

The Paddock bill, introduced in the Senate, June, 1892, provided for a thorough system of forest management by the Department of Agriculture, with a competent commissioner and inspector, resident foresters and rangers, "to protect and improve the forest cover within the reservations, for the purpose of securing favorable conditions of water flow and continuous supplies of timber to the people of the districts within which the reservations are situated." Military aid in protecting the reservations from fire and trespassers, and enforcing rules and regulations, was provided, also coöperation with State forest management. Land best adapted to agriculture was to be restored to the public domain; mining to be prosecuted within the reserves under special regulations, and wood to be cut under a system of licenses by lumbermen and others; cutting or removing timber, burning, injuring, tapping, or girdling timber, to be punished by fine and imprisonment upon judgment of any United States court or commissioner; ship-owners and railroad companies transporting any lumber or timber product unlawfully obtained to be liable to the same penalties; and all revenue derived from the reserves in any way to constitute a separate fund to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture for the care and preservation of the reservations. This bill was drawn up at the instance of the American Forestry Association, and received the active support of its members, and the zealous attention of its attorney. It found a place on the calendar, but did not become a law. The McRae substitute bill in the House was introduced in January and reported in February, but failed of consideration by the Fifty-second Congress. The McRae bill provided only for the immediate protection of the reserves by troops; for selling timber of commercial value to the highest bidder; for restoring agricultural lands to the public domain; and for creating a fund for reservation use from timber sales.

The fact that the Hon. J. Sterling Morton, the originator of Arbor Day and President of the American Forestry Association, has since become the Secretary of Agriculture, to whom the management of the government forests will be intrusted, is promise enough of the attitude of the present administration toward the new national forest policy. The appointment of Mr. Edward A. Bowers, the secretary and formerly the attorney of the American Forestry Association, as Assistant Commissioner of the General Land Office, is another assurance that the best interests of the Government and the people will be guarded in these initial years of the great undertaking.

*Eliza Ruhamah Scidmore.*

#### Money and a Day's Work.

I HAVE read with interest and profit your editorial in the June CENTURY, "Has Gold Appreciated in Value?" It occurs to me that there is a primary measure of value, which you do not mention, but tried by which the value of gold will be found to have deviated but little in thirty years past. I refer to labor,—not the price of labor, but "days' works." I have not at hand exact data, but practical miners tell me that the average result from a day's work in gold-mining is not perceptibly different from thirty years ago, while the average day's work in the silver-mines will produce three times as much as in 1865. On the theory that the natural relative price of commodities is determined by the

*bravn* expended in the production, while *demand* is but a modifier of the rule, it would seem that much of the mystery relating to the deviation in values may be explained.

WATERTOWN, SOUTH DAKOTA. *Doane Robinson.*

#### Christianity Outside the Churches.

IN the "Forum" of October, 1890, Bishop Huntington emphasized anew the fact to which Professor Ely had already called attention—*viz.*, that a wide-spread alienation, and indeed distrust, of the church existed even among those working-men who would yet applaud the name of Christ and listen respectfully to his teachings. This is a fact to the very serious significance of which the ecclesiastical authorities and leaders of our churches have given, as yet, far too little weight.

But there is another fact, due primarily to much the same causes, of perhaps even more serious import, but to which even less attention has been given. This is the extent to which some of the most sincere Christian believers of our day, especially among men of intellect, of education, and of moral culture, have come to hold aloof from the institutional fellowship of Christ's professed disciples. The Rev. Dr. Newman Smyth, in his precious little volume, "Personal Creeds," says (p. 75):

"There is now a good deal of unformulated and even unbaptized Christianity in the thought and life of men outside of the church. Christ is becoming more real in many ways to this generation. His doctrine, although perhaps not so fully apprehended as it might be, is entering effectively into much of the best striving and working of men who are standing aloof from the churches." And again (p. 102): "With a high sense of moral honor, they prefer to go without any belief in a divine plan of salvation, rather than to profess belief in some conceptions which take no active hold on their experience of life."

In even stronger language writes Professor Bruce ("Kingdom of God," p. 144): "I am even disposed to think that a great and steadily increasing portion of the moral worth of society lies outside of the church—separated from it, not by godlessness, but rather by exceptionally intense moral earnestness. Many, in fact, have left the church in order to be Christians." And again (p. 272): "Instead of claiming for the church that within it alone is salvation to be found, earnest men are more inclined to ask whether salvation is to be found in it at all, and does not rather consist in escaping from its influence. A good many are asking such revolutionary questions even now; and it is foolish for churchmen simply to be shocked and to characterize them as profane. The church is only a means to an end. It is good only in so far as it is Christian. There is no merit or profit in mere ecclesiasticism. Whatever reveals the true Christ is of value and will live. Whatever hides Christ—be it pope, priest or presbyter, sacraments or ecclesiastical misrule—is pernicious and must pass away."

Few things are more difficult than to form a calm and an unprejudiced judgment of our own times, and especially of any course of events in which we are ourselves taking, however slight, yet an interested part. We read the published story of the past with the feeling that personal equations have been largely allowed for already by the judicious historian. But in the attempt to judge of that history which is still "in the

making," not only must an allowance for the personal equation be made by us in the reception of every witness and in the weighing of every opinion; but it must be made by the writer, most of all for himself, and by the reader, in his turn, for both the writer and himself.

Now it may be "a short and easy method" with the writers of such language as that quoted above to rebuke them and to deny the truth of the witness which they bear. There is a precedent, in the case of St. Stephen, for stopping our ears and running upon such preachers with one accord and casting them out. The clergy and other religionists who intrench themselves at once in the *a priori* position that there can be no such genuine extra-institutional Christianity, and who take counsel only among themselves and will receive no witness that will not bear the test of their own orthodoxy, may so dispose of this whole subject.

But let the Christian minister or loyal churchman who is so happy as to have even one honest and earnest friend of clear head, of true judgment, and of high moral life,—a business man of integrity, a lawyer of unsullied honor, an authority in science,—among "them that are without,"—a friend between whom and himself there is such mutual trust that either will speak to the other with entire candor,—let that churchman ask that friend whether the language in question is or is not true. Let the father whose sons have never come to feel that they may not tell him honestly all that is in their thoughts, and who, at the same time, associate on terms of free, unmeasured, earnest, mutual confidence with the more thoughtful, high-hearted, and upright young men of their own age and interests—let that father ask his sons whether this is not especially true of very many of the best later graduates and undergraduates of our colleges.

It is the misfortune or the weakness of most of us, and notably of the clergy, that in proportion to our own personal sincerity in the faith which we profess, and our devotion to the church of our allegiance, our friends and even our sons hesitate to tell us plainly, because of the pain it will give us, just what they see and hear, what they believe and know. We unconsciously withdraw from the testimony we ought to hear and out of the reach of such plain speaking; and then we pronounce confidently on a state of things of which we really know nothing.

The fact probably is that both Dr. Smyth and Professor Bruce have borne only faithful witness. The present writer, as at present informed, has no reason to abate one word of such witness. He has not found that testimony directly to the point was either far to seek or hard to get; and so far as he has been able to get direct access to the facts, they fully confirm it.

There has probably been no epoch in Christian history when the best intellects were more deeply interested in religious questions than now; when young men of early advantages and of education were more eager to know what is truth or to give themselves to its proclaiming and to its defense. There never was a time when God was more real to educated and to thinking men generally; when there was, among such men, more real interest in the Bible and desire to study it; when such men were more ready to listen to the story of Christ and to his doctrine, so only it be his and not some gloss which the theologians or ecclesiastics have put upon or substituted for it.

Why then this holding aloof of just such men from the churches which appeal to them in Christ's name and, as they claim, by his authority? Why this self-dissociation from the organized fellowship of those who are united on these very grounds?

The answer to such questionings is at hand if we are ourselves candid enough to suffer it to be given us.

We shall be told, in the first place, that the scientific-theological philosophy of the day, of which it is claimed that the great law of evolution holds the master key,—that the best biblical criticism of the last generation,—that the powerfully revived Greek doctrine of the divine immanence as distinguished from the Latin doctrine of the divine transcendence,—that these have greatly revolutionized as well as given a new and strong impulse to the best thinking of earnest men; and that it has been made impossible for them any longer either to accept, or to profess without accepting, the old ways of regarding religious data, or the old traditional ideas and formulas of the churches or the dogmatic teachings based upon them.

We shall, at the same time, be reminded that the churches—at all events, those who are the presumably representative authorities and teachers in them—are, as a rule, slow to realize the facts or to admit the force of these changes in religious thinking; that they insist dogmatically upon the old confessions and traditions as part and parcel of the very warp and woof of divine truth; and that it is therefore difficult for those with whom this new religious philosophy and these new convictions find acceptance not to feel themselves virtually excluded from the churches, indeed absolutely repelled by them. At all events, if not drawn to some one minister by teaching which commends itself at once to their intellect and to their conscience, they certainly are not interested, as they might once have been, in the discussion of the claims of the rival churches upon their adhesion or upon their loyalty, upon the acceptance of this or of that confession, of a given form of ecclesiastical polity, or even of the apostolic succession of its chief ministers. They do not care to study or even to consider these questions. They will hold as apostolic and will follow that ministry which leads them most directly Christward, which most truly and most consistently bears witness to him. No other argument has force with them.

Such will be the first reply given us. Let us give it its full weight. And yet there is another and probably a more powerful reason for the facts under consideration than even this,—one indeed which gives to this much of its effect.

For the present has been truly said to be "a day of light and revelation," in which the light is searching all things and discriminating what is real and eternal from the superficial and transitory, and still more from what is unreal.

And it is, therefore, above all other reasons, because those most under the influence of this new theological philosophy feel that the churches are less loyal to truth for its own sake than to their own traditions; less anxious to be faithful to Christ than to adhere to themselves, to their own interpretations of his teachings, to the ecclesiastical habits and even to the ignorances and unreal conventionalities of their past, that they hold aloof from them.

However unjust and prejudiced this may seem to us,

who will venture to say that the churches have given no warrant for any such feelings? It will be difficult to maintain such a defense so long as the churches refuse to consider how far there may perhaps be grounds for such a feeling, and so long as any one who may honestly and loyally raise this question and ask for such self-examination is promptly suppressed. The churches which will not suffer such questions to be asked loyally by their own faithful sons must expect to have them asked in far sterner accents by their enemies.

But when the churches, when any one of them, by her leaders and representative men, shall, with honest and manly candor, court criticism and the most searching trial of all things which may have become unreal, when they manifest a sincere devotion, above all things else, to Christ's Christianity, even should the theological traditions of their past be convicted of error in the new light of truth, and the customs and methods and ecclesiastical life, which are now taken for granted, of unreality by the new revelation, when any church thus illustrates its supreme loyalty to truth and to Christ, then those who now stand so utterly apart, in their own loyalty to both, will return by one and another and at last in flocks to ecclesiastical allegiance.

There is, indeed, great reason to hope that this may soon be; for, to continue the quotations made above, Dr. Smyth goes on to say: "Within the Church itself there is beginning to make itself felt and efficacious, a revival of simpler and more real Christian life." And Professor Bruce (p. 356): "If, as both faith and philosophy attest, Christianity be the absolute religion, perennial because perfect, not destined to be superseded by any better, because better is impossible, it must be able to shake itself clear of whatever hampers the free expression of its eternal vitality. . . . The need of a new hour of emancipation is a prophecy of its coming."

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

*Wm. Chauncy Langdon.*

"The Century's" American Artists Series.

EDWIN HOWLAND BLASHFIELD.

THE picture "The Angel with the Flaming Sword," on page 696, was painted by Edwin Howland Blashfield in Paris in the winter of 1891, exhibited in the Salon of that year, and is now in the American section of the Fine Arts Building at the World's Fair. It is a canvas of large size, of much story-telling power, and is notable for stately simplicity. Mr. Blashfield has evidently approached his task in a devout spirit. The angel appears to recognize the justice of the sentence, and as a true servant wishes to execute the divine commission, but he does so with sorrow, as though he would fain hear the voice of his Master calling to the erring to return. The artist, who has admirably managed the mixed expression of justice and sorrow on the face of the angel, is to be congratulated on having produced a picture with rare religious feeling. Technically this painting is the peer of Mr. Blashfield's other works. In one respect—namely, the firmness of its drawing—it is a step in advance.

For a more extended notice of Mr. Blashfield's work the reader is referred to this magazine for Dec., 1892.

LYDIA FIELD EMMET.

LYDIA FIELD EMMET, whose picture "In her First Youth" appears on page 728, was born in Pelham, New York. Her first art knowledge was derived from her talented sister, Rosina Emmet Sherwood. While still in her teens she became, at the Art Students' League, a pupil of W. M. Chase, and later of Boulangier and Lefebvre at the Académie Julien, Paris.

Miss Emmet has done much pretty and graceful illustrating for children's books and periodicals. Her most important work is a wall-painting of large proportions, representing Music, Literature, Painting, Sculpture, and Embroidery, in the hall of the Woman's Building at the Chicago World's Fair.

*W. Lewis Fraser.*

## IN LIGHTER VEIN.

### At the Sign of the Skull.

A STRANGE old tavern have I seen:  
The walls are thick, the garden green;  
'T is damp and foul, yet through the door  
Do rich men come as well as poor.  
They come by night, and they come by day,  
And never a guest is turned away.

The landlord, an unwholesome fellow,  
Has a complexion white and yellow,  
And, though he looks exceeding thin,  
Does nothing else but grin and grin  
At all his guests—who, after a while,  
Begin to imitate his smile.

The guests are a fearful sight to see,  
Though some are people of high degree;  
For no one asks, when a carriage arrives,  
A decent account of the inmates' lives;  
But holy virgins and men of sin  
Sleep cheek by jowl in this careless inn;

And beautiful youths in their strength and pride  
Have taken beds by a leper's side;  
But all sleep well, and it never was said  
That any kind of complaint was made.  
For all the people who pass that way  
Appear to intend a lengthened stay.

The house has a singular bill of fare—  
Nothing dainty, nothing rare;  
But only one dish, and that dish meat,  
Which never a guest was known to eat.  
Night and day the meal goes on,  
And the guests themselves are fed upon!

These merry guests are all of them bound  
To a land far off—but I never found  
That any one knew when he should start,  
Or wished from this pleasant house to part.

O strange old tavern, with garden green!  
In every town its walls are seen.  
Now the question has often been asked of me,  
"Is it really as bad as it seems to be?"

*Theodore C. Williams.*