

# TORCH OF



# REASON.

"TRUTH BEARS THE TORCH IN THE SEARCH FOR TRUTH."—*Lucretius.*

VOL. 3.

SILVERTON, OREGON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1899.

NO. 36.

## Moral Worth.

I LOVE the man who scorns to be,  
To name or sect, a slave;  
Whose heart is like the sunshine—  
free—  
Free as the ocean wave;  
Who, when he sees oppression, wrong,  
Speaks out in thunder tones;  
Who feels with truth that he is strong  
To grapple e'en with thrones.

I love the man who scorns to do  
An action mean or low;  
Who will a nobler course pursue,  
To stranger, friend, or foe;  
Who seeks for justice, good to gain,  
Is merciful and kind;  
Who will not cause a needless pain  
In body or in mind.

—[Selected.]

## The Fundamental Fallacy.

BY W. H. MAPLE.

IT is admitted, as it must be, that particular things and events have causes; but, in the opinion of the writer, the great mistake in the reasoning that gives to the great whole of things a "beginning," lies simply in viewing this totality, this aggregation of all things, as a thing or event.

The reasoning of the world that has resulted in the almost universal belief in a first cause may all be condensed into the following brief syllogism:—

Major premise: Every event or thing has a cause.

Minor premise: The universe—the totality of things—is a thing or event.

Conclusion: Therefore, the totality of things had a cause.

That this may clearly be seen to embrace the substance of all mental processes lying back of the popular belief in question, let the reader again be reminded that the idea of the relation of cause and effect underlies all judgments on the subject of the origin of things.

It is not meant, of course, that every believer in a first cause consciously constructs just this formal argument; but whenever the inquiry, whence came things? has occurred to the mind, and the mind has acted at all in giving an answer to the query, it has, necessarily, used, in substance, this same intellectual process; for the best possible reason, to wit, that there was no other method to use.

If it was not known that bodies have extension, no one would ever attempt to measure a body. And it is only because substances generally have size that the mind thinks of extension in connection with them. And it is equally evident, as has before been shown, that it is only because certain par-

ticular things have causes that causes are sought for other things.

As well try to compute the size or distance of some far-away heavenly body, without employing the fundamental principles of arithmetic, as to seek for the origin of things as a whole, without having recourse to the fundamental idea that is made the first premise in this syllogism.

But is there fallacy in this argument?

Is the conclusion of the syllogism correct and necessary?

If both of the premises are really true there is, of course, no escaping the full force of the conclusion. It is in such case a true statement beyond question.

And the first premise being admitted, it follows, that if there is fault in the argument it lies in the second or minor premise, which declares the totality of things to be a "thing or event."

Now, in order to make a valid argument the words "thing" and "event" must be used in the same sense in both premises—they must represent the same mental conception.

But the writer asserts that the "totality of things" is not and can not be a "thing" or "event" in the same sense and meaning that these words necessarily have in the first premise; and that the argument is, therefore, defective and the conclusion worthless.

He will proceed to prove this statement in the following manner:

By the word thing, event, phenomenon or similar word, that might be used in the major premise is meant a particular thing, as compared with other things; one thing out of more or many; a part, an individual.

The idea of relation and condition, and, hence, of something outside the thing considered, is a part of the very conception on which is based the judgment, "every event or thing has a cause."

This is so evident that the proposition, "every event or thing has a cause," may, without any violence to its meaning, be stated as follows:

Every event or thing is the result of, and exists only because there are, other things or events.

And, therefore, the words "thing" and "event," used in the major premise, mean a part only of the totality of things.

But these words can not have this meaning in the minor premise.

It requires no argument to prove that the totality of things is not a

part of any thing. The whole of things can never be at the same time a part of those things.

Therefore, it is most evident that this argument is fallacious, in that it assumes that the great whole of things is a thing in the same sense in which this word is used in the first premise.

And it is equally evident that the totality of things does not demand a cause, because particular things must have and do have causes.

Again, all arguments based on such a syllogism for the purpose of proving a beginning for things or of succession, are absurd; for the reason that if the universe as a whole is regarded as a thing or event, the argument seeks to establish the truth of the proposition: "All things—the totality of things included as one thing—have causes." The answer can not then be: There is one and only one uncaused cause—a first cause.—[No Beginning.]

## The Infidel.

BY R. G. INGERSOLL.

NO effort has been spared in any age of the world to crush out opposition. The Church used painting, music and architecture, simply to degrade mankind. But there are men that nothing can awe. There have been at all times brave spirits that dared even the gods. Some proud head has always been above the waves. In every age some Diogenes has sacrificed to all the deities. True genius never cowers, and there is always some Samson feeling for the pillars of authority.

Cathedrals and domes, and chimes and chants; temples frescoed and groined and carved, and gilded with gold; altars and tapers, and paintings of virgin and babe; censer and chalice, chasuble, paten and alb; organs and anthems and incense rising to the winged and blest; maniple, anice and stole; crosses and crosiers, tiaras and crowns; mitres and missals and masses; rosaries, relics and robes; martyrs and saints, and windows stained as with the blood of Christ—never for one moment awed the brave, proud spirit of the Infidel. He knew that all the pomp and glitter had been purchased with Liberty—that priceless jewel of the soul. In looking at the cathedral he remembered the dungeon. The music of the organ was not loud enough to drown the clank of fetters. He could not forget that the taper had lighted the fagot. He knew that the cross adorned the hilt of the sword, and so where others worshipped, he wept.—[Prose Poems and Selections.]

## The Church and Woman.

BY H. M. TABER.

THE "fathers" of the Christian Church, drawing their inspiration, doubtless, from the writings of the Old and New Testaments, have given their opinion of woman, which, I submit, is not quite as flattering to her as the opinion of some who do not believe in the fathers.

Mrs. Mary A. Livermore says: "The early Church fathers denounced women as noxious animals, necessary evils and domestic perils."

Lecky says: "Fierce invectives against the sex form a conspicuous and grotesque portion of the writings of the fathers."

Mrs. Stanton says that holy books and the priesthood teach that "woman is the author of sin, who (in collusion with the devil) effected the fall of man."

Gamble says that "in the fourth century holy men gravely argued the question, 'ought women to be called human beings?'"

But let the Christian fathers speak for themselves. Tertulian, in the following flattering manner, addresses woman: "You are the devil's gateway; the unsealer of the forbidden tree; the first deserter from the divine law. You are she who persuaded him whom the devil was not valiant enough to attack. You destroyed God's image—man."

Clement, of Alexandria, says: "It brings shame, to reflect of what nature woman is."

Gregory Thaumaturgus says: "One man among a thousand may be pure; a woman, never."

"Woman is the organ of the devil."—St. Bernard.

"Her voice is the hissing of the serpent."—St. Anthony.

"Woman is the instrument which the devil uses to get possession of our souls."—St. Cyprian.

"Woman is a scorpion."—St. Bonaventura.

"The gate of the devil, the road of iniquity."—St. Jerome.

"Woman is a daughter of falsehood, a sentinel of hell; the enemy of peace."—St. John Damascene.

"Of all wild beasts, the most dangerous is woman."—St. John Chrysostom.

"Woman has the poison of an asp, the malice of a dragon."—St. Gregory-the-Great.

Is it surprising, with such instructions from the fathers, that the children of the Christian church should not "look up to women, and consider them men's equal?"

The following lines of Milton reflect the estimate of woman, which the teachings of Christianity has inculcated:

"Oh, why did God,  
Creator wise, that peopled highest heaven  
With spirits masculine, create at last  
This novelty on earth, this fair defect  
Of nature, and not fill the world at once  
With man as angels, without feminine?"  
—[Faith or Fact.]