

THE*GUIDING*STAR.

EXPOSITOR OF THE DIVINE SCIENCE.

"Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have authority over the tree of life"

(Rendered from the Greek Text, Rev. xxii. 14.)

VOL. II.

DECEMBER, 1888.

No. 12.

THE UNITY OF THE TRINITY. GOD IS ONE, NOT THREE.

There never has been a time in the history of the Christian Church, when there was more of a necessity for a thoroughly defined statement of the doctrine of the Triune God than at the present. It becomes a necessity to-day more than ever, in view of a particularly subtle and active manifestation of Antichrist—no doubt in fulfilment of prophecy—presented in a hydra-headed form through the materialistic philosophies of the day, through so-called Spiritualism, and through certain outgrowths of Christianity, well calculated to lead astray from the teachings of our Lord, because ostensibly founded on His teachings.

This subject of the Trinity is especially important now, in view of the undeniable progress in the final fulfilment of the ancient prophecies, of the declarations of Jesus, and especially of the visions of St. John, the Revelator. It is a question which demands not only the profoundest inquiry, but an actual settlement; because the power of Antichrist, in all its concentrated potencies arrayed against the Lord and His Church, must be met by the Logos, the Word Himself, made manifest as the ultimate TRUTH in the final revelation to His people of the mystery of godliness, and to establish forever in the hearts of His children, His law, the everlasting covenant.

God is the author of both nature and revelation, and when both are understood, it will be seen that between them there is no conflict. If there is a triune manifestation in revelation, there must be also a triunity in the operation of the law of God in the *product* of the operation of that law, *creation*, for one is the exposition of the other.

The most prominent doctrine in the Bible regarding the Godhead, is the unity of God. This is the first law of life and creation. The first, (highest,) because it embodies in it as one law, all laws and principles of existence in a central and unitary form and function. It is God, "All in all." The fact of the unity of God should never be lost sight of in the stress laid upon the triunity, for the triunity in manifestation is the repetition of the unity in the process of creation, and is but the manifestation of the functions inhering in the unity.

God created man in His own image and likeness, *male and female*. What man was *before* the fall, when he was in the image and likeness of God, can only be known by Divine illumination. What man is *now* may be known by observation, experience, &c., as to the outward or physical; but as to the interior or spiritual relations and qualities, illumination is as essential to their comprehension as to man's character before the fall. There are certain facts relative to man's being that we may know. Into these facts it is well to inquire.

Propagation is governed by law, through certain prescribed relations. The production of a natural man is the result of the relation of male and female, called father and mother. Natural offspring cannot enter into organic being except as the product of this relation. In the relation of the parents, two primals, one from each parent, are brought together and form a unit. The propagation in offspring is the result of something transmitted from the parents. The father and mother are unlike, and the offspring is unlike both. In the father, mother and child, there is a trinity; and this trinity sustains definite and peculiar relations. This trinity is not a triunity. The three are not one. *This* trinity is the result of disintegration. The male and female, called father and mother, are the product of a disintegration consequent on the fall of man, for man's *first state* was that of male and female in one form, as declared in Gen. I. 26. 27. 28., and also expressed in Gen. II. 18., showing that the man was *alone*, or male and female in one form; and in verse 23. that the woman was taken *out of* the man. If the two elements were first united, and thus constituted—because conjoined in a *bi-unity*—the first and highest state of human existence, *all other conditions and relations are abnormal*, and must be in the line of a process of *disintegration* from the primal unity, or in the line of *integration*, through a tendency to recover the unity lost through the disintegration *or fall*, or they must include both tendencies.

A man is called father by virtue of his relation to offspring. A woman is called mother by virtue of her relation to offspring; and it is only in view of these peculiar relations that we say father, mother and son, or daughter, in the fullest and truest natural sense. Right here we touch *merely*, upon the great mystery of the Triune God.

We know that in some sense man is the product of God's operations in creation. We know, according to Scripture—if it is not yet fully demonstrated by science—

that man is the final product of God's works; and that he is exalted above all the works of creation, as the Son of God. Man in his natural or primal state, is male and female, but gender is no more manifest in man than in every other department of God's created universe. Everywhere, in all creation, is written by the finger of God the great truth that all activity is engendered through the relations of male and female elements, originating somewhere, and in some thing or source as an adequate cause. A cause which can produce male and female as manifestation, must of necessity be male and female in function. Hence the declaration of Scripture; "So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them." How could God create man in His own image, male and female, if there did not inhere in Him the two elements? How could a creation be in the *image* of the Creator, except there was a correspondence in the manifestation, with the thing or being to which it was likened? There can be no escape from the conclusion, that, if man was made male and female, in the image of God, God is male and female.

"Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to Him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his *wife* hath made herself ready." "And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints." "And he saith unto me, write, Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb." "And He saith unto me, These are the true sayings of God." Rev. XIX. 7. 8. 9. "And I, John, saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven prepared as a *bride* adorned for *her husband*." Rev. XXI. 2. "And there came unto me one of the seven angels, which had the seven vials full of the seven last plagues, and talked with me, saying, Come hither, I will shew thee the *bride*, the Lamb's *wife*." Rev. XXI. 9.

We have in these truthful presentations of Scriptural cognitions, and correspondences of what nature everywhere proclaims, the express breathings of inspiration, witnessing and confirming the testimony of reason, that God is male and female; and in this very truth is the settlement of the vexed question, the origin of creation.

Man, in his fallen state, is male and female in two forms, while every indication of nature points to a universal oneness of creation, as a whole. To the thinking mind the fact is patent, that the various departments of the created universe are so many parts to one perfected unity; that, as an outgrowth of that unity, man stands forth as the nearest observable proximation to the primal unity from which creation was evolved. Man is a segregated trinity, not a triunity. The male and female elements in man are not produced as a unity, but in two forms, differing both in form and function.

Creation is a unity, and as such, indicates a unity as an adequate cause for its

production, and yet this unitary cause has inhering in it as a functional potency, the three elements of perpetuity, Father, Mother and Offspring; and that Offspring the Son of God; for the Father being male and female, the Son must be also male and female. This Offspring cannot be separate from the Father, for His final production as the fulness and sum of creation, must be a unity with the Father, a unity by which the Creator and the creature are blended in one personal entity in the "Son of Man," at one with the Son of God; a created being or Offspring of the Father, *in the express image of God*; THE express image of God; God the Father incarnate in the Son.

Any doctrine of the trinity of God which would destroy the oneness of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, (or Holy Ghost,) *in a single personality*, tends towards Anti-christ. God is one. "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one."

IN THE EXAMINER AND CHRONICLE of April 20. 1877, there is a publication in full, of a lecture delivered by the Rev. Joseph Cook, upon which are made the following editorial remarks. "In place of the usual sermon, we give this week a recent lecture by Rev. Joseph Cook, who is creating such a sensation by his Monday lectures at Tremont Temple, Boston. Mr. Cook studied at Yale, graduated at Harvard, and afterward pursued a Theological course at Andover. He then spent several years abroad, studying Philosophy and Science at the German Universities. He is fitted by nature and training to deal with the current philosophical and scientific questions which border on the domain of Theology, and he is acknowledged by his opponents to be a most formidable adversary. His Orthodoxy is unquestioned. He is doing for the speculative side of Christianity in Boston, what Moody and Sankey are doing for its practical side. His Monday lectures attract large audiences of the ablest and most cultivated people, many of whom are avowed opponents of his system."

Suppose we examine briefly some of the salient points of such a presentation of the doctrine of the Trinity as to call forth from one of the most prominent Trinitarian papers of the country, the above endorsement.

Mr. Cook says in his definition, "First, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one God. Second, each has a peculiarity incommunicable to the others. Third, neither is God without the others. Fourth, each with the others is God."

That the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one God, is an unquestionable declaration of Scripture. The first statement, then, of his definition, according to Scripture is true; but what of the second statement? Will it stand a Scriptural test? I think not. Has each a peculiarity incommunicable to the others?

Jesus was born into the world of the Virgin Mary, through the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, "The Son of God," "The Son of Man." Of this child the prophet Isaiah says, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the govern-

ment shall be upon His shoulder; and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." Isaiah IX. 6. How does this declaration of the prophet comport with Mr. Cook's second statement? This child is declared to be The Son, The Father, The Mighty God, Prince of Peace, &c; and it is impossible for this prophecy to be fulfilled in Jesus, except through the *communicability* of both the Father and the Spirit, or Holy Ghost, to the Son, through His birth and expansion towards His ultimate infoldment of the Triune God. "For He whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him. The Father loveth the Son, and hath given ALL THINGS into His hand." John III. 35. "All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that He shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you." John XVI. 15. What do "All things" here imply? ALL THINGS that the Fatheres hath? The Father hath certainly the attribute of the Father; that, by virtue of which He is the Father; the power to transmit the holy seed from Himself, from which the "Son of Man" is generated. If *all* things that the Father hath are given to Jesus, even the attribute of Father, through the communicability of both the Holy Ghost and the Father, why does Mr. Cook say that each has a peculiarity incommunicable to the other?

John says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him." John I. 1. 2. 3. "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." John I, 14.

Here is the actual declaration that the Word was God; and that this Word, God, WAS MADE FLESH; not that the *Father* was made flesh; not that the *Son* was made flesh; not that the *Holy Ghost* was made flesh; but that THE WORD, whom John declares to be God, was made flesh and dwelt among us.

Here the question arises, how did this Word mutate Himself to the natural and visible manifestation of "The Son of God," "The Son of Man?" I reply, by virtue of the attribute of paternity, through the process of procreation from a word which God sent into Jacob, which became THE WORD in the Lord Jesus Christ. This is declared by the prophet Isaiah, "The Lord sent a word into Jacob, and it hath lighted upon Israel." Isaiah IX. 8. This process of generation was conducted through the Jewish Church, for the same prophet declares, "For the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah His pleasant plant." Isaiah V. 7.

Jesus said, "I am the true vine, ye are the branches." This being so, Jesus and His disciples to whom He spake, must have been God's pleasant plant, and therefore the men of Judah, procreated through the Jewish nation from THE WORD sent by the Lord into Jacob.

In Jesus Christ is manifested the *fulness* of the Godhead bodily; so declared

by the Apostle. What is the fulness of the Godhead? *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*; the Triune God communicated to the Son, who is the Word made flesh; Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, made personally manifest in our Lord Jesus Christ; "Who is the image of the invisible God, (Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,) the first-born of every creature: (therefore a creature :) For by Him were all things created, (by whom? by *this image*,) that are in heaven, and that are in earth; visible and invisible; whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him: And He is before all things;" therefore He is the Creator, the fullness of the Godhead.

The third statement in the definition, "Neither is God without the others," is so absurd that it scarcely seems possible that intelligent minds can examine it, and not discover at once the falseness of the inculcation. The Lord Jesus Christ was either God, a part of God, or a man in the same sense that all others are men; a better man perhaps than most men. He was and is the Son of God, by virtue of certain inherent attributes, if Scripture is to be taken as authority. Let us examine from a Scripture basis the character of the attributes constituting Him the Son of God. He was begotten by the Father, and made *the express image of the invisible God*. Mr. Cook says, "Neither is God without the others." If Jesus was only the express image of the *Son*, or if only the Son was incarnate, according to Mr. Cook's statement, He was *not* the image of the invisible God, but an image of what Mr. Cook says is *not* God, for one without the others is not God. It takes the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to Mr. Cook and Scripture, to constitute God. An "Express image" of this invisible God must be the image of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; otherwise it cannot be the *express image*. To be the Son of God, Jesus must have been, and is, the embodiment of the attribute of the Father, whom He Himself declared was *in Him*, and of the Holy Ghost, which He says is the Spirit of Truth. He declared Himself to be this Truth. To constitute Him a Son of God, He must be the incarnate Word, in whom is "The Everlasting Father." To be the Son of God, He must be the Father, Word, and Holy Ghost, *personally* manifest in the Lord Jesus Christ, who is "The true God and eternal life." (John.) To be the Son of God, He must be the Offspring, not merely of the Father, but of the Triune God; and as the child of the Triunity, the image and likeness of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; or the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, incarnated.

"Fourth, each, with the others, is God." What idea is intended to be conveyed in such a statement? "Each, with the others, is God." The Father is God, with the Son and the Holy Ghost. The Son is God, with the Father and the Holy Ghost; and the Holy Ghost is God, with the Father and Son.

Mr. Cook, in the last two statements, declares the absolute necessity for the existence of what he terms three subsistences. These three subsistences are necessary to perfect his concept of a Deity. The three existed as three substances

prior to the incarnation. They exist now *subsequent* to the incarnation. The three are eternal, but neither would be eternal without the other two.

Jesus Christ is called the Son of Man, by virtue of His conception in the human womb, and birth into natural humanity. He was the Son of God prior to His incarnation; but in any sense He is the Son only by virtue of being offspring; the Son of Man by virtue of birth from humanity; of God, by virtue of being overshadowed by the Holy Ghost. Now I ask, what will Mr. Cook do with this *fourth factor, offspring*, as originating in Deity, and produced through natural humanity—a factor which brings us face to face *with the fulness of the Godhead*, manifested in personal form and function as a man, a human being, and as a human, the *express image* of the invisible God? Mr. Cook has ignored in his examination of this question, the Man, Jesus of Nazareth. He has not dared to touch upon this question of humanity as an essential “PECULIARITY” of Deity, and he leaves his readers and hearers completely in the dark regarding the BIUNITY, the two-in-one, the Divine natural, and the Divine celestial natures of Deity. The great mystery of mysteries, God made flesh, he has entirely excluded from his examination of the Trinity.

At the foot of the third column he says: “But it is not stupidity, it is not incautiousness, which causes Orthodoxy to use the word “Person,” sometimes. She is always speaking Latin when she uses that word intelligently. She employs it as a technical term, because it has been in the creeds of the Church 1500 years. Adopted in the days of the poverty of the Latin language, it has come down to the days of the richness of the English tongue.”

“Calvin himself said he would be willing that the word person should be dropped forever out of the discussions of the doctrine of the Trinity, if only the truth could be retained that there are in God three distinctions, *each* with a peculiarity, or a property incommunicable to the others, and each with the others, God.”

Mr. Calvin and Mr. Cook may expunge from use, and from concept, the word and peculiarity, *person*, but they must still deal with the person, the Man Jesus, “The Son of God,” whom all Christendom declares to be one person of the Trinity. This *person*, at least in doctrinal discussions, must be admitted. The Lord Jesus Christ, the image of the invisible God, and the being whom Christians profess to worship, is A PERSON, and this person is the *express image*, not of “Three peculiarities,” from which person is precluded; but the “Express image” of the person of God, (*not persons* of God,) as declared by Paul in the epistle to the Hebrews, as follows: “God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in *these last* days spoken unto us by His Son, whom He hath appointed *heir* of *all things*, by whom also He made the worlds; who being the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His

person, (Of whose person? The Son's person? No, for Mr. Cook says the Son is *not* God without the other two. Of the Father's person? No, for Mr. Cook says, He is not God without the other two. Of the Holy Ghost's person? No, for according to Mr. Cook the Holy Ghost is not God without Father and Son. Then of whose person? Of God's person, who is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,) and upholding all things by the word of His power, when He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."

Paul here declares the Lord Jesus Christ to be the "Express image" of a PERSON, and that person the Triune God. He does not declare Him (Jesus) to be the image of three peculiarities, nor does he declare Him to be the manifestation of one of those peculiarities: but rather the incarnation of God Himself, every attribute of the Deity communicated to the incarnate Offspring of God and man.

In the second column, near the commencement of the last paragraph, Mr. Cook says, "There is no clearness of thought on any theme, if it be not clear that our Lord, according to this definition, displayed a *degree* of being that was Deific;" and Mr. Cook nowhere in the entire discourse, claims more for the Lord Jesus than a *degree* of Deity, while Scripture constantly affirms Him to be *the fulness of the Godhead*.

Thank God, the great mystery of God made flesh, or the mystery of God in man, is now revealed. It is no longer in obscurity, for the scales have been removed from the eye of the prophet, and this great truth that "God is in the generation of the righteous," is made clear.

Both Scripture and nature constantly affirm that the habitation of God, is man. "Ye are the Temple of God, for God dwells in you." "Ye are the Temple of God, for the Holy Ghost is in you." Ye are the Temple of God. "God is in His Holy Temple."

"Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars hill, and said, Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom, therefore, ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you." (Paul nowhere declared any one, save the Lord Jesus Christ.) "God, that made the world and all things therein, (John says *all things* were made by Him—The Word: and Paul says, "By Him—the image of the invisible God—were all things created," Col. I. 16.) seeing that He is Lord (God hath made that same Jesus both Lord and Christ. Acts II. 36. Are there two Lords?) of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands." Acts XVII. 22.—25. "That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him, though He be not far from every one of us: For in Him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also His offspring. Forasmuch then as *we* are the offspring of God, we ought not to think

that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device." Acts 17. 27.—30. The mystery of the incarnation of Deity is revealed, as soon as man receives in the heart the spirit Paul manifests, (the Spirit of adoption by which we cry "Father,") the Spirit of Christ, the Son of God. For when we *abide* in the doctrines of Christ, we have (within us) both the Father and the Son. We are then like the Son of God, in His image and likeness, the Triune Offspring of the Everlasting God.

NOTE:—

The above review and criticism of Joseph Cook's lecture on "The Trinity" in Tremont Temple, Boston, was written by Dr. Teed nearly twelve years ago, and has been in our possession ever since. It has never before been published. We give it place in the STAR at this late date, because we believe it to be irrefutable by any one who receives the Scriptures as the truth of God revealed to man, and because we regard it as the most clear and logical exposition of the Trinity in Unity, or the oneness of God, and as the most crushing attack upon the dogma of the tri-personality of the Godhead, the English language affords. We feel assured that the subscribers to the STAR will fully appreciate the excellence of this article and endorse what we have said concerning it.

ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

MONEY NOT ENTIRELY PRIVATE PROPERTY.

BY PROF. O. F. L'AMOREAUX.

WHAT CAME OF THE EFFORTS OF A COLLEGE GRADUATE TO LIVE ACCORDING TO
INSTRUCTION RECEIVED IN COLLEGE.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 346.)

In size of coin the nickel seems best adapted to his needs. He knows nothing against it as money, except that Walker did not class it as natural money, but he has been forced to abandon him as authority. On inquiry he finds it to be, by law, money as good as gold in all payments up to five dollars.

Therefore, gathering up the little that the legal robbers have left him, he turns it all into nickels, and turns his back upon his unnatural and ungrateful country. Immediately upon landing in what is to be his future home, he has need of money, and at once, on attempting to use what he has, he makes the astonishing discovery that, in crossing the boundary line of his country, his good money underwent a marvelous change, from money on a par with gold, in small sums, to a comparatively worthless metal. This last terrible reverse sets our hero to studying in earnest the momentous question of the true nature of money. In answer to the suggestion of deceived or interested gold worshipers, that if he had only taken gold, the money of the world, he would be all right, he finds that there is no money of the world; that if he had gone to India, where England has by law demonetized it, he would have to repeat with that metal his losing ex-

perience with the trade dollar, for the eminent English bankers, Baring Brothers, are authority for the statement that, after its demonetization, 20,000 lbs. of that metal would not command a single shilling in money. Something, then, in addition to, and separate from the qualities given to any metal or other substance by nature, and the labor of obtaining and coining it, enters into and constitutes and sustains the value of money. Without this something else it is not, can not be money at all. Not simply a part, but all the value of money, as such, is given by that something else. So says Judge Tiffany, the highest authority on Constitutional law. "The value is in the stamp, not in the metal or material."

* * * *"It is the recognized presence of sovereignty in the market. As a medium of exchange, as a means to an end it has no value but the sovereign will recorded on its face, and in respect to its use, its value is as unchangeable as the authority that created it.*

* * * But this rests solely in the dictum of the sovereign, or sovereignty, whether the coin shall be metal, leather, parchment, paper, or any other substance, as a question of expediency—political economy—and not authority." There can be no justice in government's taking the property of one man, whether dug out of the earth or obtained in some other way, and by public act imparting a value to it above its own, which controls all other values. Free coinage of metals is essential partiality and injustice. If the value and power of money is not found in the materials, but is imparted by some other external existence or power; to wit, government; and if this acts voluntarily as it must in this case, it cannot transcend, either in space or time, the action, or reach of its own volition. If the voluntary act that gives money value is withdrawn or one goes beyond the reach of its activity, the power and value given by it, fails. Community which imparts all the value of money, as such, must have the right to determine on what conditions it will grant it. If it takes the property of an individual (which is not just, unless it does the same with all the property of all other individuals) and imparts to it a power and value that belongs only to community for the uses of all its members equally, and it has no other powers, the owner of such property has the same right to it he had before, only so far as relates to the qualities it had before and not at all as to the money quality given by community. What community has no right to do, it does not do. It has no right to give to an individual what it has only for the uses of community. If, without the power imparted by government, their owner could not loan nickels, silver, or gold coins so as to get usury, or interest on them, then he has no right to so loan them and all the money he gets in this way, is obtained by robbery, even though the law allows him to take it. Community has a right to act only in the interest of all its members equally.

As money is a necessity, not only for the community, but for the individual as well as the government, which is community in action, it has a right to coin

money using any material that is cheapest and best adapted to use as money. Our constitution rightfully provides that Congress, which is the people in legislative capacity, may coin and provide, yea, makes it its duty to provide all the money necessary as a means of exchange for the government, and for all its citizens. It further provides that it may "regulate the value" of the same, in the only way possible; that is, by providing that the *quantity* be sufficient at all times, and for all legitimate uses. The one thing that is necessary to money, in addition to its debt paying and contract forcing qualities, is QUANTITY in proportion to necessary uses. It is just as true of the other measures as that of value that quantity is the only important consideration. Ricardo says; and he only voices the opinion of political economists worth naming: "By limiting the quantity of money it can be raised to any conceivable value." Then manifestly the question of material is entirely irrelevant. If only the precious metals can be money, then the hands of Congress are tied and it can not do what the constitution makes its duty to do—supply sufficient money for all uses, as the quantity of those metals is not dependent upon the will of that body.

There is substantially but one cause of all the distress, poverty, drunkenness and crime that now appall every friend of God and lover of humanity, and that is, that a set of cunning, conscienceless knaves, who amass fabulous sums of money by usury, or interest upon their debts, have usurped the prerogatives of government and undertaken to furnish at their own price, which as they have the power to expand and contract the currency at pleasure, they can easily get, money which is the very life of community. The actual figures taken from government reports show that the National banks loan eight dollars of the peoples money to one of their own, and private banks, seven to one. All other great wrongs against humanity, as the rum traffic, resolve themselves into this one, and are perpetuated for one purpose, to get money, which, by connivance of or in spite of the money power, they readily furnish. Make it easy for men to get money by honorable callings and you will soon destroy the dishonorable ones. To deceive the people and perpetuate the great wrong by which they make their gains, they cry "Honest Money" and at the same time furnish the people the National Bank bill, the fraud that ruined our hero, and costs the people a double usury while the honest Treasury note costs them nothing beyond the cost of making it.

Although these men cry honest money, and talk as though that meant specie, they understand full well that that is too expensive money for "Mudsills," and so they have invented a sort of money structure that is built upon the principle of setting a house, not on an ample foundation, but upon the ridge pole. Suppose they were honest and meant what they said, and could do that, which for a permanent currency is impossible, supply a metallic currency, adequate to the needs of a people whose condition should be above that of savages, or of the nations whose

peoples, for want of sufficient money, are the pauperized laborers of the world, what would be the result? Prices of commodities and wages of labor would both go up. It would soon be apparent that the dollar would not buy more than half as much labor or its avails as in other countries. Being very portable commodities and in greater demand in other countries, these dollars would desert the currency and emigrate, and as they left they would pull down the prices both of labor and commodities to the level of the same in the other countries. If, when they were made part of the currency, they inflated prices, and (honest money shriekers to the contrary notwithstanding,) a currency is just as readily inflated by an addition of gold as of paper, and if, when they left it, they caused prices to shrink, they left the country in far worse condition than they found it, or than the pauperized countries around it.

But there is no honesty in their make-up.

In this nondescript money structure that they have builded, on one dollar in specie which is made money by law, they profess to base five dollars in paper which is not money at all. Of course this is a house divided against itself, with the one inevitable result, that every five to ten years it topples over, causing, as Alison says a similar one does in England, a loss of from \$500,000,000 to \$700,000,000. We said this air castle was a house divided against itself. They invariably issue enough to raise prices above those in countries where money is scarce and consequently labor pauperized and their fraudulent paper, that is not money, and yet by them is put in the place of money, cannot go abroad, but being part of the currency, causes prices to rise.

The dollar now will not purchase half as much as it will in other countries whose peoples, for want of sufficient money, are the pauperized laborers of the world. The paper cannot go abroad, but its addition to the currency has caused conditions in which part of the currency will inevitably go where it can command more of the avails of labor. The non-money part of the currency is driving the money part of it out of the currency and out of the country.

The foundation of this fine money structure goes from under it and as the rest of it is not money, and cannot of itself sustain prices, confidence fails, and the whole fabric, which is nothing more nor less than a MONSTROUS CONFIDENCE GAME, practiced over and over again, upon a too confiding people, tumbles into ruins.

Suppose now, that those traitorous, accursed metals were now and forever, stripped of the power and authority they have so long abused, and our country should issue what, according to reason and all authorities worth naming, is the only money, the national authority stamped on whatever substance is most convenient, sufficient in amount of currency to make and sustain prices on which all men can live comfortably, and such as should set every idle hand at work by making it safe for men to engage in new enterprises, and should forever render it im-

possible for men to practice usury, what would be the result?

The folly of hoarding money in banks or the Treasury, under the pretense of keeping on hand a supply to redeem other money, or what is wickedly put in the place of money, would cease.

This is one of the principal sources of hard times, poverty and panic.

Such money, not being a commodity, none of it could traitorously desert the people who gave it being. While there was confidence in the government that issued it, and there could be no departure of part of the currency to other countries to destroy confidence, panics would be impossible, and the poverty, suicides, drunkenness, and crime they always bring, would be prevented.

The gold and silver produced in the country or brought into it by trade, would be left free to settle balances with other nations, and when they left the country they could do no more harm than other commodities do when they leave it. This would be protection worth having, and any effective protection to our industries under present monetary conditions is impossible. When our manufacturers sent their products abroad they would receive their pay in exchange, or in cheap commodities, made so by the dear money of the countries with which they dealt. All trade between nations is simply barter, and a truly prosperous country will send abroad as much value in merchandise as it requires from other countries. The increased value of these commodities at home, caused by the greater supply of money, will afford ample protection for labor.

Under the present money system, protective duties can protect labor only by preventing importation, and in doing so they prevent exportation as well, and so cripple labor by contracting the market for its wares.

But, says the objector, there would be over-production. Such a thing is impossible when all men can earn enough to buy what they want. It is only wrong monetary conditions, like the present, that make over-production possible.

But we are told that such money would be a national debt, and it is wrong to circulate a national debt as money. The men who talk so, forget, or wish others to, that the national bank bill, the *honest* money of our present system, is a banker's debt. Can it be wrong for the people to circulate their own debt for their own benefit, and right for them to circulate a banker's debt for the benefit of bankers?

All money, as such, of whatever material made, is simply a due bill that one receives on parting with any product or service that enables him to receive the same value again in products or services when he parts with it. If he gets more for it, while it is legally his, he gets it by robbery.

The only question is, shall the people use their own due bills, which cost them NOTHING, or shall they pay DOUBLE USURY to rich bankers for the poor privilege

peoples, for want of sufficient money, are the pauperized laborers of the world, what would be the result? Prices of commodities and wages of labor would both go up. It would soon be apparent that the dollar would not buy more than half as much labor or its avails as in other countries. Being very portable commodities and in greater demand in other countries, these dollars would desert the currency and emigrate, and as they left they would pull down the prices both of labor and commodities to the level of the same in the other countries. If, when they were made part of the currency, they inflated prices, and (honest money shriekers to the contrary notwithstanding,) a currency is just as readily inflated by an addition of gold as of paper, and if, when they left it, they caused prices to shrink, they left the country in far worse condition than they found it, or than the pauperized countries around it.

But there is no honesty in their make-up.

In this nondescript money structure that they have builded, on one dollar in specie which is made money by law, they profess to base five dollars in paper which is not money at all. Of course this is a house divided against itself, with the one inevitable result, that every five to ten years it topples over, causing, as Alison says a similar one does in England, a loss of from \$500,000,000 to \$700,000,000. We said this air castle was a house divided against itself. They invariably issue enough to raise prices above those in countries where money is scarce and consequently labor pauperized and their fraudulent paper, that is not money, and yet by them is put in the place of money, cannot go abroad, but being part of the currency, causes prices to rise.

The dollar now will not purchase half as much as it will in other countries whose peoples, for want of sufficient money, are the pauperized laborers of the world. The paper cannot go abroad, but its addition to the currency has caused conditions in which part of the currency will inevitably go where it can command more of the avails of labor. The non-money part of the currency is driving the money part of it out of the currency and out of the country.

The foundation of this fine money structure goes from under it and as the rest of it is not money, and cannot of itself sustain prices, confidence fails, and the whole fabric, which is nothing more nor less than a MONSTROUS CONFIDENCE GAME, practiced over and over again, upon a too confiding people, tumbles into ruins.

Suppose now, that those traitorous, accursed metals were now and forever, stripped of the power and authority they have so long abused, and our country should issue what, according to reason and all authorities worth naming, is the only money, the national authority stamped on whatever substance is most convenient, sufficient in amount of currency to make and sustain prices on which all men can live comfortably, and such as should set every idle hand at work by making it safe for men to engage in new enterprises, and should forever render it im-

facility with which a large amount of stock can be bought with a small amount of money margin, that stimulates great rises, and it is the facility with which these same money margins are wiped out, when stocks fall, that creates the fear which precipitates a panic." By means of the margin and certified checks on the banks, the broker, or speculator, who has \$5,000 in bank, can buy \$100,000 worth of stock and sometimes two or three times that amount. In 1868, taking advantage of the facilities afforded by the margin, certified check, and the proceeds of the sale of 235,000 shares of watered stock, the "Erie Conspirators," as our author calls them, "Three doctors, Daniel Drew, Jay Gould and James Fisk Jr.," proceeded to still further lower the price of the stock of the road, of which they were officers and principal stock holders, so that they might buy up still more of the stock at a very low figure, in pursuance of which scheme, they proceeded to lock up \$14,000,000 in greenbacks, and by the resulting fall of prices, not only of stocks, but of every thing else, to beggar thousands and turn tens of thousands out of employment to beg or starve. Gould, the "Arch conspirator," as our author calls him, in company with his henchman Fisk, and the veteran speculator W. S. Woodward, and Arthur Kimbur, the youthful agent of a wealthy London banking house, next proceeds to organize a corner in gold. The result was what will ever be known in the annals of that den of thieves, Wall Street, as "Black Friday."

In his evidence given before the Hepburn committee of the New York legislature, as we learn from Mr. Thurber's report, given in "Whither are we Drifting as a Nation?" this same great robber testified, that he had been frequently in the habit of using large sums of money to influence elections, and bribe the representatives of the people. Truly Uncle Reub. Hatch told the truth, when he said that Gould, Sage, Field and Vanderbilt, "Would be better designated as the head centres of Communism. * * * These men are the promoters of labor strikes, and the prime cause of all the antagonism between capitol and labor."

But what shall be said of a government that carefully protects them and their stolen gains, and fashions its money system to favor their robber schemes, and when they bring forth their inevitable results of oppression, outrage, and injustice, and the peeled and ruined subjects of the same earnestly protest, silences their pleadings with the halter, on the plea that they have been convicted of anarchy?

As a last resort, the objector to a rational, full legal tender paper money, cites the paper issues of certain South American States, which are not worth more than three to five cents on the dollar, as positive proof of the worthlessness, as money, of everything but gold and silver. He forgets the fact, that the governments of those same states are as weak and worthless as their money, and that the latter fact is the cause of the former.

If, as Judge Tiffany says, money is "Sovereignty in the market," that sovereignty will have the same authority in the market as out of it and no more.

A weak government is of necessity relegated to the monetary condition of savages; that is, mainly barter. When confidence fails gold and silver desert the currency of a nation, and its credit, of course, suffers more or less.

Shall a strong government condemn itself to the monetary condition of savages, because a weak one cannot rise above it? If it does, it cannot choose but undermine and destroy its own power and itself become weak and worthless.

Silver, even though it bears in relief the American Eagle and the Goddess of Liberty, and the government stamp indicating its fineness, is not money at all, any more than when in the crude form it is dug out of the earth; that imperial metal gold, even though, in addition to all the plain republican symbols of authority, it wears the diadem of kings, is equally powerless to perform the functions of money. On further investigation our student of political economy discovers that this wonderful power inheres in no other material substance. History tells him that wood, copper, cattle, leather, sea shells, paper, and many other substances, have been endowed with this power and have borne it equally as well as, and often far more conveniently, safely, and in every way better than gold and silver. Then, so much is settled. No material substance has in it by nature, the qualities of money, and the text book must teach error that speaks of natural money.

The answer of Jesus to the question, whether men should pay tribute to Caesar, conveyed a profound monetary fact that men have not yet come to understand as they have not practically conformed in their daily life to most of His teachings.

"Whose image and superscription" (not whose commodity) "is this?" The image and superscription were signs of the authority of Caesar. When Caesar's law required that these, on whatever material stamped, be presented in payment of taxes, with-holding, or refusing to pay them was rebellion, if not treason against Caesar. Owing to the fact that government was always a dual institution, combining the authority of God and man, the image and superscription had the same significance whether that image were that of the god or king of the realm. Without this image and superscription the coin had no more power or consequence than so much potters clay. His experience with the trade dollar has taught him that the mere image and superscription on the coin is not enough to make money out of silver. These may be only evidences of a past edict of the sovereign, that has been amended or annulled. Behind the superscription must be the living law of a living and powerful sovereignty.

Many times in the history of every great nation, by fiat of the supreme authority, has the amount of the precious metals bearing its superscription been greatly diminished or a far greater amount of alloy added, without lessening the legal value of its coins. Solon's law for the relief of a people who had been reduced to slavery by the practices of usurers and the scarcity of money, added one fourth

to the volume of money, by making the coins one fourth lighter, while they retained their former legal value.

By English law, the pound of silver, that in the thirteenth century was coined into twelve shillings, was finally coined into sixty-two shillings. In every case such cheapening of money by enlarging its QUANTITY in proportion to necessary uses, gave relief to the oppressed masses, and if it did not ultimately save them from financial ruin and slavery, and their country from destruction, it was because it was not resorted to, as often and extensively as their needs required, and usurers, who, as Rollin in his "Ancient History" testifies, have ruined every nation which has tolerated them, counteracted its beneficial effects by making money plenty and then scarce, to promote their ruinous and selfish calling.

As there is but one law for the sovereign and the subject, the money of the sovereign is also the money of every subject. He is obliged to take it as well as give it. To refuse to take it when tendered by sovereign or subject, is to rebel against the authority of the government. When the New York Clearing House resolved not to take the standard silver dollars, it resolved to rebel against the government of the country.

When Congress forbade the Secretary of the Treasury to continue to do business with a nest of traitors, who were in rebellion against its authority, and under such action, the Clearing House rescinded its resolution, but the Secretary, being a banker, and sympathizing with the banks, and not with the people, did not, as the spirit and intent of the law, and the interests of the people required, tender the silver to the Clearing House, but piled it up in the Treasury, to contract the the currency, and compel the people to pay interest on what they could not use, he ought to have been impeached as a rebel against the Government he pretended to serve.

Let it forever be remembered that the power of money, the one quality that makes it money, is found, not in any material substance, but in the living edict or fiat of a living and powerful sovereignty.

Despite his teacher, Walker, our student has learned that there is no such thing as natural money; that gold and silver are not money, hence, the distinction, sharply made and insisted upon, between value money and credit money, or as his teacher calls it, "Credit currency," is a distinction without a difference. It is all value money, so far as it is money at all, and it is all credit currency. When the credit of a country becomes doubtful, as in case of war or money panic, the gold and silver at once desert its currency, and are hoarded, buried, or sent out of the country; or, as in our late war, if its traitorous owners, as they did when they induced Congress to partially demonetize the greenbacks, by making them incapable of paying interest on a debt they intended to create, and duties on imports, can induce government to make some necessity for their use, they keep them to

speculate on, out of their country's perils, and the miseries and distresses of their fellow men. As all history shows, Jefferson said the truth, when he said that a nation's only resource in time of war or money panic, was its credit.

But for pernicious teaching, such as misled our hero, men would come to see in the commercial world, what they cannot help seeing and acknowledging in the natural world, that a craft that safely bears a nation's destinies mid storm and tempest, will certainly carry them safely in fair weather. The moment the national peril or commercial storm is over, the men, who coined their wealth by the former pernicious system of pretended specie base which was the main, if not the only cause of the tempest and the ruin which followed, begin agitation for the restoration of that false and ruinous system. Strange as it may seem, they find it an easy task to convince unthinking mortals that a bark that is perfectly able, and the only able one, to carry a nation's dearest interests safely in times of their greatest peril, is entirely unseaworthy and dangerous, when the storm is over.

About their only stock in trade in the way of argument and illustration are the Continental Currency and French Assignats. The men who seriously use these as arguments against a full legal tender paper currency issued by a perfectly established and strong government, are entitled to one horn of a dilemma. They are either conscienceless knaves or ignoramuses, and in either case unfit to teach others.

The Continental Currency was not the issue of an established government, but the device of men in rebellion, who were seeking to form one, and who had neither money nor credit at home or abroad. From the first, at home as well as abroad, powerful individuals and combinations of men opposed it, with all the powers they possessed. The Congress that issued it, only regarded it as a makeshift for the present, and had no idea that it was, or could be, real money. The government, if such it can be called, that issued it, had no power to tax its subjects, or coin money, both of which powers were still lodged in the separate colonies.

After the successful issue of the war, when the Tory or Loyalist party came to take part in governmental affairs, they were full of prejudice in favor of the English financial system, and deadly hatred of that, that like the greenback in our late war, crippled, as each was, by the opposition of its enemies, had yet enabled its friends to triumph in the struggle. These enemies of the Continental Currency, overcome in the contest, when peace came, destroyed the remnant of that which had been the means of their overthrow. The only possible savior of its country's liberties was itself crippled, and finally destroyed by the foes that failed to destroy them. Instead of furnishing proof against it, they are the strongest possible proof that a paper full legal tender currency, issued by a permanently established, strong government, is the only right one.

In addition to all its other foes, history informs us that the English government, to break it down, flooded the country with counterfeits of it. In spite of all

its foes Franklin testifies of its bills; "With these they paid, clothed, and fed their troops; fitted out ships, and supported the war during five years, against one of the most powerful nations of Europe."

In his comments on the testimony of Franklin, Gillette justly says; "Notwithstanding this, we owe to paper money the independence of the United States from Great Britain as absolutely, as we owe the preservation of the Union in the recent struggle, to the greenback."

The French Assignats were based, not on the country's credit, but on a landed basis, that was afterwards taken from under it; and they were issued, not in amount limited to the country's needs for a currency, but far in excess of such need, a fact in itself, under present defective monetary laws, abundantly sufficient to depreciate and finally destroy the whole scheme.

As we have seen, community gives to money, qualities which belong to no one commodity or service, and which no person or other power can give it. It imparts these qualities for a single purpose—to represent, as a substitute, all commodities and services, in order to facilitate their exchange.

In a somewhat similar way, a railroad company issues tickets for its own convenience and that of travelers. *Quantity*, under present defective monetary conditions, apart from the law, is the sole element of value in money. Under a just and right system, it will make no more difference how much money is issued, than it now does how many railroad tickets are sold, only so that there be enough for all legitimate uses. If one should undertake to set up a banking business on railroad tickets and charge usury on them, he would commit an act no more irrational and wrong, than the man who carries on a banking business on money.

The general powers, bestowed by law upon money, in the absence of governmental restraint, enable the banker to take such advantage of others, but grant him no such right. If government grants him such right, or rather privilege, for it is a perversion of language to use the term right, in such connection, it can do so only, by transcending its legitimate powers and enabling the individual to get private gain, not from his own labor or service, but from one of the incidents of sovereignty that belongs to government, to be used, if at all, not for individual gain, but for the benefit of all its subjects equally.

The *tessera frumentaria*, or corn tickets of the Romans, were a good example of a partial money. They enabled the holders to draw from public storehouses, supplies of provisions; if they could have secured them, whatever else they needed they would have been all-sufficient and perfect money.

In the earlier times when her people were free, their principal wealth, land being yet common property, as it must be in every state where freedom exists, and justice is maintained, was in flocks and herds and her money consisted of copper discs, which bore in relief cattle and sheep, which they represented, and which, with

whatever else was considered property, they legally transferred. When this *fiat* money gave place to a commodity money of the precious metals, the enslavement and final extinction of the free Roman citizen began. The confusion of ideas consequent upon attaching the money value or office, to a commodity, was the prolific source from which came in many deceptive ways, the great power and luxury of the rich, with their attendant vices and crimes, and the unspeakable misery and ruin and vices of the poor.

When her mines of precious metals failed, by abrasion and loss of her coins, her two billions of dollars in amount of currency dwindled to two hundred millions in the times of Diocletian, and with it, men failed and died out of her cities, till, as Gibbon says, wild beasts came back into them, and the long night of the dark ages settled down upon the world. The decadence of liberty kept even pace with the shrinkage of her currency, till finally, freedom was dead, and the world's master doffed the *stephanos*, the laurel crown of the victor that had graced the head of his predecessors, and donned the *diadema*, the symbol of the absolute despotisms of the East.

This country is travelling the same destructive road to-day, and nothing but a waking up to the truth, and a return to the true monetary system can avert her fate. Under the true system, the true idea of commonwealth will be restored, and the individual or the corporation will no longer be permitted to farm out for private gain, what is the very life-blood of community.

History, in every age, shows that as long as man is the cruel, selfish being that he now is, mere legal enactments forbidding usury, the great and effectual destroyer of liberty, will never bring it to an end. Governmental provision must be made, rendering it impossible, or the idea of justice among men, secured by law, entirely abandoned.

Government loan offices, at convenient places, where money, when not needed for use in making exchanges, can be securely deposited without usury or interest, and loaned on good security, at net cost, when wanted, is the perfect and only remedy for usury. No man under such conditions would hoard money either for safety or usury, and panic or money famine would be impossible. This is not mere theory. In part it has been successfully tried many times, notably in case of the bank of Venice, where it was perfectly successful for over six hundred years. The very term money, testifies of a time when men perfectly understood its true nature, knowledge long since practically buried in oblivion. It is derived from the Latin verb *monere* which means to admonish and plainly teaches that the principal thing or power in money, is the fiat or decree of the government that issues it.

In conclusion let us remember:—

First. The individual cannot become the sole owner and master of money, as in the case of other property.

Second. Not even do men earn money; much less does money earn money.

Third. Men pay for having other property kept safely or insured, and can only get it insured for part of its value; but they get men to insure their money to its full amount and give them a heavy annual per cent of usury besides. It is the quality imparted to money by community that enables them to do so. All such gains must be unjust and wrong.

Fourth. The fact that money is hoarded to be loaned on usury, makes it impossible for a country to have a just monetary system, or standard of value.

Fifth. Usury, as all history testifies, is the principal cause of the great inequalities in human condition, and so, in time, of the destruction of nations. Bacon says, "The usurer, trading upon a certainty and all other men upon uncertainties, in the end of the game, all the money will be in the box."

Sixth. Money cannot be made or earned by an individual man, or combination of men, but is a product of community, or government, and all the benefits or avails of it, beyond its simple use in effecting exchanges, belongs to community.

Seventh. Being the product of government, it is the sole province of that power to determine how it shall be used, and it cannot rightfully allow the power granted by itself for the benefit of all its subjects equally, to be used directly by individuals, to heap up money by usury for their own benefit at the expense of the mass of its subjects.

Eighth. Usury can be prevented only by government or private combinations making it impossible to loan on usury.

Ninth. Down to some two hundred years ago, the law of England and God's law were in accord on this subject, both of them strictly forbidding the crime of usury.

Paul says; "The love of money is the root of all evil." Mammon worship was never so rampant and universal as to-day. With Mammon as king, "A government of the people, for the people and by the people," is an impossibility. Money has overborne and set at naught all the claims of God and humanity and in the sacred name of Christianity, which it profanes and practically prostitutes to its base purposes, it defies God and degrades and then robs man. Human rights have become nothing; vested rights, everything. To suppose that this state of affairs can last, is to suppose that God has forsaken the earth.

The time is at hand of which David spake when he said, "When he maketh inquisition for blood, he remembereth them; he forgetteth not the cry of the humble.* * * For the needy shall not always be forgotten, the expectation of the poor shall not perish forever." Any cure for such a state of affairs, to be effective must be radical. This is the time of which it was said; "And now the ax is laid at the root of the tree; therefore every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire." The one of whom John testified in the beginning

of the Christian age that He should baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire, did baptize with the Holy Ghost after His translation, on and subsequent to the day of Pentecost. In addition to the baptism of the Spirit that made men sell all their possessions and lay all the proceeds at the apostle's feet, so that distribution could be made to all that had need, He will now, in the end of the Christian age, the "Last day," as it is called, the Judgment day, that ends the dispensation, baptize with fire, that shall burn up every plant which our "Heavenly Father hath not planted." This fire will burn out of human hearts, the selfishness that now in the name of Christianity, makes merchandise of the gospel, and of the happiness, the liberties and the lives of men. Despite present seeming, the prayer that Jesus taught; "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven," was not uttered in vain, but will certainly find full realization.

No reform is of permanent value that does not take out the roots of the evil, and as the Bible declares, "The love of money is the root of all evil."

It cost billions of treasure and the lives of half a million of young men to destroy negro slavery, but as the devil of human selfishness and greed was not cast out, the lapse of scarce a quarter of a century finds the great mass of laborers, black and white, systematically robbed of the avails of all their labor above a mere subsistence, and in millions of cases they cannot get by their labor, even that.

Let the weary and oppressed toilers of earth take heart, for the light of heaven is already beginning to light up the midnight darkness that precedes the dawn. Already God's watchman's joyful cry, "The morning cometh," wakes the echoes, and startles from their heavy slumbers, earth's sleepers. We are on the eve of God's coming, according to promise, to rescue His sheep out of the mouth of false shepherds who shall no more devour them.

The "New heavens and new earth, wherein dwells righteousness," which means a new church and a new state, which John saw, "Come down from God out of heaven," will soon be here. Then extortion, robbery and crime, with their attendant poverty, suffering, vice, and misery, shall cease, and "God shall wipe the tears from off all faces."



THE * GUIDING * STAR *

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY C. R. TEED, M. D.

A. W. K. ANDREWS, M. D. ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

Nos. 2 and 4 College Place.


CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

SUBSCRIPTIONS IN ADVANCE.

One Year,	\$1.00	Three Months,	\$0.25
Six Months,50	Single Copies,10

Rates for Advertising, 10 cents per line of nine words each. For special rates and standing "ads" address Editor THE GUIDING STAR.

Published the First of Each Month.

 Publishers inserting the foregoing Prospectus in their journals or magazines as a reading notice, will receive a copy of THE GUIDING STAR for one year, if they will mark copy and forward to our office.

Man's Purification from his animal propensities and instincts, merges him out of his animal existence into the domain of his divine life.

Entered at the Post Office in Chicago, Ill., as second-class matter.

THE LAW OF ATONEMENT.

The primary signification of atonement (at-one-ment) as symbolized in the Jewish Church, as pertaining to the office of the Savior of the world, is the unity or conjunction of man with God. Whether we regard the process of conjunction as essential to the restoration of man to a unity with the Father, as a contingency of the fall of man from his once high estate, or as a necessity depending upon a condition contingent upon progressive development, the principle is the same. This point is not now in discussion. The law of atonement was symbolically involved in the system of the Jewish Priesthood, the principal office of which was the offering of sacrifices through which the Jewish people were brought into favorable relationship to God. The real law of sacrifice up to the present time has been but little understood by the church in any age of the world, except by those who have been initiated into its mysteries, either at the inception or termination of the ages, or during periods when certain minds have been developed, capable of sufficient illumination to comprehend the mysteries of genuine faith.

The Jewish sacrifices as symbolic representations, were supposed to point directly to Christ as the *great atonement* for the race; but unless there can be discovered some mysterious principle through which the Lord Jesus can officiate as the MEDIATOR, other than through the Order of Melchizedek, He in no wise ever did, or ever can fulfil the mission of the great Levitical High Priesthood. Jesus came of the tribe of Judah, and was a priest after the Order of Melchizedek, an order which pertained exclusively to the conjunction of the Son with the Father, not a conjunction of the general humanity with God.

The Levitical Priesthood was a priesthood representative of the final unity of man with God, and of the principles and processes by which that conjunction should be effected. In the offering of sacrifices it will be distinctly observed there was a great variety, and this variety was for a specific purpose. Bulls, rams, goats, doves, &c., were devoted to sacrificial purposes, and the sacrifice of each kind was denominated the sacrifice for some specific purpose, having a specific relationship.

It may be generally observed that to the question, "What did the sacrifices imply? to what did they point?" the answer is almost invariably and uniformly given, "They pointed to Christ." There exists also a general conviction that the sacrifices represented some propitiatory influence, by which the wrath of God was appeased through the suffering and sacrifice made by the people, in the devotion of their best productions to the service of Jehovah. Such convictions grow out of radical misconceptions of God's character and the relations of man to Him. Every sacrifice was representative of some human affection to be done away with, or sacrificed by man to insure his affiliation with God the Father. The natural and animal life in man must be destroyed, to insure to him his divine or higher being; hence, if a man would save his life, he must lose it.

To study the special law of sacrifice as herein involved, we will go at once back to Abraham when he was commanded to sacrifice his son Isaac. He had a special paternal affection for this son, which was after the flesh. It is natural to suppose that as through Isaac was to come the fulfilment of the covenant, it was a covenant, (conjunction,) after the law of the flesh, since conjunction with God is not through the flesh, but through the spirit, by the crucifixion of the lusts (desires) of the flesh. As Abraham was about to lift the knife to slay his son—for he had come to the law of sacrifice in his heart, being obedient unto the law of God, through a willingness to sacrifice the love of the son for the love of God—the Angel of God stayed his hand, and he looked and beheld a ram, entangled in the bushes, which he sacrificed. The ram was the symbolic representation of that special love, tendency or desire; namely, an affection, desire, or inclination, which was to turn man from God the Father, through human and sensual determinations. The animals being the symbolic representatives of the various affections,

loves or desires, and also of the intellectual principles, the sacrifice of these animals implied the necessity for the sacrifice of the corresponding desires and principles, to insure an at-one-ment with God. If the animals represented principles of the animal nature of man, and the tendency of that nature; that tendency being towards the flesh, and such tendency militating against the tendency towards God, it can readily be seen how there should be a sacrifice of that nature with all the animal desires, before there can be a determination to God, and thereby a unity with the Father in heaven.

Let us take the ram for instance, as a representative symbolic type, and its sacrifice as a symbolic representation of the kind of love, the love of the child merely because it is my child. It was therefore the sign or symbol of the love of offspring, and back of that the love of begetting, and back of that still the lust of the flesh, simply for the gratification of desire. The sacrifice of the ram did not point to Christ as a whole, but to Christ as possessing the attribute of having overcome the desire to beget by natural generation, through which power he was enabled to beget by regeneration. The mere fact that Jesus overcame, and that some will believe on him in the sense in which men are supposed to believe, will not save an individual man or woman. His overcoming not only that love, but many other loves symbolized by many other typical sacrifices, enabled him to pass through an incorruptible dissolution by which the race could be impregnated with the same possibilities and powers. He thus at the end of the age, enables all who are developed to the standard of applying the same specific laws of life as he applied, to overcome their natural and human tendencies, and become *at one* with God, the Father of the race; and by confessing God as the one common Father, acknowledging the whole human family as the *one common brotherhood*.

I have hinted at the fact that Jesus, as coming through the house of Judah, and being a High Priest after the Order of Melchizedek, could not fulfil the law of the Levitical Order, except through some mysterious principle not known to the world and church. I will now endeavor to make plain the fact of the existence of such a mystery and the nature of it, one purpose of which will be to show how the Levitical Priesthood could be made the type of Christ's Priesthood.

The law of sacrifice and at-one-ment is directly antagonistic to the general Christian idea of the *vicarious* at-one-ment; that is, that one, the innocent, could die for the guilty without the guilty making his own sacrifice. Admitting it to be true that somehow, to be shown, the Levitical sacrifices did point to Christ, what do they prove? Who furnished the sacrifices? All sacrifices offered came from the people, from the firstlings of their flocks, and the firstfruits of their land. These productions were the results of their own labor and were their own property. If they were a type of Christ, they indicated this, that the substance of Christ, the offering, originally came from the people; that He was the product of human

effort, that the sacrificial substance of his nature came up by some process as the aggregation and husbanding of their own desires. This will be made clear as I progress.

In the offering of the animal sacrifices, the High Priest in his officiation took the blood of the animals and sprinkled it upon the various parts of the sanctuary. By this process the sanctuary became polluted. What was this sanctuary? It was the symbol or type of the dwelling place of the Word. It was divided into two parts, the holy place, the symbol of Truth, and the Most Holy, the real tabernacle or dwelling of Jehovah, the Word, the divine principle of desire. The sanctuary in the most literal degree was a type of the humanity of God himself. What did its pollution imply? by what process was it accomplished? The sacrifices were spotless. The killing of the animals symbolized the degeneracy of the life of God in man through the corruptions of the human nature. Man originally possessed the life of God, pure and spotless. By the pollution of his nature through the fall, the life of God had become prostituted. The spotless animal implied the original purity in man from God. The killing of the animal by the priest signified the death or fall or descent of the human loves or desires. The sprinkling of the blood upon the tabernacle implied the gradual pollution of the interior nature of man till his entire being was separated from God.

As applying to the universal humanity, Jesus representing the tabernacle of the Word and the Word himself, it signified that the Savior of the world should descend into the race, take upon himself the actual fallen nature, and at his coming in the end of the dispensation, be born in sin and shapen in iniquity; that He should come to the world as a perfectly natural man, and as typified by the cleansing of the sanctuary should overcome the sinful nature which he takes upon himself and thus be enabled to lead the race by redemption into life.

Let the reader notice that the sanctuary, the type of the Divine Human, became polluted by the sprinkling of the blood of the dead animals, which represented the prostitution of the divine affections in man.

At the end of the year, which was a type of the end of the age, the High Priest cleansed the sanctuary. If the tabernacle was a type of the Divine Humanity—Jesus the Christ, who was the very Word—and its pollution signified the pollution of that humanity, how was the transformation effected? The body of Jesus was dissolved through his translation. The Holy Spirit was the product of that dissolution. The Holy Spirit was the very substance of the Lord's body. By the descent of this Spirit into the race, the race partook of and appropriated the divine nature. By thus partaking of Him they fulfilled the saying, "Except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life and I will raise him up at the last day." The divine nature, being appropriated by the race

through its declension in the church, was prostituted to the sensual tendencies of man, brought down into the animal principle under the power of sensual propagation, and thus reproduced to be born of sinful man through the law of natural development.

When the time is ripe for the coming of the Christ, he comes forth as a sinful man, having taken upon himself the sinful nature. Thus the sanctuary is polluted or defiled, and he becomes the High Priest after the Levitical Order, instead of the Melchizediacal Order. He purifies his nature first by eliminating error from truth. When this is accomplished, the Truth, the Science of Life, is made manifest, by which, in its application, life itself is attained through its purification. As the death of man was brought about by the corruption of the divine nature in man, life could only be brought about by the sacrifice of the animal propensities in man, and a restoration to the life of God.

EXTRACTS FROM "KORESHAN ASTRONOMY."

By PROF. ROYAL O. SPEAR, GRADUATE OF THE "COLLEGE OF LIFE."

SOON TO BE ISSUED BY THE "GUIDING STAR PUBLISHING HOUSE."

Is the sun hot, or is it cold? The reader observes that authorities differ. If it is such a large burning orb as astronomers declare, why does the cold increase the higher we go? On the tops of mountains there is perpetual snow. Ice, snow, and hail, are formed high in the air, and every test that has been applied, demonstrates the colder condition of the higher atmosphere. Those who teach that the sun is hot, have not been able to answer these questions; and it is not in accordance with common observations concerning heat, to say that the heat of the sun can flit across millions of miles of cold space, and still be heat. We know such cannot be the case. The later savants conclude that the sun is an ignited body, without combustion; that it is surrounded by atmospheres; that the ignition of the sun vibrates its atmospheres and the surrounding ocean of ether, which vibration or trembling comes flitting through the long, cold, cheerless distance of ninety-five millions of miles, and that the friction of these gentle waves of ether (a jelly-like substance) on the particles of matter in our atmosphere, causes a general combustion, the product of which is light and heat.

The theory of Newton was, that heat leaves the sun as a substance, but he did not brace his theory, and the later physicists destroyed it. That light and heat could come through so much space and still be light and heat, when the distance through which they come is both cold and dark, is not a rational theory. The later theory is, that light and heat are nothing but modes of motion; that they are not substance, but leave the sun as motion, and traverse the immensity

of space as motion, which by its action on our atmosphere produces light and heat. It is quite generally conceded, that if we ascend ten miles into the atmosphere, a condition of absolute cold is reached.

I desire the reader to note critically the two theories of our able men, and see if he can discover any reason for his faith. Note carefully that there is no light and heat, as such, from the sun, until they are produced in our atmosphere by the decomposition and combustion of matter; that light and heat are not substantial forces, but modes of motion. It would seem as if one would need no further proof that the whole Copernican system of Astronomy, and much that is taught in Natural Philosophy, especially that on vision, optics, &c., is a poorly constructed theory, with less than cob-web strength to hold it together. I desire the reader to consider carefully this theory of modern astronomers, that light, heat, electricity, magnetism, and gravity, are not substances, but are merely motion, or nothing, of themselves. Cold is nothing; darkness is nothing; heat and light are nothing. They have no existence or being. Sight is nothing; sound is nothing; sensation is nothing; and according to the same theory, the soul and spirit are nothing. All these are but modes of motion, and are not substantial. I wish the reader to understand that these are not my convictions. They are the conclusions of many able men, for the questioning of whose opinions I am derided. While in school I was taught all of these theories but the last one, which says that soul and spirit are but motion. I was taught in an Orthodox College, and my teachers and able professors delighted to quote these astronomical sages when we were considering the substantiality of light, heat, gravity, &c.; but when these same wise men observed that the operations of animal life were but modes of motion, the professors of the orthodox faith denounced them as materialists, and dangerous to the stability of the Christian's hope and expectation. O consistency! Thou art a jewel.

If light and heat are not substantial, and if there are no light and heat until this gentle motion of *nothing* strikes our atmosphere, there are some curious problems to be worked out by the man who has faith to believe such nonsense. The facts and the theories of these teachers are at variance, hence I conclude they are deluded and can not help themselves. Every chemist of ordinary observation knows that light and heat from the sun produce a chemical action on the entire surface of the earth. Its rays, said to be light and heat, exert chemical and magnetic action upon the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms. These two agents, which are said to be nothing but motion, have power to give life, health, energy, color, and actual substance, to all animal, vegetable, and mineral existence. If light and heat be nothing, it must be a nothing of very peculiar character, for they cannot be superseded by anything else. The sun's rays are absolutely necessary to all animal and vegetable life. If they have a chemical action on all things on the surface of the earth, or on any one thing, the conclusion is irresistible

that they must add something which performs the chemical action. Nothing cannot perform a chemical action. Light, heat, electricity, &c., do perform such action; therefore I must conclude that these agencies are actual substances, the philosophers to the contrary notwithstanding. This doctrine or theory upon which the Copernican system of Astronomy depends, is a fallacy; hence I deny the whole system for the fourth time.

Again: upon their theory, the sun is useless and powerless without our atmosphere. There is neither light nor heat proper from the sun. Nothing but motion is generated there! This motion we are told, after it traverses ninety-five millions of miles, comes in contact with the air, and by *friction* disintegrates substances which generate light and heat. But these same teachers fail to state how motion can decompose matter in the air any better than it can on the earth, in giving color, life, and substance, to the vegetable kingdom. This theory has no science, and less sense in it. Right here comes a question that has not been answered; at least I have not found it answered. Newton, Herschel, Tyndal, Thompson, and Proctor, have not asked the question, nor do I know that they were ever called upon to answer it. It is fatal to the whole modern system of astronomy and to my mind cannot be scientifically and rationally answered. If it can, I hope some person who can solve the problem, will favor me with the solution. It is this:—

If the sun be not in combustion, and of late they all agree it is not; and if actual streams of light and heat from it do not fill eternal space, and they all agree that they do not; and if there be no light and heat until after this motion from the sun strikes our atmosphere, how can they tell *where* the sun really is, how *far* it is, or how *large* it is, or in what *direction* it is from our earth? It seems strange to me that all humanity should fall into the same error; yet they have done it. Whether the sun be an ignited body, or whether it be surrounded by luminous atmospheres, (and either assumption is mere guess work,) all agree that the atmosphere of the earth is necessary to receive and transform the sun's forces to light and heat. There would be no sun to our earth if there were no atmospheres. That which we see in our atmosphere is not the real sun, but only its reflection; the focalization, in our atmosphere, of the forces of the central sun. These forces constitute the projected sun, and not the real *center* of physical light and heat. This apparent sun is wholly within our atmosphere, and we can see nothing beyond. No one of our modern astronomers can tell the direction of the real from the apparent sun; hence none of them know its size or distance. They have presumed to face a non-thinking humanity, to teach them two opposing theories; one of them philosophical and the other astronomical. Light and heat, with their laws and principles, belong to physics; while observations of the heavens, &c., belong to astronomy. The last depends upon the first.

We are taught in physics the non-substantiality of light and heat; that their use to the earth depends upon the atmosphere, while in astronomy this theory is

ignored, and the astronomers pretend to tell us all about objects, their magnitudes and distances, for billions of miles beyond. As the sun, we are taught, is dependent on the air, we cannot know of it beyond the air through any of the modern methods of calculation. The books teach us that the air extends into the heavens some fifty miles. If this be correct, (but it is not,) the sun, moon, and stars, are within fifty miles of us. There are several calculations which justify us in the conclusion that the air extends several hundred miles into the heavens. I am satisfied from various reasons, that the air extends upwards, from 700 to 1000 miles. The main point, however, which I wish to fasten in the mind of the reader, is this; there is no sun to the earth except by the office of the atmosphere; and the light and heat which appear to come from the sun, do not come from it in fact, but only in appearance. They are generated in our atmosphere, and have their greatest power, energy, and strength, on the earth. This is especially true of heat. The books do not state in just so many words that there is no sun without our atmosphere, but no critical reader can reach any other conclusion. They do state that there would be no twilight, and no general light, except for the atmosphere. They do say all rooms, houses, and sheds, would be dark but for the action of the air. Judging from the many things they say, there is no light only as it is generated by the friction of a supposed ethereal motion on our atmosphere; and I am not afraid of having my conclusion successfully contradicted. Judging from their own facts and theories, the real sun itself is not seen. What we do see is but the focalization of its reflections in our own atmosphere, and not a solid, material body, many million miles away; so I am bound to dismiss the whole theory for the fifth time.

Astronomers make observations of the visible sun. They measure its parallax as they suppose, and get the diameter of its disk. They conclude that it is ninety-five million miles away, and that its diameter is 850,000 miles; but they are looking, not at the sun, but at its picture, beyond which they know nothing.

It is a fact, yes a law, that opaque bodies, by perspective, *come to a point in just 3000 times their diameters*. That is, if a ball is one foot in diameter, it would become a point 3000 feet away; or it should appear as a point at the end of 3000 feet. While this is said to be true of opaque bodies, it is said not to be true of luminous bodies. According to this law, the sun, because it is luminous, and extends its perspective beyond that of opaque bodies, should be *more than two and a half billions of miles distant*; for even as an opaque body, according to the law of perspective, it should not terminate in a point at less than that distance. We are told that the sun is only 95,000,000 of miles away. This is only about one twenty-seventh as far as the law of perspective would place it, even if it were opaque; (850,000 multiplied by 3,000 equals 2,550,000,000 miles;) but it has lost nearly all of its size in only 95,000,000 of miles according to the commensuration of astronomers, when according to the law of perspective it should as a luminous body, be at least 2,500,000,000 miles distant, to assume the apparent diameter of only about two feet, which astronomers are agreed upon as the apparent size of the sun.

You say it is luminous. So much the worse for your computations; for if it is as large as the Copernican system makes it, and is only 95,000,000 of miles away, and is luminous at that, it should appear to be many thousands of miles, instead of about two feet in diameter. If it dwindles, as it is regarded, from a diameter of 850,000 miles to a mathematical point, in a distance of 2,550,000,000 miles, according to computation in accordance with the law of perspective for opaque bodies, then, as a *luminous* body, it should appear as an object of two feet in diameter at even a much greater distance.

One other fact convinces me that the present theory is false, and that is, that the sun loses about 75 seconds of a degree when the earth is in perihelion. That is, in January, the sun's disk is 75 seconds, or one forty-eighth of a degree larger than in June. They also say that the sun is 3,000,000 miles nearer the earth in January than in June; from which we learn that the sun appears to lose one forty-eighth of its diameter in 3,000,000 miles. The average diameter during the year is 32 minutes of a degree. A little calculation proves that the sun would be a focal point in 77,000,000 miles more, which added to 93,000,000, makes 170,000,000 miles from the earth, when it would be a star; but if it be 850,000 miles in diameter, the law of perspective would place it over 2,500,000,000 miles. Here is a disagreement. It is either not 850,000 miles in diameter, or else to-day it is not 32 minutes of a degree, and there is not a change of 75 seconds in 3,000,000 miles. The law of perspective of opaque bodies is true. The sun's disk can be measured now, so I am forced to conclude that the sun is not 850,000 miles in diameter, but, according to their own facts, it is only 57,000 miles in diameter; for 3,000 multiplied by 57,000 equals 171,000,000 miles, the focal point by perspective.

Again: I am told to cut a piece of paper into circular shape, which shall exactly cover the sun's disk at a certain distance from the eye. Then I have the following proportion: The distance to the paper is to the distance to the sun, as the diameter of the paper is to the diameter of the sun. Well; let us take the moon for our piece of paper. I find in the books that the moon exactly covers the sun's disk in a total eclipse; so I say, the distance to the moon—240,000 miles—is to the distance to the sun—93,000,000 miles—as the diameter of the moon—2,000 miles—is to the diameter of the sun. The calculation shows the sun's diameter to be 775,000 miles. The best of them make a difference of 37,000 miles in the sun's diameter; hence something wrong.

From this we learn that all which the astronomers teach us about the sun is theory; and I don't believe it for the sixth time.

Most people prefer to believe blindly, rather than question the Copernican system of Astronomy. They are so in the habit of permitting a few men to do their thinking, that they never question the tenets of the sciences, as promulgated by the so-called thinkers. They turn with a sneer upon any one who has the courage to question the truth of established theories.

All astronomical teachers depend on observations which are derived through

the function of vision. The astronomers behold the stars in their courses, the planets in their celestial orbits, the sun and moon in all their glory, splendor, and ever changing positions and relations. They have mapped out the course of the stars, given the orbits of the planets, and calculated as they suppose, the exact, at least the approximate magnitude of all the heavenly bodies. But have they? As all they know is derived from observations which depend upon vision, we must turn again to the physicists, to see what they teach as the truth of astronomical science.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

With the beginning of Vol. III. of the GUIDING STAR, Jan., 1889, we shall increase its size to 48 pages, and advance the price to \$2.00 per year. The increasing demand for the science of the New Age, in both its physical and its metaphysical domain, and the growing necessity for instruction in the laws which govern the physical world, and the correct adjustment of theories to the facts by which these theories are sustained, call upon us to give out to the best of our ability, and to the fullest extent, the knowledges which have been given to the Koreshan head for dissemination to the world. Greater than for the knowledge of the laws which create and govern the physical world, is the hunger for knowledge of the spiritual world; for a true, and rational, and scientific demonstration of man's origin, his relation, and his destiny. This we purpose to give, and in such a clear, and rational, and demonstrable manner, that it can be neither gainsaid nor resisted successfully. We purpose not only to give the laws of immortal life, by which man shall enter into his blissful and eternal rest, but we purpose to also give the laws of harmonic grouping and relation in the natural and mortal existence, that by orderly and properly balanced relations, even hell itself, in the age to come, shall seem tolerable in comparison with this lowest deep through which man is now passing.

By this we mean the establishment of the Divine Government in the earth, by the power of which the hells themselves shall come into order and subjection to the Divine authority, and the Golden Age come again of which poets have sung in all the recorded pages of the past, as the lingering sweetness of a long forgotten dream.

To the friends of our cause we appeal for their aid in donations, or in personal efforts in obtaining subscriptions for the STAR, that we may enlarge the sphere of our operations as rapidly as possible, and send out the life giving Word to all the nations of the earth. Our cause will triumph for God is in it, but it remains for you to decide whether you will have part and lot in this great work, the crowning work of all time, or wait till the battle is fought and the victory won, and feel that you have no right to the reward which awaits the faithful servant, and are no partaker of the supreme joys of the kingdom of our God.

The November and December numbers of the STAR will be issued in one, which will close the second volume, after which we expect to issue it regularly in its enlarged form, and fulfil to the utmost all our promises to subscribers. Friends of this work send us your names.

ASSOCIATE EDITOR.