

# TORCH OF



# REASON.

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

VOL. 4.

SILVERTON, OREGON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 1, E. M. 300 (A. D. 1900.)

NO. 4.

## The Present.

BY ADELAIDE A. PROCTOR.

Do not crouch today and worship  
The old Past, whose life is fled;  
Hush your voice with tender reverence;  
Crowned he lies, but cold and dead.  
For the Present reigns our monarch,  
With an added weight of hours;  
Honor her, for she is mighty!  
Honor her, for she is ours!

See the shadow of his heroes  
Girt around her cloudy throne;  
Every day the ranks are strengthened  
By great hearts to him unknown;  
Noble things the great Past promised;  
Holy dreams both strange and new;  
But the Present shall fulfil them,  
What he promised, she shall do.

She inherits all his treasures,  
She is heir to all his fame;  
And the light that lightens round her  
Is the luster of his name.  
She is wise with all his wisdom,  
Living on his grave she stands;  
On her brow she bears his laurels,  
And his harvest in her hands.

Coward can she reign and conquer  
If we thus her glory dim;  
Let us fight for her as nobly  
As our fathers fought for him.  
God [Man] crowns the dying ages,  
Bids her rule and us obey;  
Bids us cast our lives before her;  
Bids us serve the great Today.

## Manliness, the Basis of Lite.

BY DR. PAUL CARUS.

MR. HERBERT SPENCER builds his system of ethics upon the supposition that "conduciveness to happiness is the ultimate test of perfection in a man's nature." He quotes Aristotle's view, that the proper work of man "consists in the active exercise of the mental capacities conformably to reason," and that "the supreme good of man will consist in performing this work with excellence or virtue; herein he will obtain happiness." Mr. Spencer blames Aristotle for "seeking to define happiness in terms of virtue instead of defining virtue in terms of happiness," and he seriously attempts to justify the opinion, that if immoral acts caused agreeable sensations, we would not call them crimes.

There is a great difference between pleasures and the peace of soul that a good conscience alone can give. Mr. Spencer classes both as "pleasurable sensations" and makes them the test of ethics. The happiness of which Aristotle speaks consists in the satisfaction of having done one's duty, which has nothing in common with any "pleasurable sensation;" for it is no sensation and has as little to do with sense-activity as for instance has our satisfaction at the correctness of a logical judgment. Mr. Spencer might with the very same arguments he uses for his theory of

ethics, declare that the ultimate test of logical truth is its "conduciveness to happiness." Those logical arguments, he might say, which cause pleasurable sensations are correct, those which have pain giving effects are incorrect; and the same holds good for all the departments of human activity and the truths of scientific inquiry. But who would maintain that the solution of a mathematical problem is right in so far and because it gives pleasure to him who has solved it? I know of circle squarers who derive a greater satisfaction from their most ridiculous blunders than any discoverer or inventor possibly can attain by most important and useful discoveries. Yet a moral act, we are told, is good solely because and in so far as it produces pleasurable sensations.

Goethe, who, like Aristotle, defines happiness in terms of virtue, objects most strongly against any other kind of happiness. In the second part of Faust the young emperor is described not as vicious, but as a man desirous to enjoy himself; and Faust pronounces a very severe judgment about a tendency of finding virtue in happiness instead of happiness in virtue. He says:

Enjoyment makes us gross,  
Geniessen macht gemein.

If pleasurable sensations were the standard according to which we have to gauge the ethical worth of actions, they would form the quintessence of ethics and a saying like that of Goethe's would be extremely immoral. Yet it is not so! Is there any one who denies that enjoyment and the hankering after enjoyment weaken the character? To measure the ethical worth of actions by pleasurable sensations is not superficial; it is radically erroneous. We might just as well let the judge give his decisions in court according to the principle that his sentence must produce a surplus of pleasurable feelings in all the parties concerned.

Nature has not intended man to live for the mere enjoyment of life. All egotism will in the end defeat itself. Man's life has a meaning only if he lives the higher life of super-individual aspirations. The individual must cease to consider himself as an individual; he must consider himself as a steward of the soul-life of mankind.

Every one of us has at his birth and through his education received a rich and most valuable inheritance from his fathers, and it stands

in every one's power to increase the spiritual treasure of human soul-life which he has received. The question: Is life worth living? accordingly, depends exclusively on the purpose to which life is devoted. Life is not worth living if a man seeks his own, if he uses his rich inheritance like the prodigal son and wastes his substance to get as much pleasure as possible out of the treasures that his fathers have gathered. However, life is worth living if but the aim of life is high enough to give value to the work of life.

Pessimism has taught that life from the standpoint of a pleasure-seeker has no value; if we expect a satisfaction of our egoistic desires, life will not be worth its own troubles. Life can acquire value only by the use to which it is put. If our days are empty of any action worthy to be done, then they are indeed spent as a tale that is told, although they may be four-score years or more. Our actions only can and must give value to the days of our life. Yet is their strength labor and sorrow; for a life worth being lived is one that is full of active aspirations for something better and higher.

The ethical life accordingly affords indeed the only salvation for man, and the old religions have been religions of salvation to the extent that they have helped man to raise himself above his egotism. The old religions are not wrong; they contain all of them this all-important truth. Yet the truth is wrapped in myths; and the time has come that we are no longer satisfied with myths. The apostle says:

"When I was a child I spoke as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child, but when I became a man, I put away childish things."

Mankind has passed through the phase of childhood in which it could be taught only by myths and parables. As says St. Paul:

"And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ."

"I have fed you with milk, and not with meat; for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able."

We do not intend to abolish the truth of the old religions, but to purify them from their mythological character. We do not come to destroy, but to fulfil.—[The Ethical Problem.

## Matter.

BY G. W. MOREHOUSE.

By the word matter we designate the substance that constitutes the world-building material of the Universe. It is evident to our senses, exists all about us, and in our own bodies. All are more or less familiar with its properties, and its wonderful combinations and varieties. Its usefulness and beauty are recognized and admired in the mineral, the vegetable and the animal kingdoms. Volumes, yea, whole libraries would be inadequate to do justice to the grand subject. I can only indicate a few facts and conclusions with which we are at present most concerned.

Matter exists in at least three forms—solid, liquid and gaseous. Its solid form is due to the absence of heat, and on the application of heat it becomes liquid. A still higher temperature vaporizes. It then fills more space, but on cooling it resumes its original form and size.

Chemical action also changes the forms of matter, decomposing combinations and forming new ones, liberating the component gases of substances, and dissolving minerals or other solids or restoring them. The solid substance becomes an invisible gas, or the reverse. Colorless solutions when combined may produce beautifully colored precipitates. It would be impossible to give much more than a hint of the varieties found in Nature.

Notwithstanding all the changes of form, and the many complex chemical combinations that matter has undergone in Nature, in the laboratory of the chemist, and in the seemingly destructive heat of the furnace, or of the sun, not one particle has ever been destroyed. However changed it may have been, every ounce, and every grain and fraction of a grain, may be accounted for.

It has come to pass that the doctrine of the indestructibility of matter is established beyond a doubt. Matter may be divided and subdivided, and separated into microscopic particles and these into smaller molecules, and these again into indivisible atoms, thousands of times more minute than the molecules, yet, not one of the atoms can be destroyed. It takes its place again, and performs its part in the shifting scene of the Universe, in accordance with the economy of Nature.

Matter then, being indestructible, its creation out of nothing becomes most emphatically unthinkable, and as a matter of course unbelievable. It has always existed and always will. Like time and space it is without beginning or end.—[Wilderness of Worlds.