

# ETHICAL TALKS BY CLERGY AND THE LAITY

## LIARS AND THEIR EVIL ANALYZED

BY PROFESSOR CAMILLE MELINAUD

HERE is in our time no historian, no judge, no teacher who is not continually hindered in his work by the omnipresent lie.

For the historian it is made difficult to separate the real facts from the mixture of truth and lies which always constitute his material. The task of the judge is almost superhuman, because there is always the possibility that the accused witnesses or the counsel on either or both sides may tell things that are not exactly true and very often barefaced lies.

I shall try to explain the origin and nature of this vice of lying that we find in all classes and all ages. I shall try to analyze the complex soul of the person who lies.

First of all let us try to discover how a child begins to lie, what motives drive him to lying and what happens he uses to justify his lie, and then afterwards a few words as to how to counteract the lie, how to fight against it and, if possible, how to drive it out.

How does a child become a liar, how does it discover how to lie, and how does it get into the habit of lying? The child in its very first years neither lies nor simulates; its thoughts, its ideas, its feelings are immediately transformed into acts. This is the great natural, primitive law: Every idea, every desire immediately becomes an act. The act is only the idea, left to itself and following its natural course, and this is what we see in all impulsive or all hypnotized persons whose personal will-power is not strong enough to control.

In the child all thoughts are immediate-

ly expressed in movements, in cries or later in words. Its body is the perfect and constant expression of its inner self.

How is it then possible that a child may take up the habit of lying?

In the passing from the primitive sincerity to mendacity we are able to discover a certain number of moments.

First, the child discovers the lie, then it notices that lying is useful or even necessary, and finally it starts to lie itself. The child first discovers the lie by playing. To play is to live in a world of dreams, of unreality, of illusion. To play is to transform the monotonous reality into an alluring fiction which is more in accord with the desires of the soul of the child. A little girl, for instance, plays with her doll and tells that she has a baby, that it will soon grow, that it has taken cold, that it begins to talk, and so on.

From this to lying the step is very short, and what proves this is that we are often deceived ourselves.

A child will come to us crying, saying that another child has struck it, or has broken its toys, and we believe in it, until suddenly the child will burst out laughing and tell us that it was all said for fun.

Of course, from a moral point of view, there is a world of difference between playing and lying; but from the psychological point of view the difference is almost imperceptible, because both are in contrast to the truth.

It is very natural that the child should discover the lie through playing—it is sufficient that it sees that grown people are taken in once or twice, that it discovers that it can fool us. It amuses itself over our credulity, and then it will soon know how to lie.

The second moment is the teaching of lying by example, the revelation that the lie is not only possible but real, that it is practiced by the persons that surround it, and, worst of all, by its own parents.

We all lie before our children; we all tell any number of fibs that we consider excusable; we let the servants tell that we are out, when we are at home; we compliment people to their face and criticize them behind their back; we say that we are delighted to see a person, whom we do not care to see at all. These tolerated lies are sufficient, the example is set, but still worse is it when a child is made an accomplice in a lie, as when a mother will say to her child: "Now, you must not tell papa anything about this." To treat a child this way, to teach it that things may be done, but not told, is to show it the straight road to moral ruin.

The third moment comes when the child faces its first conflict with society. It already knows that lying is possible; that it is practiced by almost everybody, and it now discovers that lying is, so to speak, necessary.

Every child makes its start in life with perfect candor and sincerity; it says everything that it thinks and feels; it immediately transforms its impressions into words and acts; it wears absolutely no mask. But very soon it discovers that this will not do. Sooner or later it suffers for its frankness.

In the first place its own parents will show their dissatisfaction, will tell it that it must not repeat everything that it hears or says everything that it feels. They do not directly teach it to lie, but they do teach it that to be sincere in everything is to make yourself ridiculous, to say the least.

Very soon the child learns not only to conceal its real feelings, but also to pretend feelings that it does not possess; it soon learns that confidence is abused; that promises are given only to be broken; that the whole social life is one rotten, hollow, empty shell.

Thus the child learns that absolute sincerity, absolute straightforwardness is an utter impossibility; that there are many reasons why it must be impossible; that

politeness forbids us to be truthful, that modesty and policy are continually fighting sincerity, and the child becomes a conventional liar as everybody around it.

After this comes the critical point. Will the child stop here, will it not slide further down, will it understand not to go beyond the line of these necessary conventional lies?

Until now the child is still relatively sincere, it has seen that lying is possible, that its own parents are guilty of lying almost every day, it has even seen that lying is necessary. But how prevent it from becoming what society calls a liar?

Education has much to do with this. It is very important that the educators understand when to punish and when not. The child that gets into the habit of lying very often the child who is too often and too severely punished by its parents or its teachers.

The child who is always afraid of punishment, the child who is beaten for the smallest offense, will very soon find out that if it confesses having done something wrong it is sure to be punished.

The first and second time he offends he may have the courage to admit frankly that he has done wrong, but very soon he begins to hesitate, partly because he is afraid of the humiliation and partly because he does not want to shock his parents, or his friends, or to cause them any unnecessary sorrow, and lying becomes easier every time it is practiced, and at last a person will lie at the very smallest temptation and even without any temptation at all, hardly realizing himself that he is not telling the truth, and when it comes to this point it is only a very strong character that will be able to resist a person.

These are the different reasons that make a sincere child or person become a liar, and the most prominent of them is the desire to appear to be living a respectable life, when you know you are not. The lie is a mask that we wear when we do not want people to see us as we are; we get into the habit of lying when there are too many things in our life that we are ashamed of and that we dare not admit.

(Copyright, 1902, by W. R. Hearst.)

## MYSTERIES OF THE HUMAN MIND

BY DR. ANDREW WILSON

IR T. LAUDER BRUNTON, M. D., has courteously sent me the report of the address he delivered before the general meeting of the Medico-Psychological Association, and to his courtesy I have been indebted for an instructive hour or two spent over his pages. The address attracted a large amount of notice, even from the somewhat abridge reports that followed its delivery.

Dr. Brunton deals with that most fascinating of topics, "Hallucinations and Allied Mental Phenomena." It is an all important subject, because not only is that dim borderland between sanity and insanity included in its consideration, but the ways of the world, as our lecturer shows us, are singularly liable on occasion to be affected by the hallucinations and illusions of men and women.

Julius Caesar and the first Napoleon, for example, were epileptic, but, says our author, they were great men not because of their epilepsy, but in spite of it; and it is undeniable, of course, that the epileptic constitution is often associated with a brain of singularly bright and apt intelligence. It is when the illusions of men—"illusions" being an appearance or sensation we know to be unreal—pass into the stage of hallucinations, when what is unreal is regarded as true, that the world may seem to have gone mad. If I behold the image of a specter, if I know that the specter is simply a reproduction passed on forwards from my brain

cells to the background of my eye, I suffer from an "illusion" of sight. But if I regard the appearance as a real thing and as a ghostly visitation originating outside my own personality altogether, I suffer from a "hallucination." This is the general and, I fancy, sensible distinction we are bound to make between the visions that may affect or afflict us, but nobody knows better than I do that the definition will not please everybody. Mr. Andrew Lang, for example, will not hold it to be accurate, neither will certain members of the Society for Psychical Research, who believe in what one may term the materialization of spirits and in the existence of ghosts as entities appealing to our senses as things objective.

But the distinction will still remain a safe one if we take into account that we must assuredly distinguish between the unbiased observation of a sane man and his experience and the ravings of a lunatic. One curious point is that illusions are much more frequently represented in our ordinary life than many are apt to believe. Of this fact I can give one familiar example. There is a well-known experience which happens to most of us on occasion, wherein, coming to a place, a room, a church, or, indeed, seeing any scene to which we are absolute strangers, we are impressed with a strange sense of familiarity with what we behold. The feeling may be so strong as to give a kind of eerie sensa-

tion. The poets have noted the occurrence of this familiar feeling. Dickens speaks of it in "David Copperfield." Thomas Hardy remarks it, as Wordsworth, Scott, Rossetti and Tennyson have duly noted it. I have even met people who alleged they based in it a proof of the doctrine of metempsychosis and that the feeling was due to the reproduced memory of a former state of existence."

Excluding cases in which a sense of familiarity with an unknown scene may be traced to, say, the previous view of a photograph, we may find in science a simple explanation of the incident. It is known that each half of our cerebrum, or big brain, possesses a certain independence of the other half. In ordinary life we may take it that both halves act in unison so far, the left half appearing as the dominant factor in our brain work. Now, if we may suppose that occasionally this unison is interrupted, and that one-half of the brain is temporarily switched off—it may be only for a moment—from its neighbor, we may find in such an idea an explanation of the sensation of "having been there before." The left half, let us imagine, takes in the scene, its perceptive cells acting in advance of those of the right lobe. A second later the right half perceives the scene, but already there is the implied consciousness of the left. It is this consciousness, acting or produced out of time and unison, that conveys the impression we have seen the place before.

So we have in a sense—namely, that a first impression preceded the second, when both should have in point of time been concurrent. The ordinary way of seeing things is conducted on the stereoscopic plan, where both images are focused into one. If we disturb the brain's stereoscopic we get a double consciousness in place of a single.

That for which Sir T. L. Brunton's lecture will be most serviceable is the clear exposition of the dependence of so-called mysterious brain states on physical causes, many of which medicine is able to trace out satisfactorily enough. Illusions or hallucinations are referable often to disease of the eye, and physicians know that in certain special cases the existence of hallucinations may be safely predicted, I am well aware the medical or scientific phase of the explanation will not cover the whole field. There are many incidents of which doubtless science is unable to offer an adequate view in respect of their causation, but I would remind the person who sits in the chair of the scorer that it is needless to taunt science with an inability to offer a clue to every mystery of mind when the alternative is declared to be a belief in ghosts and specters as veritable outside entities. It is a dangerous practice to fly off into the region of the unknown and to people it with phantasies because science may not be able to place her finger, yet awhile, on the exact cause of alleged miracles and supernatural wonders. The scientist, however, has learned the lesson of patience as well as of hope, and we must not blame the region of the brain, and its ways has been cause to reflect that the superstitions of today assuredly tend to become the commonplaces of tomorrow.

## THE GREAT TASK OF MOTHERS

BY CHARLOTTE TELLER

BISHOP of the church is quoted as saying that three-fourths of the crime, poverty and depravity in America is due to the woman. "Poverty, depravity and crime" would be a better order unless the bishop wishes to class poverty as an evil no less degraded than crime and its forerunner, depravity.

But the bishop's remark may be true, for the early influences of the child are the strongest, and it may be that the mothers of America have failed in exerting the proper influence that to their negligence three-fourths of the evil of the country may be attributed.

It is generally agreed nowadays that crime and depravity (poverty will have to be left out of the discussion) spring from abnormal conditions and that they are social diseases. Those who make a study of them say that, first of all, health of body and freedom for the expression of the instincts of play and workmanship are the best conditions for the child in its time of development, and then that the broader outlook coming through contact with the trained minds of parents and teachers is almost a guaranty of healthy morals in any community.

Now, if the good bishop can prove that the mothers of America are responsible for the conditions contrary to those which

tend toward social welfare, then they stand accused, and rightly.

To be healthy, children must have healthy parents; they must have plenty of good food, warm clothing, sanitary homes and plenty of exercise. Girls who work in factories, or stand behind counters, have lost much of their vitality; men who began the struggle for money too early and without preparation have lost theirs; those two classes, at least, do not make good parents. Are the women of America responsible for factory conditions and for the demand for child labor? Have they the right to make the law?

When good food, comfortable clothing and shelter are wanting because fatherhood is so low in the public estimation that corporations may underpay their men without public protest—is it the women of this country who have organized industry and reared the stupendous structures of commercialism? Or is it the woman who can determine how much of the taxes shall go to the maintenance of the public schools and playgrounds?

"Ah, yes," the bishop may say, "but you forget the influence of the woman in the home; it is there that her power may be felt, and she may work through man and thus change the laws, or so bring up her children to work for the change."

Work through man. Is there anything more dangerous than the subtle device of obtaining what is wished through influencing those who have power? In the political world that is known as corruption; in the name it is considered the beautiful exercise of woman's influence.

The exercising of influence upon the children—that is still left to woman as a means of helping the next generation. When she feels a love of the race which prompts her to work for the future, then indeed has she become a power for good. But think of the mother who comes under the \$500-a-year limit in income. She has a daily struggle in crowded rooms, if she has no ambitions for the children beyond a comfortable animal existence, even then her life is so full of work and worry that she cannot be a friend to the little ones.

The woman who has to work all day cooking, washing, sewing, who sees the needs increasing from year to year, but at the means of satisfying them, who is as far as her own training will allow, ambitious for the children's schooling and future—that is the woman who may exert the highest influence if she still has strength. And the woman who has more of the world's goods, but lives in uncertainty, not knowing what may come to

her children if the father dies or she leaves them, is no less to be marveled at if she has the courage to talk of beautiful motherhood to her girls, for whose highest welfare she can do little, because money must be saved against the future of possible old age or illness.

The whole race of mothers can do little in the face of the present conditions unless they are free from the tormenting cares that come with the question of supporting the families. They are struggling in a swift current, and if they do not speak words of encouragement to the children, who cling for a while and then strike out in the hope of more freedom, they are not to be blamed.

Let the good bishop take the place of a mother in a growing family for a short time; let him be confronted with the natural obligations of that place. There are some who, having more imagination than he, can picture the surroundings and mental attitude which destroy the possibility of a mother's influence; and these cry out, not against the women, but for greater economic freedom, for the equal opportunities which would make children hopeful of a future and for those changes which can be brought about only by the use of the ballot.

The bishop must go back of the present generation of mothers to the foundation laying of the modern home, and he will find it built undoubtedly on a system created by man, who has had for centuries the industrial and political power, while woman was still acknowledged as his property.

## MAN'S ENDLESS IMITATIONS

BY GABRIEL TARDE, PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF PARIS

STONE drops into the water, and the first wave produced repeats itself in increased size until the limits of the basin are reached.

I light a match and the first undulation which I cause in the ether propagates itself in an instant into vast space. It suffices to transport a couple of termites to a new continent in order to have it ravaged in a few years.

In the same way a local dialect, the usage of a few families, little by little becomes a national idiom. In the development of societies the art of striking the flint, of domesticating the dog, of making bread, of working on bronze, of mining, have each developed by contagious imitation, every model of bread, every bronze carving being at the same time both copy and model.

Thus in our own day diffusion of every kind operates, with this difference, that the increasing density of population and the progress accomplished prodigiously accelerates this extension, just like the velocity of a sound is increased by the

density of its medium. Every invention, every discovery, tends to extend itself in the social medium, a medium which itself tends to expand since it is essentially composed of equal things, each ambitious for the infinite.

As examples of the progression of imitations, I could cite the statistics relative to the consumption of coffee, of tobacco and the like, from the time of their first importation to the period when the market has commenced to be inundated with them, or again those relative to the number of locomotives constructed since the first.

I will quote a discovery which appears less favorable to my theme, the discovery of America. It has been imitated in this sense, that the first voyage from Europe to America, imagined and executed by Columbus, has been repeated in an ever-increasing number of times by other sailors, with variations, of which has been the little discovery grafted upon that of the great Genoese, and has had in its turn its imitations. Another example. The Roman empire

has fallen, but it has been excellently said, that the Roman conquest lives always and ever prolongs itself. By Charlemagne it was extended to the Germans, who in being Christianized were Romanized; by William the Conqueror to the Anglo-Saxons; by Columbus to America; by the Russians and English to Asia, to Australia, soon throughout the entire ocean. Japan has already been invaded. China alone appears to offer any serious resistance. But we suppose that she, too, will be assimilated in her turn some day.

So we can say that Athens and Rome, that is to say, the type of civilization formed by the union of their initiatives and by their ideas of genius, co-ordinated and combined, have conquered the whole world. All races, all nationalities, have concurred in this limitless imitative contagion of Graeco-Roman civilization.

It would not have come with the same certainty if Darius or Xerxes had conquered and reduced Greece to a Persian province, or if Islamism had triumphed over Charles Martel and invaded Europe, or if China for 3500 years had been as warlike as she is industrious, and had turned her spirit of invention to arms, or if at the moment of the discovery of America Europeans had not invented gunpowder and the art of printing, and had been found in a state of military inferiority to the Aztecs and Peruvians.

But chance ordained that the types of civilization, of all sheaves which have been spontaneously tossed into divers parts of the globe, the type to which we belong should triumph. If it had not prevailed another would have triumphed in the end, for it is certain and inevitable that one among them all would have become universal, for they all seek universality; that is to say, they all tend to propagate themselves imitatively following a geometrical progression, like a wave of light or sound, or like every kind of animal and vegetable.

The imitation, far from choking the proper originality of individuals, favors and nourishes it. The thing that is contrary to personal accentuation is the imitation of a single man upon whom one models everything. But when instead of depending upon a certain one or a certain few the imitation is diffused to 100, or to 1000, or to 10,000 people, each considered under a particular aspect, the choice of copies to imitate in itself accentuates our original personality.

## ABSURDITIES OF THE PENAL SYSTEM

BY DR. CHARLTON T. LEWIS, PH. D.

Dr. Charlton T. Lewis, the writer of this article, is one of the highest and best-known authorities in the country on all questions relating to crime and criminals. He has been the president of the New York State Prison Commission for a number of years, and is also president of the Charities Aid Association of New Jersey and chairman of the commission to revise the penal laws of that state. He is also known in the literary world as the author of a "History of Germany."

ORGANIZED society everywhere must deal with crime, seeking to keep it in check and to eradicate it. The degree of its success has been small, no apparent progress being made towards the extinction of the criminal class and the complete and undisturbed ascendance of civil order and security of private rights. The detection and so-called punishment of offenses against the law are as large a part of the office of government as they were a century ago, and there is no evidence that under the systems which now prevail there is a material diminution from year to year in the number of those who live by preying upon others or in the number of those whose lives are an habitual protest and revolt against social duty. Something is wrong in the traditional methods of dealing with crime, or else the claim that civilization is progressive is subject to large qualifications.

But the history of penal law and its administration shows that they are founded upon no system, no reasoned body of thought, no principles of social science. Almost all offenses against law are visited with terms of imprisonment assigned as penalties in proportion to the degree of guilt which the lawmakers attach to the offenses as crimes. But this custom, which is embodied in the penal code of every civilized state, has grown up by the gradual modification of older and more vindictive customs. It is not many generations since the prison was regarded merely as a place of detention, and the penalties for crimes were death, mutilation, whipping, or other forms of torture. As men became more refined and humane these barbarities gave place to milder treatment. An immense experience proved that the terrors of such cruelties had, on the whole, no important deterring effect upon criminals, and, as the most convenient way to dispose of them without shocking the humane feelings, imprisonment for graded terms was, little by little, substituted for the gallows, the stocks, the whipping-post and the amputation of the ears or the splitting of the nose. But still there has been retained, as the avowed purpose in awarding legal

penalties, the distribution of suffering in proportion to the supposed demerit of the offender. One who steals from a dwelling at night is supposed to deserve severer punishment than one who pilfers by daylight, and must therefore be imprisoned for a longer term.

The penal law deals with offenses, while penal administration deals with offenders. There is no possibility of adjusting the law to the actual work to be done, upon the theory of fitting the penalties to the offender's desert. The law in general regards criminals as a class, to be treated without individual discrimination; but in fact the persons who come before the criminal courts differ as widely among themselves as any other members of the community. There are habitual or professional criminals, made such, some by heredity, some by invincible habit, some by gross defects amounting to moral idiocy. The instinctive criminal will prefer vice to virtue and crime to orderly conduct. Others are simply persons of strong passion who yield to temptation, but whose desires and sympathies are with good citizenship. Many are men of more than ordinary sense of duty, who have yielded to influences sufficient to overcome all but exalted virtue. Again, there are among them those who, while prone to excess of passion, would scorn dishonesty or theft; while some are eager to gain by fraud, and yet incapable of violence or cruelty. In short, a collection of so-called criminals shows endless varieties in natural ability, learning, habit, passion, and even conscience—just as it shows varieties in height, weight, color of hair and of health, like any other community.

The law which includes all these various classes in one category and treats them alike can never be administered with justice, nor so as to meet the needs of society. Any law which comprehends under one class, to be treated by the same method, the brigand or burglar, who knows no other calling, and the bewildered and despairing mother who pilfers to save her child from starving, is self-condemned. But if our laws are to meet and solve the problem of crime, they must provide for the treatment of all offenders and supervision of the probation officer. Already this experiment has been productive of most encouraging results in diminishing the number of the pupils of crime in our prisons. When it is universal practice it will be found beyond doubt, the most effective means of preventing the recruiting of the criminal class. The reformatory, the intermediate sentence and the probation law are the most potent means which have ever yet been found for dealing with the problem of crime.

made, first to prevent it, and then to destroy it. It is no part of the business of organized society to inflict punishment. The conception of distributive justice must be eliminated from criminal law, before it can be made consistent and effective. The attempt to treat men according to their merits is hopeless; the attempt to use offenders who are caught in order to deter others from similar offenses, is always being unavailing, and only confuses and impairs the issue in which it is embodied. The use of prisons for the confinement of men has been carried to an excessive and injurious extent, and should be reduced within as narrow limits as practicable. In particular, the county jails throughout the country, and very many penal institutions of the states, are schools of crime, and do far more harm than good. In fact, the criminal class is largely the produce of these prisons, the greater part of all the professional criminals who have received their education in these jails. The young man who is sent to one of them for a trifling offense is not only degraded before the community, so that it is hard for him to lift his head again, but he is commonly corrupted by the associations there found, so that he is morally ruined.

But to justify imprisonment there should be satisfactory evidence of a criminal disposition. The mere outward act named and defined in the law is not such evidence. I have no doubt that by far the majority of those who are sentenced to imprisonment ought never to have been confined. The most important step in the reform of penal laws which has ever yet been taken is in the probation laws which have recently been adopted in many states. These authorize the court, in the case of a person who has violated for the first time the penal law, if there is nothing in the circumstances or in his character to make his freedom dangerous to society, to place the offender under the guardianship of a probation officer appointed by the court. He may then, during the term of his probation, follow his accustomed pursuits under the influence of home and friends, with the added guidance and supervision of the probation officer. Already this experiment has been productive of most encouraging results in diminishing the number of the pupils of crime in our prisons. When it is universal practice it will be found beyond doubt, the most effective means of preventing the recruiting of the criminal class. The reformatory, the intermediate sentence and the probation law are the most potent means which have ever yet been found for dealing with the problem of crime.

## TYRANNY OF THE INFANT

BY DOROTHY DIX

BABIES have always been a subject of perennial interest in the world, but so completely have we been in the way of regarding them from a sentimental point of view that it has made us overlook many of their most important characteristics. This is unjust. Babies are not merely things for the philanthropist. The rare subjects for the study of the philosopher as well.

No one, of course, is going to say a word against babies at this late day. They are one of the things that we can never get along with nor without, and, although they do not speak the language of the country when they arrive and come in with as little baggage as a pauper immigrant, we all welcome them as most desirable additions to our population. As an inspirer of poetry and a warning against matrimony they have no equal; as an ornament to a house they are the most expensive bric-a-brac known, while as constituents for future politicians they are a necessity for which no substitute can be provided. Still, for all that, there are points about the baby that we have failed to give their proper consideration.

Disassociated from the halo that hangs around the cradle, one fact that stands out most prominently is that the baby leads the list of the world's relentless tyrants. It is nothing less than absurd that when we want a synonym for grinding despotism we speak of Nero or Caligula when there is a baby around to illustrate our remarks. There are times when the hardest mature heart is touched with pity or remorse, but a baby is adamant.

Did anybody ever know a baby to sympathize enough with its tortured family to quit howling and let them go to sleep? Never. Haven't we seen a compassionate

infant make a poor, weak, suffering mother walk until she was nearly ready to drop with fatigue? Haven't we seen an aged grandparent forced to make a Roman holiday for some barbarous little fiend by getting down on his poor, rheumatic old knees and playing horse? And yet, instead of ruthlessly murdering the infant tyrant, we wear a single look of pity or oppression actually hug their chains and glory in their slavery.

Another almost wondrous thing about a baby is its power of hypnotism. How it does it Heaven alone knows, but every baby alive has but to fix its parents with its wandering gaze and make a few passes at them with its wobbly hand, and they forthwith see beauty in a creature with no more hair on its head than a billiard ball, a fishy eye with no eyebrows, a rudimentary nose and a loose mouth, and perceive intelligence in a countenance that has no more expression to it than a plate of cream cheese. Still more remarkable, otherwise sane people of irreproachable taste not only do not resent being thought to resemble such a looking individual, but actually glory in it.

Another characteristic of babies that we are in the way of ignoring is their deceitfulness. They look innocent, but they are full of guile, and deep, very, very deep. Take the mere matter of physical strength, for instance. The baby is entered in the featherweight class and apparently is no match for a grown person, yet in a single Sunday afternoon, on the nurse's day out, a little creature that is still so unsteady on its legs he falls as heavy as a leaden ball, and getting on his feet he is a match for the family, and has been engaged in a six days' continuous walking match.

The moral effect of a baby in a household can only be compared to the deluge that washes away all the familiar landmarks by which you know the place. Before the advent of the baby your friends may have been people of the most exquisite taste, the nicest regard for the rights of others, and a wide and catholic interest in the doings of the world. The baby changes all that. The world narrows down to a single circle of interest, and that is baby. Common decency of civility dies before a perambulator, and you are welcome or unwelcome according to the amount of unpleasantness you can muster up about the baby.

So far as your own pleasure is concerned, nobody in a house where there is a baby makes a pretense of considering it. Your brightest witicism fails that and stale before a gurgle of infant volubility, a rudimentary nose and a loose mouth, and perceive intelligence in a countenance that has no more expression to it than a plate of cream cheese. Still more remarkable, otherwise sane people of irreproachable taste not only do not resent being thought to resemble such a looking individual, but actually glory in it.

Another characteristic of babies that we are in the way of ignoring is their deceitfulness. They look innocent, but they are full of guile, and deep, very, very deep. Take the mere matter of physical strength, for instance. The baby is entered in the featherweight class and apparently is no match for a grown person, yet in a single Sunday afternoon, on the nurse's day out, a little creature that is still so unsteady on its legs he falls as heavy as a leaden ball, and getting on his feet he is a match for the family, and has been engaged in a six days' continuous walking match.

The moral effect of a baby in a household can only be compared to the deluge that washes away all the familiar landmarks by which you know the place. Before the advent of the baby your friends may have been people of the most exquisite taste, the nicest regard for the rights of others, and a wide and catholic interest in the doings of the world. The baby changes all that. The world narrows down to a single circle of interest, and that is baby. Common decency of civility dies before a perambulator, and you are welcome or unwelcome according to the amount of unpleasantness you can muster up about the baby.

So far as your own pleasure is concerned, nobody in a house where there is a baby makes a pretense of considering it. Your brightest witicism fails that and stale before a gurgle of infant volubility, a rudimentary nose and a loose mouth, and perceive intelligence in a countenance that has no more expression to it than a plate of cream cheese. Still more remarkable, otherwise sane people of irreproachable taste not only do not resent being thought to resemble such a looking individual, but actually glory in it.

Another characteristic of babies that we are in the way of ignoring is their deceitfulness. They look innocent, but they are full of guile, and deep, very, very deep. Take the mere matter of physical strength, for instance. The baby is entered in the featherweight class and apparently is no match for a grown person, yet in a single Sunday afternoon, on the nurse's day out, a little creature that is still so unsteady on its legs he falls as heavy as a leaden ball, and getting on his feet he is a match for the family, and has been engaged in a six days' continuous walking match.

The moral effect of a baby in a household can only be compared to the deluge that washes away all the familiar landmarks by which you know the place. Before the advent of the baby your friends may have been people of the most exquisite taste, the nicest regard for the rights of others, and a wide and catholic interest in the doings of the world. The baby changes all that. The world narrows down to a single circle of interest, and that is baby. Common decency of civility dies before a perambulator, and you are welcome or unwelcome according to the amount of unpleasantness you can muster up about the baby.

## HOW CAN WE ALL BENEFIT MANKIND?

BY BISHOP J. L. SPAULDING

EMERSON says that America is God's great charity to the race, but true religion working with the added power which science gives is greater than America, and will purify, ennoble and transform our life into some likeness to the divine ideals, which as yet we but dimly discern.

We have already learned that a man's chief value does not lie in his ability to conquer with sword and shell, and we are coming to understand that it lies just as little in his ability to manipulate machinery or to get money.

Comte thinks that Christianity is the consecration of egoism, and it is a fact that it regards primarily the individual, and asserts the supreme worth of personality. But it also insists that the individual can rightly develop and find himself only in devoting his thought and life to the love and service of God and his fellow man. It would found on earth a kingdom of heaven in which obedience to the will of God, which is good will to man, shall be an all-controlling constitutional principle and law, and beneficence the universal means of personal and social advancement.

We must be benefactors that we may become able to love our fellows, for if we incline to hate those whom we wrong, we are surely as we drawn to love those to whom we do good. They who live with whatsoever things are true, gracious, pure and amiable, continue to grow in mental and moral power, and the good of life lies in the mental and moral dispositions which a disinterested conduct creates and fosters within us.

As matter is but life's setting, not its substance, so if we would go to the success of those who fall in right living, we must give them our interest, sympathy,

condemns and affection more than our money.

The special vice of the thriftless and delinquent is heedlessness and recklessness. We must train them to forethought, attention and consideration, and personal interest, not amassing, is the proper means whereby this may be accomplished. If we would save them, we must save them from themselves.

The purest charity consists in doing the spiritual rather than in doing the corporal works of mercy, since the essential good is the good of the soul. Let us have confidence in whatever increases the power of the soul, confidence in knowledge, science, freedom and labor, persuaded that riches are good only when they are the possession of the wise and the just. It is easier to be generous than to be just. The generous win approval while the just are often misunderstood and suspected of lack of heart.

The poor love the poor, because they give their thoughts and time to one another. They do not love the rich, because the rich give them only money.

More advice has little efficacy, for what we all need in nearly all situations is not so much a clearer view of right as a more fervent desire, a more determined will to do right, and this advice