

# TORCH OF REASON.

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

VOL. 6.

SILVERTON, OREGON, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, E. M. 302 (1902.)

NO. 44.

## Noble!

Edel sei der Mensch,  
Helfreich und gut!  
Denn das allein  
Unterscheidet ihn  
Von allen Wesen,  
Die wir kennen.

Noble let man be,  
Rich-in-help and good!  
For that alone  
Distinguishes him  
From all the Beings,  
Whom we know  
—[GOETHE.]

**THINK** nobly: Do you know  
That thoughts are things?  
And that, for weal or woe,  
To other souls they go,  
On noiseless wings?

Speak nobly: In a word  
The power may rest,  
By which the world is stirred,  
By which its souls are spurred  
To seek the best.

Act nobly: Men give heed  
To him whose work proclaims  
His faith: A helpfull deed  
In others sows the seed  
That grows to higher aims.

Live nobly: He who dies  
For truth, all men adore;  
But he who ever tries,  
By daily sacrifice,  
To live for it, is more!

## ABOUT THE HOLY BIBLE,\*

### Sixty-one Reasons for Doubting.

BY ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

Divided into Sunday Bible Lessons for  
study and reflection.

SIXTH SUNDAY.

**THIRTY-EIGHTH.** Is it to be wondered at that some people have doubted the statement that God told Moses how to make some ointment, hair oil and perfume, and then made it a crime punishable with death to make any like them? Think of a God killing a man for imitating his ointment! (Ex. xxx, 23). Think of a God saying that he made heaven and earth in six days and rested on the seventh day and was refreshed! (Ex. xxxi, 17). Think of this God threatening to destroy the Jews, and being turned from his purpose because Moses told him that the Egyptians might mock him! (Ex. xxxii, 11, 12).

**THIRTY-NINTH.** What must we think of a man impudent enough to break in pieces tables of stone upon which God had written with his finger? What must we think of the goodness of a man that would issue the following order: "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel: Put every man his sword by his side, and go in and out from gate to gate throughout the camp and slay every man his brother, and every man his companion, and every man his neighbor. Consecrate yourselves today to the Lord, even every man upon his son and upon his brother;

\*These 61 reasons from Ingersoll are now to be had of the N. Y. Truth Seeker and in Volume 11 of the Dresden Edition. They were written in the 80s, but not published till after his death. We will print them in parts—each part reads as a whole. We do this because until the people are emancipated from the Catholic Church, the Protestant Bible, and the belief in "the supernatural," there is no hope for this world.—ED. TORCH.

that he may bestow upon you a blessing this day?" (Ex. xxxii, 27-29). Is it true that the God of the Bible demanded human sacrifice? Did it please him for man to kill his neighbor, for brother to murder his brother, and for the father to butcher his son? If there is a God let him cause it to be written in the book of his memory, opposite my name, that I refuted this slander and denied this lie.

**FORTIETH.** Can it be true that God was afraid to trust himself with the Jews for fear he would consume them? Can it be that in order to keep from devouring them he kept away and sent one of his angels in his place? (Ex. xxxiii, 2, 3). Can it be that this same God talked to Moses "face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend," when it is declared in the same chapter, by God himself, "Thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see me and live?" (Ex. xxxiii, 11, 20).

**FORTY-FIRST.** Why should a man, because he has done a bad action, go and kill a sheep? How can man make friends with God by cutting the throats of bullocks and goats? Why should God delight in the shedding of blood? Why should he want his altar sprinkled with blood, and the horns of his altar tipped with blood, and his priests covered with blood? Why should burning flesh be a sweet savor in the nostrils of God? Why did he compel his priests to be butchers, cutters and stabbers? Why should the same God kill a man for eating the fat of an ox, a sheep or a goat?

**FORTY-SECOND.** Could it be a consolation to a man when dying to think that he had always believed that God told Aaron to take two goats and draw cuts to see which goat should be killed and which should be a scapegoat? And that upon the head of the scapegoat Aaron should lay both his hands and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, and put them all on the head of the goat, and send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness; and that the goat should bear upon him all the iniquities of the people into a land not inhabited? (Lev. xvi, 21, 22). How could a goat carry away a load of iniquities and transgressions? Why should he carry them to a land uninhabited? Were these sins contagious? About how many sins could an average goat carry? Could a man meet such a goat now without laughing?

**FORTY-THIRD.** Why should God

object to a man wearing a garment made of woolen and linen? Why should he care whether a man rounded the corners of his beard? (Lev. xix, 19, 27). Why should God prevent a man from offering the sacred bread merely because he had a flat nose, or was lame, or had five fingers on one hand, or had a broken foot, or was a dwarf? If he objected to such people, why did he make them? (Lev. xxi, 18-20).

**FORTY-FOURTH.** Why should we believe that God insisted upon the sacrifice of human beings? Is it a sin to deny this, and to deny the inspiration of a book that teaches it? Read the twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth verses of the last chapter of Leviticus, a book in which there is more folly and cruelty, more stupidity and tyranny, than in any other book in this world except some others in the same Bible. Read the thirty-second chapter of Exodus and you will see how by the most infamous of crimes man becomes reconciled to this God. You will see that he demands of fathers the blood of their sons. Read the twelfth and thirteenth verses of the third chapter of Numbers, "And I, behold, I have taken the Levites from among the children of Israel," etc.

How, in the desert of Sinai, did the Jews obtain curtains of fine linen? How did these absconding slaves make cherubs of gold? And where did they get the skins of badgers, and how did they dye them red? How did they make wreathed chains and spoons, basins and tongs? Where did they get the blue cloth and their purple? Where did they get the sockets of brass? How did they coin the shekel of the sanctuary? How did they overlay boards with gold? Where did they get the numberless instruments and tools necessary to accomplish all these things? Where did they get the fine flour and oil? Were all these found in the desert of Sinai? Is it a sin to ask these questions? Are all these doubts born of a malignant and depraved heart? Why should God in this desert prohibit priests from drinking wine, and from eating moist grapes? How could these priests get wine?

Do not these passages show that these laws were made long after the Jews had left the desert, and that they were not given from Sinai? Can you imagine a God silly enough to tell a horde of wandering savages upon a desert that they must not eat any fruit of the trees they planted until the fourth year?

(To be Continued.)

## SOCIOLOGY—

### In the Early History of Society—Social Before Human.

BY F. H. GIDDINGS, PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

(From "Elements of Sociology.")

**PRIMITIVE ECONOMIC IDEAS.**  
—By communication and discussion, until they became a common possession, the primitive ideas of utility and value were combined in a primitive conception of wealth. Desirable things are not wealth until they are appreciated by the community as well as by the individuals that first discover their desirable qualities. Economists imperfectly express this truth when they say that wealth consists of the useful things that can be exchanged, or that have value in exchange. Actual exchange is not necessary to convert the material means of satisfaction into wealth; but a general or social esteem is necessary. Such an esteem arose when men began consciously to compare their wants, their efforts, and their satisfactions; and when, by that common consent which is a product as much of emulation as of discussion, they began to arrange the means of satisfaction in a scale of desirableness. In those days of sharp alterations of feasting and starving, mere quantity of anything consumable impressed the imagination; and crude abundance was put first in the social esteem. To discover and conquer abundance was to win distinction.

Next in order were put the things that qualitatively or quantitatively served as marks of distinction, such as trophies, ornaments, and implements, and finally the things that appealed to new desires. The primitive idea of wealth was thus not essentially different from the idea of wealth today. It was the notion of a socially esteemed abundance of things necessary for life, for social distinction, for emulation, and for the imitation of novelty. It expanded with the growth of inequality, which intensified the desires to excel and to emulate.

The remaining economic ideas of the primitive social mind were those that constitute the useful or productive arts. Discovery and invention were then, as they are now, the prime factors in economic production. The discoveries made by primitive man were few and simple; and his inventions did not get beyond the most elementary tools and processes. Professor Tylor says that it is not quite true that man