TORCH OF REASON.

VOL. 2. SILVERTON, OREGON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1898. NO. 13.

It Is Time.

In this age, when gold is king,
Seated on a brazen throne;
When 'tis thought the proper thing
To rate men by what they own;
When the brute is more and more,
And the moral less and less;
When the world is lorded o'er
By corruption and excess;
It is time that men of worth
Boldly step into the van,
With this message to the earth:
Down with Mammon, up with Man.

We have seen the idler feast
While the toiler lacked for bread;
We have seen the king and priest
Rob the living and the dead;
We have seen the thief arrayed
In the purple robes of state,
While the honest man was made
To beg succor at his gate.
It has ever been the same
Since this reign of wealth began;
Let us stop the sickening game—
Down with Mammon, up with Man.

Earth is far to wise and old
For a lordling or a slave;
To respect a band of gold
On the forehead of a knave;
Far too old for war and hate,
Old enough for brotherhood;
Old enough to found a state
Where men seek each other's good.
We have worked for self too long.
Let us try a better plan:
Let us labor for the throng—
Down with Mammon, up with Man.

Oh, my people! will you heed?
Be no more like beasts of prey;
Turn from selfishness and greed;
Let us find a better way.
From the worn-out lies of old,
Let us make the whole world free:
Down with kings and priests and gold,
Up with Good, Humanity.
Lust for gain breeds hate and crime:
Let us crush it while we can;
Let us bring the better time—
Down with Mammon, up with Man.

—[Selected.

Fallacy of False Analogies.

The following, from John Stuart Mills' "System of Logic", very nicely illustrates the errors which Christians, spiritualis, theosophists and others have made in trying to find reasons for their false, unprovable theories, and the reader is asked to apply to them this great philosopher's idea, viz., that when a resemblance in one point is inferred from resemblance in another point, and there is no evidence to connect the two circumstances by way of causation, but the evidence tends positively to disconnect them, this inference is a fallacy of false analogy. If we apply this rule to the idea of there being a god because watches, wagons, etc., have makers, and to the idea of immortality because grubs become butterflies, etc., etc, etc., after we have read the following, we believe we will never again be led astray by shallow figures from shallow brains, and we will be able to put others on the right road to truth and common sense.—ED.

As a first instance, we may cite that favorite argument in defence of absolute power, drawn from the analogy of paternal government in a family, which government is not, and by universal admission ought not to be, controlled by (though it ought sometimes to be controlled for) the children. Paternal government, in a family, works well; therefore, says the argument, despotic government in the state will work well: implying that the beneficial results of paternal government depend, in the family, upon the only point which it has in common with political despotism, namely, irresponsibility. Whereas, it does not depend upon that, but upon two other atributes of parental government, the affection of the parent for the children and the superiority of the parent in wisdom and experience; neither of which properties can be reckoned upon, or are at all likely to exist between a political despot and his subjects; and when either of these circumstances fail, even in the family, and the influence of the irresponsibility is allowed to work uncorrected, the result is anything but good government. This, therefore, is a false analogy.

Another example is the not uncommon dictum, that bodies politic have youth, maturity, old age, and death, like bodies natural; that after a certain duration of prosperity, they tend spontaneously to decay. This also is a false analogy, because the decay of the vital powers in an animated body can be distinctly traced to the natural progress of those very changes of structure which, in their earlier stages, constitute its growth to maturity; while in the body politic the progress of those changes cannot, generally speaking, have any effect but the still further continuance of growth: it is the stoppage of that progress, and the commencement of retrogression, that alone would constitute decay. Bodies politic die, but it is of disease, or violent death; they have no old age.

The following sentence from Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity" is an instance of false analogy from physical bodies to what are called bodies politic. "As there could be in natural bodies no notion of anything unless there were some which moveth all things, and continueth immovable, even so in politic societies there must be some unpunishable, or else no man shall suffer punishment." There is a double fallacy here, for not only the analogy, but the premise from which it is drawn, is untenable. The notion that there must be something immovable which moves all other things, is the old scholastic error of a 'primum mobile'.

Some of the false analogies upon which systems of physics were confidently grounded in the time of the Greek philosophers, are such as we now call fanciful, not that the resemblances are not often real, but that it is long since any one has been inclined to draw from them the inferences which were then drawn. Such, for instance, are the curious speculations of the Pythagoreans on the subject of numbers. Finding that the distances of the planets bore or seemed to bear to one another a proportion not varying much from that of the divisions of the monochord, they inferred from it the existence of an inaudible music, that of the spheres: as if the music of a harp had depended solely on the numerical proportions, and not on the material, nor even on the existence of any material, any strings at all. It has been similarly imagined that certain combinations of numbers, which were found to prevail in some natural phenomena, must run through the whole of nature: as that there must be four elements, because there are four possible combinations of hot and cold, wet and dry: that there must be seven planets, because there were seven metals, and even because there were seven days of the week. Kepler himself thought there could be only six planets because there were only five regular solids. With these we may class the reasonings, so common in the speculations of the ancients, founded upon a supposed perfection in nature; meaning by nature the cutomary order of events as they take place of themselves without human interference. This also is a rude guess at an analogy supposed to pervade all phenomena, however dissimilar. Since what was thought to be perfection appeared to obtain in some phenomena, it was inferred to obtain in all. 'We always suppose that which is better to take place in nature, if it be possible,' says Aristotle: and the vaguest and most heterogenous qualities being confounded together under the notion of being better, there was no limit to the wildness of the inferences. Thus, because the heavenly bodies were 'perfect' they must move in circles and uniformly. For 'they' (the Pythagoreans) 'would not allow', says Geminus, 'of any such disorder among divine and eternal things, as they should sometimes move quicker and sometimes slower, and sometimes stand still, for no one would tolerate such anomaly in the movements even of a man, who was decent and orderly. The occasions of life, however, are often reasons for men going quicker or slower, but in the incorruptible nature of the stars, it is not possible that any cause can be alleged of quickness or slowness.' It is seeking an argument of analogy very far to suppose that the stars must observe the rules of decorum in gait and carriage, prescribed for themselves by the long-bearded philosophers satirized by Lucian.

As late as the Copernican controversy it was urged as an argument in favour of the true theory of the solar system, that 'it placed the fire, the noblest element, in the centre of the universe.' This was a remnant of the notion that the order of nature must be perfect, and that perfection consisted in conformity to rules of precedency in dignity, either real or conventional. Again, reverting to numbers: certain numbers are perfect, therefore those numbers must obtain in the great phenomena of nature. Six was a perfect number, that is, equal to the sum of all its factors; an additional reason why there must be exactly six planets. The Pythagoreans, on the other hand attributed perfection to the number ten, but agreed in thinking that the perfect number must be somehow realized in the heavens; and knowing only of nine heavenly bodies to make up the enumeration, they asserted 'that there was an antichthon or counter-earth, on the other side of the sun, invisible to us.' Even Huygens was persuaded that when the number of the heavenly bodies had reached twelve, it could not admit of any further increase. Creative power could not go beyond that sacred number.