

desires, their penitence, and implore His pardon. I always have understood it to be the most consistent way to pray to the Father direct without the agency of a third person to bear our petitions to the throne of grace. Christ is the intercessor and He is the great Mediator, and his is the legitimate name to be used and associated with that of the Father in the important matter of prayer.

In the 6th chapter of St. Matthew we find the following instructions:

And when thou prayest thou shouldst not be as the hypocrites are: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. But thou when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut the door, pray to thy Father which is in secret. and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly. But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions as the heathen do; for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking. Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask Him. After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven, etc."

Notwithstanding this very plain instruction the Catholic people choose to pray (if not directly at least indirectly) to Mary, as will be made clear by the following form of prayer which I copy from a Catholic book:

"Remember, Mary, tenderest-hearted Virgin, how from of old the ear hath never heard that he who ran to thee for refuge, implored thy help and sought thy prayers, was forsaken of God. Virgin of virgins, Mother, emboldened by this confidence I fly to thee, to thee I come, and in thy presence I, a weeping sinner, stand. Mother of the Word Incarnate, Oh, cast not away my prayer; but in thy pity hear and answer. Amen."

Captain Shields has been drawing almost the entire population to his large open tent to hear him upon the temperance question, for the last two or three weeks. The people seem to go almost *en masse*. On Sunday evenings the churches generally discontinue their meetings to give their members an opportunity of hearing him. I understand he takes the names of children irrespective of age; any and everybody who will sign the pledge for themselves or their families are at liberty to do so. I understand some 1800 of the citizens of Maryville and vicinity, now wear the badge, a red ribbon, as the token of their intentions to adhere to the requirements of temperance. This is certainly good if the resolution is formed substantially to be kept and not to be broken.

Mr. Shields is quite eloquent and earnest in his appeals. He may be very sincere, too, but, I am informed, he requires \$75 per week for his services. If this amount is raised this gentleman will consent to remain

in Maryville one more week, to reclaim the wayward, make happy homes, and add to his own substance. Doubtless he is largely actuated by humane ideas; but minus the \$75 he declines his generous services.

The world is filled up with such philanthropic souls. They figure in temperance, in politics, in religion, and in the multifarious industries of trade. At best, this is a fast age. Money produces the enchanting ring that sets communities and governments in motion. Many great men who sway the masses and direct the helm of government say it is the good of humanity they seek; but money must be amassed to keep them upon the high plane of popularity and affluence. Such is life in this portion of the nineteenth century.

Respectfully,

L. O. LITTLEFIELD.

MARYVILLE, Mo., Aug. 22, 1889.

HOW PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE.

IN THE *Popular Science Monthly* for August the following thoughtful paper appears, the truth of which will be appreciated by most of our readers. It adds a little more to the volume of evidence that the opinion of the multitude is not a test of the truth of any principle, and that the opposition of the masses is no proper guide in estimating a man, a doctrine or a measure:

The study of all civilizations proves that all progress has been accomplished by a small number of the higher minds. The mass has done nothing more than profit by the advance; it does not even like to see it extended, and the greatest thinkers or inventors have often been martyrs. Yet all the generations, the whole past of a race, bloom out in these geniuses. They do not appear by chance or miracle, but represent a long synthesis. To favor their birth and growth is to favor the birth of a progress by which all mankind will be benefited. If we should allow ourselves to be blinded by our dreams of social equality, we should ourselves be the first victims of it. Equality can only exist in inferiority. To bring about a reign of equality in the world it would be necessary gradually to pull all that gives value to a race down to the level of what in it is lowest. It would require ages to raise the intellectual level of the lowest peasants up to that of the genius of a Lavoisier. While a second and the stroke of the guillotine is sufficient to destroy such a brain. But while the part of superior men in the development of a civilization is considerable, it is not quite what it is generally believed to be. Their action, I repeat, consists in synthesizing all the efforts of a race; their discoveries are always the result of a long series of prior discoveries; they build an edifice with stones which others have previously hewn. Historians fancy they must couple the name of a man with every invention; yet among the great inventions which have

transformed the world, like those of printing, gunpowder, and electric telegraphy, there is not one of which it can be said that it was created by a single man. Of similar character is the part which great statesmen have played. They could without doubt destroy a society or disturb its evolution, but it is not given to them to change its course. The genius of a Cromwell or a Napoleon could not perform such a task. Great conquerors might destroy cities, men, and empires by sword and fire, as a child could burn a museum filled with treasures of art, but this destructive power should not subject us to illustrations respecting the grandeur of their achievements.

The work of great political men is durable only when, like Caesar or Richelieu, they direct their efforts according to the demands of the moment; the true cause of their success is, then, generally long anterior to themselves. The really great men in politics are those who anticipate the demands that are going to arise, the events for which the past has prepared, and point out the way to be followed. They, also, like the great inventors, synthesize the results of a long previous work. Of what, in the eye of philosophy, is history, as the books tell it, composed, except of the long recital of the struggles endured by men to create an ideal, adore it, and then destroy it? And have such ideals any more value in the eyes of pure science than the mirage of the desert? There have been, however, great enthusiasts, creators of such mirages, who have profoundly transformed the world. They still from their tombs hold the minds of multitudes under the sway of their thoughts. While not mistaking the significance of their achievements, let us not forget that they would not have succeeded in accomplishing what they did if they had not unconsciously incarnated and expressed the dominant ideal of their race and their time. It is, in fact, ideas, and consequently those who incarnate them, that lead the world. They rise at first under vague forms, and float in the air, gradually changing their aspect, till some day they appear under the form of a great man or a great act. It is of little account, as determining the force with which they shall act, whether they are true or false. History teaches us that the most chimerical illusions have excited more enthusiasm among men than the best demonstrated truths. Such illusions are only shadows, but nevertheless have to be respected. Through them our fathers were hopeful, and in their heroic and heedless course they have brought us out of barbarism and led us to the point where we stand today. Mankind has expended most of its efforts, not in the pursuit of truth, but of error. It has not been able to reach the chimerical aims it was pursuing; but in pursuing them it has realized a progress that it was not seeking.

If you note all the details you have not seen the whole.

Deliberation too far prolonged defeats its own ends.