



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

VOL. 6.

SILVERTON, OREGON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 1, E. M. 303 (1903.)

NO. 52.

## EVOLUTION.

BY MENANDER DAWSON.

It is a hopeful doctrine that modern science preaches  
That there is evolution from low to higher forms,  
That man has not descended as the old fable teaches  
From primitive perfection; but that he ever reaches,  
By natural selection and numberless reforms,  
To hasten his ascent  
In race development.

Oh, what a vista opens to the ecstatic vision  
When we have comprehended these possibilities!  
We see the race advancing in orderly precision;  
We see mankind the gainer by every right decision,  
By every generous action, by all true sympathies.  
Thus ever up and on  
We sweep into the dawn.

The race is lifted up as the individual rises;  
The interests of all men combine in harmony;  
The crown of self perfection the individual's prize is,  
And he who wins that trophy, is he who ne'er denies his  
Allegiance to all, and responsibility.  
The race goes up and down  
With the hero or the clown.

But the great current ever is toward the good and better,  
The power of growth is greater than forces of decay;  
And pain is Nature's warning that we must not forget her,  
Must master all her lessons unto the very letter,  
And not through sloth and ignorance loiter by the way.  
Man is submerged in night  
That he may seek the light.

Live, then, the best that's in you! Bring each to its perfection,  
The physical, the mental, the psychical, the self!  
'Tis thus the world advances; by process of selection  
The things which you accomplish are saved for man's direction:  
Then, live for lofty purposes, and do not live for self!  
By doing so we can  
Evolve the better man.

## BIBLE ILLUSIONS.

### The Gallantry of God.

BY ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

I HAVE said that the Bible is a barbarous book; that it has no respect for the rights of women. Now I propose to prove it. It takes something besides epithets and invectives to prove or disprove anything. Let us see what the sacred volume says concerning the mothers and daughters of the human race.

A man who does not in his heart of hearts respect woman, who has not there an altar at which he worships the memory of mother, is less than a man.

"Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection.

"But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence."

The reason given for this, and the only reasons that occurred to the sacred writer, was:

"For Adam was first formed, then Eve.

"And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.

"Notwithstanding, she shall be saved in child-bearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety."—1 Tim. ii.

"But I would have you know,

that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God."

That is to say, the woman sustains the same relation to the man that man does to Christ, and man sustains the same relations to Christ that Christ does to God.

This places the woman infinitely below the man. And yet this barbarous idiom is regarded as divinely inspired. How can any woman look other than with contempt upon such passages? How can any woman believe that this is the will of a most merciful God?

"For a man, indeed, ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of man."

And this is justified from the remarkable fact set forth in the next verse:

"For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man."

This same chivalric gentleman also says:

"Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man."—1 Cor. xi.

"Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord."

Is it possible for abject obedience to go beyond this?

"For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head

of the church, and he is the savior of the body.

"Therefore, as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything."—Eph. v.

Even the Savior did not put man and woman upon an equality. A man could divorce his wife, but the wife could not divorce her husband.

Every noble woman should hold such apostles and such ideas in contempt. According to the Old Testament, woman had to ask pardon and had to be purified from the crime of having born sons and daughters. To make love and maternity crimes is infamous.

"When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the Lord thy God hath delivered them into thine hands, and thou hast taken them captive,

"And seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldst have her to thy wife,

"Then thou shalt bring her home to thy house; and she shall shave her head and pare her nails."—Deut. xxi.

This is barbarism, no matter whether it came from heaven or from hell, from a God or from a devil, from the golden streets of the New Jerusalem or from the very Sodom of perdition. It is barbarism complete and utter.

## DOES THE BIBLE SANCTION POLYGAMY AND CONCUBINAGE?

Read the infamous order of Moses in the thirty-first chapter of Numbers—an order unfit to be reproduced in print—an order which I am unwilling to repeat. Read the thirty-first chapter of Exodus. Read the twenty-first chapter of Deuteronomy. Read the life of Abraham, of David, of Solomon, of Jacob, and then tell me the sacred Bible does not teach polygamy and concubinage. All the languages of the world are insufficient to express the filth of polygamy. It makes man a beast—woman a slave. It destroys the fireside. It makes virtue an outcast. It makes home a lair of wild beasts. It is the infamy of infamies. Yet this is the doctrine of the Bible—a doctrine defended even by Luther and Melancthon. It is by the Bible that Brigham Young justifies the practice of this beastly horror.

It takes from language those sweetest words—husband, wife, father, mother, child and lover. It takes us back to the barbarism of animals, and leaves the heart a den in which crawl and hiss the slimy serpents of loathsome lust. Yet the book justifying this infamy is the book upon which rests the civilization of the nineteenth century. And because I denounce this frightful thing, the clergy denounce me as a demon, and the infamous "Christian Advocate" says that the moral sentiment of this State ought to denounce this Illinois Cataline for his blasphemous utterances and for his base and debasing scurrility. —[Dresden Edition, Vol. 7.

## SOCIOLOGY—

### Tribal Society—Advantages of Patronymic Kinship.

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

(From "Elements of Sociology.")

WHEN patronymic tribes entered upon pastoral pursuits and became wealthy in cattle, the chief's relations acquired a great importance. He not only inherited his father's herds, but on every ceremonial occasion he received presents of cattle from the tribe. He levied fines and confiscations which were paid in kind. At every opportunity he organized excursions to steal cattle from neighboring tribes. Dispensing favors and enriching favorites, he was soon able to control formidable bands of retainers.

Through the favoritism of the chief, these retainers themselves became powerful men, and not infrequently strong enough to set up their own authority against that of the tribal organization. The chief had received from his tribesmen not only cattle but the right to pasture them on the outlying borders of the tribal domain. This right he extended to his followers who thus had the opportunity to become wealthy, powerful, and independent if they, in their turn, could obtain bands of adventurous followers. They usually experienced no difficulty in finding such, since, in a disturbed state of society continually engaged in war and plunder, there were many ruined men, the survivors of tribes that had been broken up, and criminals who, for some offence against clan law, had been driven forth from the communities in which they were born. Such broken men were glad to attach themselves to any chieftain or chieftain's favorite who would employ them. The final step in the development of the independent power of the chief or of his ambitious retainer was to use his lawless bands in committing depredations on weaker tribes and in stealing their cattle. Deprived of possessions, conquered tribes could subsist then only by borrowing stock back from the arrogant cow-noblemen,—as they are called in the old Brehon law of Ireland,—who thus became receivers of regular tributes and of rents.

All historical peoples probably passed through the stage of pastoral feudalism. The best picture of it that remains to us is that disclosed