

hope to win under the rule of a Military Dictator." In other words, his lordship is disappointed that General Lee, after obeying the commands of his native State to fight for a new constitution and government, did not prove a traitor to the trust reposed in him. After this confession of the character Lord Wolsley would have preferred to find when he visited General Lee, if his lordship's shade (when there is no longer waging or studying of war) should seek to renew the acquaintance with the calm spirit that bowed its head, in honor, at Appomattox, it is to be feared the insulted chieftain would exclaim: "Insatiate Englishman, will not one Benedict Arnold suffice?"

17. Lord Wolsley has as little sympathy with General Lee's real virtues as with his illusory "faults." Apparently he is far away from any possible comprehension of a great leader raised up to command wisely and unselfishly an army of democratic freemen. Nor can he appreciate how General Lee would feel, to know that the most famous English general of the time has written about him as though there were only one side to the civil war, and that the Confederate; and only one soldier on that side, and he Robert E. Lee.

Landscape-Gardeners Needed for America.

THE architectural profession, we are told, is already crowded, and bids fair soon to be so overcrowded that even creative ability will find it hard to make a path for itself, and executive intelligence will be a drug in the market. Demand strictly limits supply in this art at least; whenever it comes to pass that there are not enough architectural commissions to "go round," some aspirants will be compelled to turn to other tasks. But, fortunately, the demand for the services of a sister-profession seems to be fast outgrowing existent sources of supply. Our landscape architects are very few, and we are yearly awakening to a clearer recognition of our need for them.

As yet we do not recognize it half clearly or half generally enough. But it is only a few years since the case was even worse with the architects themselves,—in their true estate as differentiated from the "builder." And ideas develop rapidly in America—wants and wishes define and extend themselves with marvelous celerity when once a first faint prompting has been felt. Therefore that young American will be wise in his generation who takes note of current signs and now begins to fit himself to answer the imperious call that will soon be made upon the art of the landscape-architect,—or, to use the older, equally dignified, and exacter term, the *landscape-gardener*.

It is interesting to remember that—far as it lags behind to-day in the number of its professors and in the degree of public interest which attends it—this art showed earlier promise of vitality in America than architecture. Downing wrote excellently of landscape almost forty years ago, when certainly no American had written well of brick and stone; did admirable landscape work when our building was at its very worst; and published helpful illustrations of schemes of planting side by side with the most helpless and hideous designs for cottages and villas. The Central Park, which was planned in the 'fifties, when Richardson was still at college, may be called—considering the difficulties of the site, and allowing for the incom-

plete way in which first intentions have been carried out—almost as great a work of art as any Richardson created. But the public, now so quick to recognize success in the one art, did not then, and does not now, really appreciate success in the other. As a consequence, a hundred aspirants are ready and eager to tread in Mr. Richardson's footsteps, while the path which the success of Messrs. Olmsted and Vaux ought to have made tempting remains almost untrodden by younger feet. If we name these artists, Mr. Parsons, and but one or two others, we name all who are known by repute, it appears, even to those architects who are seeking help,—certainly all who stand visibly before the public as professed landscape-gardeners, anxious to work, as the landscape-gardener always should work, hand in hand with the architect.

Yet how vast is our need for the ministrations of such men. How immense is the number and how various the nature of the tasks which should no more be intrusted to the gardener-artisan than should the construction of public buildings and beautiful homes to the carpenter or mason. A whole huge continent has been so touched by human hands that over a large part of its surface it has been reduced to a state of unkempt, sordid ugliness; and it can be brought back into a state of beauty only by further touches of the same hands, more intelligently applied. Public parks are yearly being laid out in our larger towns. Our customary schemes of village building call imperatively for the landscape-artist's help. And there is an ever-growing demand for country homes of a more sumptuous sort, where the best of architects can but imperfectly do his work if he must do it quite alone. Look at the *châteaux* of France, for instance; at the older country homes of England; at the villas and palaces of Italy, and we see how intimate a union of the two arts produced their magnificent charm. We find it hard to decide where the work of the architect ended, the work of the gardener began. But we find it easy enough to imagine how infinitely less would be the impressiveness of the architect's work had not the gardener's been as good,—had he not set off and emphasized constructed beauty by making nature beautiful about it, and helped to connect and unify the two by an intermediate arrangement of terraces, fountains, balustrades, and more or less formal plantings.

Let it not be supposed that because the landscape-architect works with and in deference to nature, he can trust the light of nature to teach him how to work. The training he needs is as long and as serious as that needed by the architect, and even more varied in its character. He must begin—since his work so emphatically demands *good taste*—by cultivating himself in every possible way, and especially by cultivating his powers of observation and that feeling for natural beauty which comes by effort quite as often as by birth. He must study botany,—must acquaint himself not only with the aspect but with the habits and needs and idiosyncrasies of all sorts of plants, and in particular of all sorts of trees and shrubs. He must know of soils and drains and exposures and fertilizers, and all such matters, as the practical agriculturist knows of them. He must study architecture in a general but not a superficial way. He must travel widely,—in his own land to see how nature works towards beauty, and in older lands to see how men have worked

with her materials and with architectural materials towards the same great end. He must go through a term of pupilage in a busy office like Mr. Olmsted's to learn how the new problems of our own day may be met, how complicated are the considerations which affect any large problem, and how fully it must be worked out on paper before a spade is lifted. He must cultivate patience and imaginative power,—for his works will grow very slowly to completeness, and their final estate will be scarcely foreshadowed in their first. And he must cultivate tact,—the art of dealing with men,—even more diligently, perhaps, than the intending architect must; for he will have to

meet and often "manage" not only the client and the artisan, but the architect himself.

All this is slow work and costly work. But most of it will be found pleasant work, provided *pleasant* is not thought a synonym for *easy*. And once well accomplished it will open a delightful life, an ample outlet for the broadest and deepest artistic endowment, and, we believe, a surely prosperous career. The day is very certainly at hand when the gardener-artisan must and will be relegated to his proper place,—beside the builder; and wise, we repeat, will be the youth who will then have fitted himself to stand in this artisan's former place,—beside the architectural artist.

OPEN LETTERS.

Church Union.*

FROM A UNITARIAN POINT OF VIEW.

THE simple truth seems to be that Christian Unity exists in America now, for any one who wants it. Those people have it who were born, out-of-doors, in the open-air freedom of the Christian church, and those also who, having been born in one or another Egypt or closed tabernacle, have had the courage to go out into the freedom of the world of God.

This would never be doubted, but that, as I dare say you have seen, people not used to the freedom of the open air are at first a little puzzled by it. It is somewhat as, on your summer "outing," you have seen people who have been so much shut up in the winter that they do not at first enjoy the strong light of the sea-shore or the open pastures. But, indeed, they soon learn. Most people really want Christian Unity. I observe that most of your correspondents do. But some people are hand-tied, and, may be, tongue-tied, by some old shred of what is called a symbol, written in a dead language and in another time, which they are expected by somebody to subscribe in good faith. So you may see a boy on the sea-shore who wants to go into the ocean, but does not, because he is afraid to wet his clothes.

But when there is any real Christian work to do these people almost always strip off enough rags to be able to plunge into God's own infinite sea, and help the others who are doing it. At first, very likely, some stickler, or Pharisee, insists on a formula to say who may come and help and who may not. The word "Pharisee" means sectarian or lover of division. But once past this reef at the harbor's mouth, when they are all out on the infinite ocean, the initial difficulty is all forgotten. I belong to a society which had to meet many times before it could adjust the delicate balance of its formula. It discussed, even to a syllable, the language of its constitution. Finally, all were happily agreed, and it went to work. It has now been at work for nearly a generation. New members have joined it, eagerly, without so much as asking what was the language of its constitution. If they did ask, they would

not learn. For I have put away my copy so carefully that I do not know where it is, and the secretary's was burned in the Boston Fire; but fortunately he does not know that. There are no other copies. The society itself, all the same, does good work for God and for man, every day. It is judged by its fruits, as everything else is judged and must be judged, in the heavens above or in the earth beneath. And yet no man can tell in words what are the conditions of membership.

Any one who wants Christian Unity in America at the end of the nineteenth century has simply to walk out of his own house and go to work with other men in some enterprise which the good God wishes to have carried through. He will find all the unity he wants. This is nobly illustrated in the charity organization societies which are now at work in all the larger cities of the country.

A man may enter any one of these charity organization societies, whether he be Arminian, Baptist, Calvinist, "Disciple," Episcopalian, Free-Baptist, Greek, Gentile, or Galilean, Hicksite, Independent or orthodox Friend, Jew, Karaite, or Coptic, Lutheran, Methodist, New-Church, orthodox, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, or Reformer, Sandemanian, or Supralapsarian, Trinitarian, Unitarian, or Universalist; or, indeed, if he be one of those Variorum or Wild-Cat come-outers, the unorganized and un-creed believers in Xavier, Yahveh, or Zinzendorf, or Et-cetera himself, who bring up the alphabet of the older and the younger churches.

All these people are eagerly welcomed in any of these practical organizations. Dr. Wayland's rule was, is, and will be, the only working rule. "Can they cast out the devils?" he used to ask. If they could, he did not push his questions further. Before the charity organization has been running three months these people are at work together, without a thought of the verbal or technical formulas by which, on occasion, they could divide into their several companies.

It is easy to say that the work of the church is better done by its several sections when they keep up a strict organization among themselves, and each lets the other sections severely alone. But this is only "say so," and Americans are not ready or apt to believe it. They have read their own history enough to understand the lesson taught in the twelve years between 1775 and 1787, when Massachusetts governed herself, and kept

*See Professor Shields on "The United Churches of the United States," CENTURY for November, 1885; also subsequent Open Letters from ministers of various denominations.