

are drawn away from 'the peaceful life of the fields that they may learn to kill, to devastate and destroy.

THE SOUL'S ELECTION-DAYS.

Every soul must have its election-days, when it must definitely express its will in regard to great moral and spiritual issues. The old alternative of God or Baal is forevermore presenting itself under every variety of modern form. Life and good are being constantly set over against death and evil, and come before us perpetually for our adjudication. Questions vaster in their eternal import than those of imperialism, currency, protection, tariff, the control of trusts, the age-limit of pensions are being decided daily by common men everywhere, but no one notes the profound meaning of these transactions. The minor choices of men as to their places of residence, their business, their political and social affiliations are not to be brought into comparison with those which touch the deepest interests of the spiritual life.

This power of choice—this endowment of solemn responsibility—is one of the profoundest mysteries which belongs to humanity. It involves all the world-old inexplicable enigmas which center about man's free agency, the foreknowledge and foreordination of God, and the insoluble problem of evil. It negatives any purely fatalistic philosophy, any theology which at once puts man helplessly under the relentless grip of necessity and Divine compulsion, and then holds him accountable for his acts. It is the title-deed to our greatness. Our choice must be our own. In every political campaign, after the speeches and letters of acceptance, the ratification meetings, the addresses of campaign orators, the distribution of literature, the appeals of the newspapers, the organization of clubs, the quiet activity of individuals—after all this, it is the voter who must decide for himself and by himself how he will cast his ballot. So men may seek to influence their fellows; parents, by training, example, and precept may seek to secure virtue in their children; pastors, by exhortation and private pleading, may endeavor to lead their brother-men into ways of righteousness; friends, by loving companionship and sympathetic counsel, may try to exert a potent influence for good. But after all is said and done, in the final event, every man—despite all that God or men can do for him—is the determiner of his own destiny for weal or woe. No fact in the universe is fuller of more solemn significance than this. The starry heavens, the moral law, and man's responsi-

bility—these have been declared to be the three things which should fill the mind with the greatest awe. For time and eternity we are sovereigns of our own fate.

In the body politic national elections fall on some specific day of the year and after an interval of years; in the spiritual realm they are ordered daily and hourly. The polls are always open. Determinations which may involve crises are as numerous as the calendared months. Mistakes may figure as fatalities. In governmental matters changes of administration may, indeed, have considerable weight and far-reaching effects. But no such results can measure with the outcome of the count in the spirit's booth. At a Presidential election a nation is the intensely interested participator and spectator. At the soul's election, friends on earth and in Heaven, the angels, Christ, and God wait in prayerful hope and expectation. If the majority blunder at the nation's polls, many years may be required to rectify the resulting bad legislation. If the soul shall choose wrongly, it will travel many a mile of suffering and loss before its perilous mistake is remedied.

At the country's ballot boxes the voters drop secret ballots. They fall silently, but they are decisive. So secretly and silently does the soul record its preference for the good or the evil. There can be no split ticket—no division between God and mammon—in that voting. No citizen who ignominiously remains at home on election day can avoid his share of responsibility for what was then done. And no one can escape deciding, by imagining that he will not decide the great questions of the soul and eternity. And we may be sure that every vote in the precinct of the soul will be counted. There is a self-registering contrivance for this purpose.

Sometimes men, under stress of conviction, feel that they must sever their old party ties and go, with whatever sense of pain, into the new cause. Thus often does it cost the soul some agony to break up its old connections and choose the new path of truth; but that path leads to the House of Peace. And as, after the battle of the ballots, the country recovers from its perturbation and excitements and settles down into regularity, so, in conversion and in all the critical judgments which the soul must make, after "the great transaction" is done there is an entering into a serenity which is like a benediction.—Western Christian Advocate, for Nov. 2, 1904.

A CORRECTION—LINCOLN AND LABOR.

Several weeks ago there was reproduced in these columns (p. 299) an editorial from the Detroit Times of May 5, 1904, which was entitled: "The Greed of a Few a Peril to the Liberties of the Many." The editorial concluded with a postscript by the editor of the Times in which the following statement was made regarding what had preceded:

It was written by Abraham Lincoln 40 years ago, forming part of his message to Congress in 1864. In reprinting it we have changed the Lincoln "I's" and "my's" to "we's" and "ours," but otherwise it is word for word as Lincoln wrote it.

In copying this article from the Detroit Times, The Public gave full credit, and having no reason to doubt the genuineness of the quotation from Lincoln, made no investigation. The Times itself must have been similarly misled by some other publication, for it is inconceivable that it would have credited the extract to Mr. Lincoln's message of 1864, when nothing like it appeared in that message, but much of it did appear in his message of 1861.

In his first regular message to Congress, of December 3, 1861 (see "Messages and Papers of the Presidents," published in 1900 by authority of Congress, Vol. VI., page 56), Mr. Lincoln wrote:

It continues to develop that the insurrection is largely, if not exclusively, a war upon the first principle of popular government—the rights of the people. Conclusive evidence of this is found in the most grave and maturely considered public documents, as well as in the general tone of the insurgents. In those documents we find the abridgement of the existing right of suffrage and the denial to the people of all right to participate in the selection of public officers except the legislative boldly advocated, with labored arguments to prove that large control of the people in government is the source of all political evil.

Monarchy itself is sometimes hinted at as a possible refuge from the power of the people. In my present position I could scarcely be justified were I to omit raising a warning voice against this approach of returning despotism.

It is not needed nor fitting here that a general argument should be made in favor of popular institutions, but there is one point, with its connections, not so hackneyed as most others, to which I ask a brief attention.

It is the effort to place *capital* on an equal footing with, if not above, *labor* in the structure of government. It is assumed that labor is available only in connection with capital; that nobody labors unless somebody else, owning capital, somehow by the use of it induces him to labor.

This assumed, it is next considered whether it is best that capital shall *hire* laborers, and thus induce them to work by their own consent, or *buy* them and drive them to it without their consent. Having proceeded so far, it is naturally concluded that all laborers are either *hired* laborers or what we call slaves. And further, it is assumed, that whoever is once a hired

laborer is fixed in that condition for life. Now there is no such relation between capital and labor as assumed, nor is there any such thing as a free man being fixed for life in the condition of a hired laborer. Both these assumptions are false, and all inferences from them are groundless. Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights, which are as worthy of protection as any other rights. Nor is it denied that there is, and probably always will be, a relation between labor and capital producing mutual benefits. The error is in assuming that the whole labor of community exists within that relation.

Mr. Lincoln's message here proceeds to describe the economic condition which had prevailed in this country down to his time, a condition in which there were masters and slaves, hired men and employers, independent workers (mixed laborers and capitalists), etc., and to notice the tendency of hired men to pass into the condition of independence. Of this tendency his message then went on to say (same volume of Messages, etc, page 58):

The prudent, penniless beginner in the world labors for wages awhile, saves a surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account another while, and at length hires another new beginner to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all, gives hope to all, and consequent energy and progress and improvement of condition to all. No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty; none less inclined to take or touch aught which they have not honestly earned. Let them beware of surrendering a political power which they already possess, and which it surrendered, will surely be used to close the door of advancement against such as they and to fix new disabilities and burdens upon them, till all of liberty shall be lost.

In the article we are now correcting, some of the foregoing passages occurred, and from it some of them were omitted. Other passages were interpolated, which do not appear in Lincoln's message nor in any other public document to which his signature was attached.

The first of these interpolations is at the commencement of the article, in the place of that part of the message beginning with the words, "It continues to develop," and ending with the words, "source of all political evil." The interpolation is as follows:

We see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves us and causes us to tremble for the safety of our country. As a result of the war, corporations have been enthroned, and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until all the wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic is destroyed. We feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of our country

than ever before, even in the midst of war. God grant that our forebodings may be groundless.

The second interpolation occurs at the end of the article, in place of the part of the message beginning with the words, "This assumed, it is next considered," and ending with the words, "all of liberty shall be lost." This interpolation is as follows:

Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor and could not have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration. We bid the laboring people to beware of surrendering the power which they possess, and which, if surrendered, will surely be used to shut the door of advancement for such as they, and fix new disabilities and burdens upon them until all of liberty shall be lost. In the early days of our race, the Almighty said to the first of mankind, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," and since then, if we except the light and air of heaven, no good has been or can be enjoyed by us, without first having cost labor. And inasmuch as most good things have been produced by labor, it follows that all such things belong of right to those whose labor has produced them. But it has so happened, in all the ages of the world, that some have labored and others have, without labor, enjoyed a large portion of the fruits. This is wrong and should not continue. To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any government. It seems strange that any man should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing bread from the sweat of other men's faces. This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it.

That these passages were improperly credited, in the article in question, is undeniably true. With the exception of one clause of the second interpolation they do not appear verbally in any message of Lincoln's nor in any of his public addresses. The excepted clause is as follows:

Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration.

That clause does appear verbatim in the message of 1861.

Although these interpolated passages are improperly credited, it is by no means certain that they are forged, as has been charged.

If forged, the forgery consists for the most part in transferring Lincoln's sentiments, expressed in public speeches and authentic letters, to his message with slight verbal alterations. The only part of the interpolations for which substantial authority from Lincoln's speeches and letters cannot be found is that which refers to the enthronement of corporations. But even such transference—with its verbal alterations and though it in no wise misrepresented Lincoln—would fairly constitute literary forgery. It is worth referring to only because the supposed

transference might have been made by Lincoln himself. That is, the document which the Detroit Times published and The Public reproduced (p. 279), while not a Presidential message, may have been some other product of Lincoln's pen—a letter or a fragment of a speech.

Lincoln was habitually bold in reproducing his own words of one occasion on other occasions. The fact that he used certain words and phrases in his message of 1861, does not prove that he did not use them before or after in another document or speech and in other connections and collocations.

A remarkable instance occurs in connection with this very message of 1861. Mr. Lincoln's statement in that message that "labor is prior to and independent of capital," etc., is credited word for word by Geo. S. Boutwell to a speech of Lincoln's in 1854—seven years before the message in which those words appeared. The second interpolation quoted above is evidently made up of extracts partly from the message of 1861 and partly from other Lincolnian sources, while the substance and much of the language of that message itself on the subject of labor may be found in Lincoln's speech at Cincinnati on the 17th of September, 1859—two years before the message.

It is possible that the interpolations noted above are literary forgeries. But if they are, the fact cannot be proved on the ground that they misrepresent Lincoln's sentiments; for they do not. Neither can it be proved by the assumption that some forger made extracts from various Lincolnian sources and wove them together; for Lincoln himself was in the habit of doing that very thing and might have done it in this instance.

The only basis for an inference of forgery is the fact that the authenticity of these supposedly spurious quotations has not been affirmatively proved, and that the reference to the enthronement of corporations seems to be an anachronism.

Some effort has been made to show that in what Lincoln indisputably did say about labor he made no allusion to the labor question, as it now expresses itself; but that his mind was centered upon the question of slave extension.

"In this section of his message," says one critic, "he strove to arouse the industrial workers to the danger of the competition of slave labor. That was the thought in his mind. Lincoln lived all his life, before he became President, in rural localities, where the union movement, then in its infancy, was unknown."

This interpretation of Mr. Lincoln's words on slavery is complimentary to the intelligence of neither the interpreter nor of Mr. Lincoln. As to Mr. Lincoln, not only does the language of his message indicate, but

many other circumstances go to show, that he had in mind the whole broad principle regarding human labor, and not exclusively the one angle of it which touched upon slavery. And it is evident from his speech at New Haven, Conn., March 6, 1860 (Nicolay and Hay, vol. I. p. 625) that he had at least some knowledge of the distinguishing characteristic of the labor union movement of to-day—the strike. In that speech Mr. Lincoln is reported to have said:

I am glad to see that a system of labor prevails in New England under which laborers can strike when they want to.

He then went on to urge that the right to strike ought to be given to the slave. His essential democracy was indeed stimulated by the slavery phase of the labor question; but no man like Lincoln could have addressed a community of striking shoemakers, as he did in that New Haven speech, without knowing something of the labor union movement—a movement which had begun in this country before he was born, and which had grown to sufficient proportions to have evoked from two of the greatest judges of Lincoln's palmy days at the bar (Shaw, of Massachusetts, and Savage, of New York) conflicting decisions, "leading cases," as lawyers call them, on the right of workmen to organize unions and carry on strikes.

L. F. P.

Boy—Is a dollar a week all I'm to get?

Superintendent — Oh, no; besides your salary you will learn the business.

Boy—And when I learn the business, do I get more pay?

Superintendent—Oh, dear, no. When you are worth more we shall let you go, and take another boy and let him learn the business.—Boston Evening Transcript.

He was a diner in a club which had opened its doors to the members of his club while some necessary repairs were being made. He did not know that some of his club waiters had been lent to the club which was offering its hospitality. He proceeded to abuse the food, and said to a servant:

"Go and tell the cook what I say."

"I couldn't well do that, sir," was the answer. "You see, I am only a guest in this club myself."

And the abuse of the viands ceased.—Sporting Times.

Drummer—What became of old Tuffnut, who formerly owned a disreputable dive on Blank street?

Merchant—Oh, he reformed several

years ago and is now one of our most honest and respected citizens.

Drummer—What business is he in now?

Merchant—None at all. He made a fortune out of his dive, and retired.—St. Louis Star.

The Saturday Evening Post says that "good times or bad" have "not enough importance to disquiet any man of the right sort." Considering the vast number of wage-earners who are obliged to live up to the last dime of their incomes week by week, and to whom the loss of a job in bad times means immediate privation, it would be somewhat interesting to see the Post's "right sort of man"—to observe how representative he is of a majority of the people.

EDMUND VANCE COOKE.

BOOKS

MISS HARRISON'S STUDY OF CHILD NATURE.

The copy of this little book that lies before us is marked twenty-second edition, but it is never too late to say a word about a good thing. Miss Harrison, of the Chicago Kindergarten College, is recognized the land over as an authority on child study, and this book is the heart of what she has to say on the subject. For mothers and for teachers of young children she says many helpful words that are in line with the best modern thought.

Her first italics are as good as anything in the whole book: "Build up the positive side of your child's nature and the negative side will not need to be up-built." If this could be laid to heart by all who deal with the young, it would make a great difference in all our teaching. To be positive and constructive rather than negative and destructive is a good injunction to put at the very beginning of instruction—and why? Because the positive attitude is the healthy attitude, and because it is so awfully easy to slip into the negative attitude. One of the chief values of Miss Harrison's little book is that, all through, it takes the positive attitude. She believes in saying "do, do" rather than "don't," and in seeking occasion to praise rather than in seeking occasion to blame.

Another strong point in her teaching is the insistence upon the great law of the "deed returning upon the doer's head." The text, "with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again," is shown to be a divine law, which the mother should ever heed. "The more," says the author, "she lets the deed do its own punishing, the more impersonal her own part in the affair, the sooner does the child learn the les-

son." On this point, as on others, many illustrations are given which add greatly to the interest and effectiveness of the abstract injunction.

In reviewing such a book, which is throughout a protest against the critical spirit, it is hard to depart from the author's fine ideal, and to assume for a moment the attitude of criticism. One feels like a traitor. And yet—to one who has children of one's own, and has been called on to deal with other people's children of all degrees of culture and training, there cannot but arise the question, whether the virile side of punishment is not perhaps sometimes more necessary than the author imagines. One wants to be with her on every point, but silently questions whether one can be, at the present unregenerate state, of the game.

J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—The New Lights: a Drama in Four Acts. By Hugh Mann. Boston: Richard G. Badger. The Gorham Press. Price, \$1. To be reviewed.

PERIODICALS.

"All sorts of religious people," says the New York Independent, "however else they differ, agree to evade taxation." According to reports \$216,694,195 of church property escapes taxation in Greater New York. The Independent truly claims that "every dollar's worth evaded is so much of a lie to our principle of separation of church and state." J. H. D.

The philosopher of the New York Independent, in an editorial on Making Life Worth Living, says some wise words about the accumulation of things in households. "There is hardly a house in America," he says, "that would not be improved in 'livableness,' in substantial comfort, and especially in attractiveness, if, some evening, the good man and his wife should sit down and make up a list of exactly one-half of their possessions to be consigned next morning to the bonfire." This is almost literally true. How many houses one enters in which getting about is like steering one's way through an archipelago. J. H. D.

The article in the November Arena on Our Legal Machinery and Its Victims, by Dr. G. W. Galvin, of Boston, ought to be widely read. Dr. Galvin shows how misdirected is much of the work of prison reformers. "If such men," he says, "would accomplish the great purpose they have in mind, they must devote themselves to improving industrial conditions and the administration of justice." He criticises with deserved severity many of the statutes which have been passed at the instigation of well-meaning but mistaken reformers. J. H. D.

The recent convention of the Episcopal church in Boston had a report on "Capital and Labor." Three members of the committee were Bishop Potter