

part, I cannot for a moment understand why our friends should assert that Dr. Wallace did wrong in delivering the address in question at the International Congress of Spiritualists. Many are the men and women outside the pale of the spiritualistic movement whose whole hearts and souls yearn to propagate the principles of truth and human fellowship. I speak of the men and women reared in the ranks of the working classes, who by some power or other have been able to escape the contaminating and degrading influences by which their very lives have been surrounded. These people have suffered all the physical and mental pains that follow as a natural consequence of being born into the world as propertyless workers at a period when everything is governed and controlled by the principle of self-aggrandisement and the subjugation of truth and honesty. Yet, notwithstanding this, they have not fallen victims to their environments, but have endeavoured, through all times, to cast from their hearts and minds all evil thoughts and desires, striving to inculcate the principles of human *brotherhood*. It is with these people, who have been made sceptics by the hypocrisies of life in this world of commercialism, that the address of Dr. Wallace would have effect. Take my own case, for instance. Brought up from childhood as a Protestant, and eventually being disgusted with the hypocrisies of the Protestant Church and its followers, I was forced into the ranks of materialists of all schools, because it was here that I could find men and women who were not afraid to speak the truth, and whose actions were controlled by a desire to establish conditions of society that would enable men and women to do unto others as they would that others should do unto them; and never, throughout all my experience in life, have I felt myself so thoroughly attracted by any speech or writing as I have been by just merely reading the address of Dr. Wallace in the columns of 'LIGHT.' It stirred within me a strong desire to know more of the Spiritualist movement and its teachings, but when I find that some of your correspondents, who profess to be Spiritualists, are still devoured by a desire to perpetuate a society based upon class distinctions and class privileges, I am forced to again pause before I enter the portals of the spiritualistic world; for, though I am a materialist, the one desire of my heart is to do what little I can towards bringing about the abolition of class distinction and the establishment of the universal brotherhood of man. If Spiritualism does not teach me that such is the duty of all human beings, then, as Shakespeare says, 'I'll none of it.' In conclusion, I would like, as an ignorant, uneducated workman, to tender my sincere thanks to Dr. Wallace for the good I have personally gained from his address. 'LOOKER-ON.'

SIR,—Dr. Russel Wallace's address and the subsequent correspondence on it in 'LIGHT' have been a painful awakening of many sincere Spiritualists to the fact that certain members would like to employ the Alliance as a propaganda for politics and Socialism.

The very strained link by which they try to bind Spiritualism and Socialism together will not bear the strain, and I fear, if continued, may snap the chain and wreck the vessel 'Alliance.'

As 'R.H.' justly shows, Spiritualists may hold every variety of politics, but is not the *raison d'être* of the Alliance for the investigation of the truths of Spiritualism, the continuity of existence, and of spirit communion, rather than the assertion of political views, however sincerely held, but which hitherto have been generally relegated to Hyde Park meetings? This is a danger from which many inquirers would shrink, and one which would inevitably tend to estrange many from joining the Association. K.C.

SIR,—I for one have read Dr. Wallace's paper at the Congress with deep regret. I admire, nay, I reverence, Dr. Wallace as a brave and honest Spiritualist, whose honesty has cost him much, and who, as a scientist of transcendent ability, has silenced the sneers of our opponents, who declare that all Spiritualists are credulous dupes. But I cannot but think that he has chosen a wrong moment to ventilate his particular political theories, to urge on a Socialistic Jihad, and to endeavour to connect Spiritualism with his own

Dr. Alfred R. Wallace's Address.

SIR,—I have read with regret the criticisms of your correspondents on the address of Dr. Wallace. For my own

favourite tenets before a mixed assemblage collected from many countries, many of whom may have possessed different political opinions. He seems to have forgotten that while all present were Spiritualists, all may not have been Socialists, and that each man present had a right to his honest convictions. Would it not be disastrous if he had been the cause of that 'rift in the lute' which might destroy that harmony among us which is so essential, and which hitherto has been so conspicuous a feature? How often have you gloried in 'LIGHT' that Spiritualism is a thing apart from all political parties, and that on all other matters honest men may agree to differ? But here comes Dr. Wallace proposing the word 'Socialism' as a shibboleth by which a Spiritualist is to be known!

All of us are too well aware of the terrible amount there is of poverty and crime in this world. All good men deplore it and do their best to lessen it; but all do not agree as to the various panaceas suggested to abate it. Instead of exciting class against class, would it not have been far better for the writer of the paper to use his power to raise the desire in all his hearers to do their utmost, each in his own way (even if it were not in the writer's way), to meet and tackle the admitted evil? But let us not allow Dr. Wallace or anyone else, however respectable, to import discord among us Spiritualists!

A SPIRITUALIST OF MORE THAN TWENTY YEARS'
STANDING.

[This correspondence must now be considered as closed.—
ED. 'LIGHT.']
