entertaining, and expressing, in a proper manner, any opinions I please on political, religious, or any other subjects. And when this writer threatens to invoke "legislative enactment," and to "suppress by the strong hand of the law" the investigation of this matter, I beg leave to say to him, in all candor and sincerity, if he could be gratified in this Christian aspiration, he will have kindled a flame throughout this land of civil

and religious freedom which will consume every vestige of bigotry and intolerance by which he is surrounded.

The writer says I "grossly misrepresented" him when I attributed to him a spirit which would "invoke the Salem hangings and the fires of Smithfield." I am glad to learn that he entertains no such spirit. But let us see how far my remark was justified by his language. He says, "It has been effectively urged by a luminous scientific writer, that, although the *Salem hangings* were cruel, useless, and illegitimate as punishments for crime—more particularly for a crime which did not exist, communication with the demon—*they might have been necessary* in order to cut short the growth of a horrible and contagious species of monomania; and that there may yet arise, at future periods, similar and analogous disorders of the popular mind, invading and corrupting the whole body politic, which it may *in like manner* become necessary to suppress by the strong hand of the law. Indeed, we might point, *as already coming within this category, the Rochester knockings*, with their kindred train of rascalities and abominations." I have made the above quotation to show that I am not obnoxious to the charge of gross misrepresentation. If the "Salem hangings might have been necessary;" if it might, "*in like manner*, become necessary to suppress by the strong hand of the law similar or analogous disorders of the popular mind," and if the "Rochester knockings" were pointed at by the writer "as already coming within this category," I say no logical mind can come to any other conclusion than that the writer was in favor of suppressing by law, "*in like manner*," these disorders as they were suppressed at Salem, namely, by "*hangings!*" But he says he did not so intend to be understood; that he only meant that they should be suppressed by "legislative enactments," "under the heaviest penalties."

Having thus vindicated myself from the charge of gross misrepresentation, I cheerfully leave the writer to declare his own intentions as to what he did mean. And although he still intends to inflict on us poor investigators the "heaviest penalties" of the laws, still we shall feel under great obligation to him, and shall breathe easier and freer when we are assured that the *halter* does not come within this category of penalties.

And now, Messrs. Editors, if I were disposed to retaliate the charge of "gross misrepresentation," I could do so with perfect pro-

priety and with the strictest justice. But I will not do it. I will leave your readers to judge of the fairness and candor of the writer, after I shall have stated the facts and pointed their attention to them. A writer who is under the necessity of resorting to such means to sustain his tottering argument really excites my compassion. It is "more in sorrow than in anger," therefore, that I allude to it at all. He says, "for my assertion that the effect of these things was to subvert the authority of the Bible, and annul, not a sect or sects, but Christianity itself, I have virtually Mr. Tallmadge's and his friend Mr. Simmons' own authority in the words italicized in the letter of the latter gentleman." He then gives a *garbled* extract from my letter, *leaving out one whole line*, which goes to strengthen and give point and significance to the whole, and then adds his own comments, which pervert the entire meaning of the sentence, and yet claims that he has virtually my own authority for his comments and his conclusion which charges me with "rank blasphemy!"

I will now introduce the sentence as it originally appeared in my letter, not garbled or eviscerated by this writer, and your readers will then judge of my opinions on this subject. I remarked: "From the investigation I have given the subject, I agree with the Rev. Adin Ballou, who has written the most candid and satisfactory explanation I have seen, that whatever of divine fundamental principle, absolute truth, and essential righteousness there is in the Bible, *in the popular religion, and in the established churches*, will stand. It can not be done away; on the contrary, will be corroborated and fulfilled by spirit-manifestations." The words in *italics* are omitted by this writer in the quotation of this extract. The extract goes to show that the Bible not only will stand, but that the "popular religion and the established churches," founded on the "divine fundamental principle, absolute truth, and essential righteousness" of the Bible, will stand also; and that it will be "corroborated and fulfilled by spirit-manifestations;" and yet this writer has the modesty to assert that this all means, "that whatever in the Bible is not confirmed by spirit-manifestations is not the truth," and of course the whole Bible authority is annulled at "one fell swoop." Such gross ignorance of all that the advocates of the spiritual theory maintain I have never seen crowded into so narrow a compass. I forgive it, because it is the "sin of ignorance," and I pity, from the bottom

of my heart, any one whose "super-serviceable zeal" leads him into such gross absurdities. If the writer had consulted the publication of the Rev. Adin Ballou, to which I referred, and from which I extracted the sentence garbled by him, he would have found a full confirmation of the construction which I gave to that sentence from the Rev. Adin Ballou himself. I will quote him once more. He says:

"Our all-wise and benignant Father in heaven has left no essential truth or righteousness dependent on the mere pretension or uncorroborated testimony either of departed or undeparted spirits. He has addressed his revelations of essential truth and duty to the moral reason of mankind, and authenticated them by every necessary attestation. Any attempt, therefore, to build up a religion or moral philosophy radically different from the genuine Christian Testament, on what is being disclosed to the world through dreamers, somnambulists, impressibles, clairvoyants, spirit-media, spirit-rappings, etc., is absurd, and must prove mischievous rather than beneficial to the human race. But fundamental truths and duties may be re-affirmed, clarified from error, demonstrated anew, and powerfully commended to the embrace of mankind by fresh spiritual communications. I am of opinion that this is really the case; and the conversion of many long-confirmed atheists and deistical rejectors of the Christian revelation confirms me in it."

If the writer had had the proper disposition in discussing this subject, he could have saved himself from the awkward and unenviable predicament in which he is placed by consulting the above quotation, instead of quoting a garbled sentence from my letter, as my authority for what he calls "rank blasphemy." I have always maintained, and still maintain, that these "spirit-manifestations" go to confirm the great and leading doctrines of Christianity. If they differ in any respect from the particular tenets of the denomination to which this writer belongs, it is no greater difference than that which he will hear from the pulpits of other denominations every Sunday of his life! And still, all denominations maintain the great and leading doctrines of Christianity, and all go to the Bible to establish the particular tenets which constitute the discrepancies between each other. Why does not this writer denounce all other denominations than his own? They differ as much from his as "spirit-manifestations" do. Why does he not make one gigantic stride, and charge them with maintaining "rank blasphemy," as he has very kindly and very courteously charged me? I make no pretension to any over-righteousness. I make no profession of any

over-zeal for the Bible, that I may thereby manifest my prowess in its defense, by tilting against a wind-mill of my own creation. Those who have known me best and longest know that I have always maintained the great truths of the Bible as the anchor of our hope; that skepticism has never darkened my mental vision; that I have contributed as much as any one, according to my ability, in the circulation of the Bible and in the building and establishment of churches to propagate the truth of its doctrines. I have seen nothing in these "spiritual manifestations" to change my opinions, but much to confirm them. And still, by a total perversion of what I have said, I am graciously charged as authority for "rank blasphemy." I bow with deep humility to the over-righteousness of this *incognito* of the *Intelligencer*, and confess with shame that, with all my efforts to live up to the doctrines of the Bible which he and I profess, I have come so far short of the requirements of that sacred volume. From the apparent sanctity which he has thrown around himself, I feel that I am following him in his career of righteousness, as Iulus followed Æneas from the flames of Troy, *haud passibus æquis*. But I am not as one without hope. From my investigation of spiritualism I am getting the "fundamental truths of the Bible reaffirmed." All I ask is to be permitted to pursue this investigation unmolested by either church or state, with the full belief that the results will make better men and better Christians of us all.

In regard to the decisions of Judge EDMONDS, the writer says he has uttered no sneers. He says: "I merely stated that it was rumored—and it is rumored widely—that the gentleman in question has consulted spirit-manifestations in regard to his decisions." And he makes this rumor, if it can be established, one ground "to show that the application of coercive measures is already and imperatively needed." Now, it was a very easy matter to ascertain the falsity of this rumor, if the writer had desired not to circulate the slander. No respectable citizens of New York would for one moment give countenance to it. Every one acquainted with Judge Edmonds knows it to be untrue. And yet this rumor is assumed as a basis for "legislative enactments" and the "heaviest penalties" of the law.

It seems that when this *monomania* seizes any of these anti-spiritual denouncers, it is accompanied by a sort of proclivity for slander from which their sanity on other subjects is exempt. I do not, therefore, incline to hold the gentleman responsible for this

retailed slander on Judge Edmonds, or his libellous charge of "rank blasphemy" on me; although he, "whether priest or layman," knows that the retailer of a slander or the republisher of a libel is equally responsible with him who originates it. But let this all pass. I can make great allowances for these monomaniacs, and would advise them, in their lucid intervals, to argue this question without denouncing those who investigate it. With that I will be content; and, so far as I am concerned, they shall have the whole field of argument to themselves. But if they continue their denunciations, I shall repel their assaults as I would the assaults of any other madmen, no matter whether they imagine themselves Don Quixotte, Hyder Ali, or *Tong Whang!*

The writer still persists in his determination to put down the investigation of this subject by the strong arm of the law. Well, let him, and those laboring under the same hallucination, persevere in their praiseworthy efforts. As the venerable JOHN QUINCY ADAMS once said on a memorable occasion, "We shall see what we shall see." In the mean time let us have the name of this writer, when entering on this crusade against civil liberty and religious freedom, emblazoned on his monomaniac banner, that his ignorant and infatuated followers may see under what sign they conquer. He has put his name at your service. I insist that you give it to the world, that the whole world may revel in the effulgence of this luminary of the nineteenth century.

Very respectfully, yours,

N. P. TALLMADGE.

### Appendix—C.

#### EDWARD FOWLER'S COMMUNICATIONS.

I copy the following papers from Edward Fowler's notes of some interviews which he had, and which were given to him evidently to carry out the explanations which they were unable to give to me.

#### FIRST INTERVIEW.

Nov. 21, 1851.—On this night I sat at my table engaged in reading and writing until within a few minutes of twelve o'clock, when I retired.

After extinguishing my light, and before getting in bed, I noticed a bright light over my bed, which I should judge was a foot in diameter. At this I was not surprised, because I had been accustomed to see such lights, with the exception that this was brighter than usual.

I proceeded to bed, where I had lain probably five minutes, when I heard a footstep in the room.

The following diagram will aid the understanding of the statement.

