

them for man to utilize either for his own individual benefit or for that of the race in general, it has no power to require direct or compel the man to thus utilize them. This belongs to that faculty or part of the man that impels to make a right or wrong use of them, as it shall choose to impel the man to act, and which I term mind or will. The careful and thoughtful observer of human actions cannot have failed to discover that with the many opportunities for the acquisition of knowledge, man very often pursues courses almost, if not quite, diametrically opposite to that which the evidences which have been furnished his reason would, had they the power, have dictated.

As, for instance, a man may be so placed as to have unusual advantages to acquire a knowledge of science either in general or in a specific department, and if his mind or will impelled him to properly use these advantages he would become a proficient in them; and yet if this mind or will impelled him to spend his time in merely pandering to sensual enjoyment he would ultimately sink into a worthless member of society.

One may, under favorable circumstances, acquire a classical or scientific education, which would, if rightly used, fit him to become a valuable member of society and this right use of the acquirement would be the choice of the mind or will to utilize it for his own individual advantage, consistent with the rights of other men; but if the mind or will choose to use the acquirement to infringe on the rights of others, he would become a dangerous member of society.

This would but be the fault of the reason or of the evidences furnished it in the course of the study pursued.

Hence I conclude that mind or will is something distinct from, though closely allied to, reason, and forming with it and the soul or spiritual nature parts of the complete man. As the head, the trunk and the limbs and feet are different parts of the body,

and indispensable to the performance of all its functions, yet the head is not the foot, nor the limbs the trunk, and vice versa. So the mind is not intellect or reason, nor intellect mind.

For similar reasons, I must distinguish between the entire spiritual nature of man, or the soul and mind.

As I understand this spiritual nature or soul, made in the likeness or image of God. That is spirit, and not physical, is capable of holding immediate conscious communication with God, and through this communication receives evidences of a spiritual and moral nature, which are imparted by it to the intellect or faculty of reason to be arranged, classified and stored away for the mind or will to use in so directing the actions of the man as to make him to live up to the highest purposes of his being, and to direct him to take such courses as shall contribute to the highest happiness he is capable of appreciating. This being the true object of his religious life, and yet while man has these superior advantages, if the mind or will refuses to use these evidences, or chooses to discard them for others less noble or less fruitful of good results, they must lie dormant in the storehouse where the reason or intellect has placed them, for they have no power of their own to control the actions of the man independent of the action of the mind or will, and hence with the advantages man may possess by the right use—by the mind or will—of these evidences he may live up to the requirements of his being, and find his true happiness in life; but if the mind refuses to so use these evidences, and simply chooses to allow the lower appetites of man's nature to be unduly gratified, the man becomes a moral wreck.

We cannot therefore say the mind was the spiritual nature or the soul which led to such results, nor that the mind was the intellect or reason which directed such a course, for the evidences which had been furnished the spiritual nature, and through it to the