That the address was out of place was clearly demonstrated by the fact that the chairman had hardly sat down before he had to call a gentleman to order who alluded to one of the logical deductions from what he had just listened to.

P. W. [We have also a letter to the same effect, signed 'A Spiritualist of more than Twenty Years' Standing,' but as the writer does not give us his name and address, we regret that we are unable to print his communication. En. 'Light.]

Sir,—One can understand 'R. H.'s' regret without sharing it. If we do not get what we desire, we usually regret it; but it does not follow that what we get is wrong. Besides, in the case of a man like Dr. Wallace, his choice would, in any case, be an argument in its favour. A careful reading of his address yields the fact that he thinks Spiritualism has social bearings, and that it leads to a social Gospel. Is that not true? So it was to the point.

But, in any case, we must stand guard against any narrowing, any tabooing, any closing of windows and doors. There is life in ventilation; there is death in stagnation. By the way, is not Miss Bates wrong in her assumption that the bias of the London Spiritualist Alliance is not a haven for Christian Spiritualists? It is generally accepted that 'Light' is, on the whole, a very fair representative of the Alliance, and we all know how steadfastly 'Light' has testified for Jesus, and entirely on the lines she indicates. In fact, it is an open secret that many think it is too orthodox!

But again the need appears for breadth, freedom, and the open mind.

An Inquirer.

Sir,—As you have opened your columns for expression of opinions on the above subject, I should like to maintain a contrary view to that of your correspondent 'R. H.' last week.

Spiritualism at first sight seems to have nothing to do with revising the present state of social conditions, but as one who has been closely watching for the last eighteen years the chances of progress that our cause has in the present state of society, I am growing more and more convinced every year that society will first have to be reconstituted on lines which will give all persons time and motive for self-culture, and afford cultured persons opportunities for contact with the inarticulate masses in a way that spiritually gains more popular acceptance. Woodcutting may have nothing to do with soldiering, but yet pioneer armies have chiefly to be woodcutters and roadmakers.

F. W. Thubsran, M.A.

Sir,—As letters from me have from time to time appeared in 'Light' over the signature 'R. H.,' perhaps you will allow me to say a few words about the letter in your last issue from another 'R. H.,' with whom I have no desire to be identified. 'R. H.' furnishes a curious instance of how the open mind.

W. F. Thubsran, M.A.

Dr. Alfred R. Wallace and Socialism.

Sir,—I am in agreement with 'R. H.'s' letter. I think it a matter for congratulation that the respect his audience held for Dr. Wallace prevented any member of it from taking exception to the address at the time.

Our experience in Spiritualism teaches us that there are on the other side Individualists and Collectivists, Republicans and Monarchs, admirers of Lord Beaconsfield and of Mr. Gladstone.
Now the Socialism advocated in the address is simply and solely a little step in the only direction by proceeding in which we can by any possibility make a social state in any way resembling brotherhood among men an actuality. Singularly enough, the very thing that Dr. Wallace asks for, 'Equality of Opportunity,' is much more frequently regarded as an Individualist measure than as a Socialistic one; because its first effect would undoubtedly be to intensify competition. It is only on account of the other measures which it would entail, measures for carrying it out fully and equitably, that Equality of Opportunity is Socialistic; and even then it is not a Socialistic measure in the sense of a levelling down, but in that of a levelling up of mankind in general.

It is rather curious that in the same number in which the letter of 'R. H.' appears you have reprinted a correspondence from the 'London Review,' in which Dr. Wallace is severely taken to task for having anything to do with such 'charlatanism' as Modern Spiritualism. Dr. Wallace seems to be threatened with the same fate that befell the man with two wives: the old one plucked out all his dark hairs, and the young one all the grey ones. Dr. Wallace's spiritualistic admirers would pull out all his Socialism, and his scientific friends would pluck out all his Spiritualism; and although the operation would far from leave him bald of ideas and enthusiasm, the effect would hardly be becoming.

Another coincidence is that in the same number of 'Light' Mrs. Densmore unintentionally justifies those friends of Dr. Wallace who wish him to lose neither his dark hairs nor his grey ones; for, in contrasting Theosophy with Spiritualism, she says of the latter: 'To my apprehension this is the only system of philosophy that is based on absolute democracy, equality, and justice, and I say this after a thorough study of the various theological systems.' If this is anywhere near the truth, surely the joining together of Spiritualism and 'equality and justice' by Dr. Wallace is of the nature of a true marriage, the parties to which neither 'R. H.' nor any other man has a right to 'put asunder.'

May I say in conclusion that (as secretary of our Committee) I shall be glad to forward the address, as soon as it is printed, to anyone who will send me his name and address (clearly written); and that I shall be much obliged if those who write for it will send me a list of persons who, in their opinion, would like to receive a copy.
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