

The Independent.

"EVEN AS WE HAVE BEEN APPROVED OF GOD TO BE INTRUSTED WITH THE GOSPEL, SO WE SPEAK: NOT AS PLEASING MEN, BUT GOD WHICH PROVETH OUR HEARTS."

VOL. XLIX

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1897

No. 2554

The Undiscovered Country: An Idyl.

BY J. RUSSELL TAYLOR.

It was the fifth dawn of our honeymoon,
And we who long had loved to roam at dusk
Or sunrise, loved yet more the hillside now
When wedded lovers up through dew we climbed,
Eastward to look across the sleepy town
Resounding in its mists, while all the sky
Was lit with daffodils, and brightening air
Laughed with the crystal matins of the birds;
Our talk, I scarce know why, was all of death.

"We near the poles," I said, "we chart the moon,
But not the undiscovered country; all
Are fancies, those who on the silent meads
Were feigned to journey, or to climb down Hell
Toward Heaven, Odysseus or Æneas or the grim
Dante. Here's something modern, all as vain."

And from the learned society's report
I read the words of one who tasted death,
Not drank, to her whose sweet hair touched my cheek,
While thrushes fluted dreamy to the dawn.

"As in a dream I heard the doctor say,
Yes, he is dead," and wondered who was dead,
Tho I was all too drowsed to think. Yet soon
I seemed to rise from an abyss of sleep,
And floating listless in a dusk of air
Looked down and saw a corpse upon a bed,
My own dead body. With the sight there came
A stab of sharp surprise that woke me up
To find myself a bubble, a balloon,
That wavered up and down upon a thread
Holding me, like a kite-string, to the corpse.
I could not break that fragile spidery line.

What was I then? I seemed to see myself
With my own eyes, expanding into limbs,
A flickering lambent likeness of a man
Poised by the ceiling, stealthy, unobserved,
Exultant to have pulled my feet from death,
And sick with strangeness, eager to escape,
Yet loathing my desire that on the cord
Tugged fiercely till I rose to outer air,
Through ceiling and roof, as lightly as a thought,
Altho I could not wholly snap the thread.
All in a homesick dream I hung. 'Twas night;
The city twinkled with a thousand lamps
As if an earthly constellation, and stars
Winked overhead. Mysterious sounds rang faint
Within my ears. There came a shadowy bat
That blundering with blind wings against my breast
Passed through and on, as there were nothing there;
Which angered me. And still the spider-thread,
Tho stretched, and thin, dropped downward out of
sight

And held me to the heavy dead below;
'Ah God,' I seemed to say, 'if but weird fate
Might snip the gossamer with her fatal shears!'
Then suddenly the thread tugged hard and strong;
I fell like Satan; through the trees, the roof,
I dropped upon the body in the room
And felt my limbs contracting to a globe
Like that at first, and struggled and shrieked to feel
The bubble swallowed by the corpse again.

The pallid eyelids flickered; round my bed
I saw those tear-stained faces all aghast
With terrible joy to see me look on them."

A fire in clouds, the sunlight broke on us,
And shot the elms with gold, and splashed the slopes;
The dim leaves shimmered with a little breeze
That set adrift the town's transfigured smoke
Against the hills half lost in light, all air
In a clear ripple and shiver exquisite
Of intricate-laughing birds. The bell tolled five.

"My uncle," soft she said, "died in his chair
Sudden at noon, none with him but my aunt,—
A rainy day upon the lonely farm;
And with the dead she sat till early dusk,
When all at once her desolate loneliness
Uttered itself in one long wailing scream;

And her dead husband waked, and smiled on her
With tender pity and with soothing words
And all love's comfort and undying hope;
Then like a strange and noble mask assumed
A second death, and she was left alone."

And with that word we both were weeping, clung
And kissed and trembled, till words came to me:
"God lets us walk together, dear, through life;
And then like children fearful when alone
But hand in hand content, we'll take our love
Into the undiscovered country." Dawn
Was brighter through our tears, and like a dew
Upon our hearts the wise woodthrushes belled
Their golden melancholy-jubilance;
The sunlight breathed of honeysuckle and hay;
And gathering purple all-heal for her breast
We went with tender laughter, glad in heart.

COLUMBUS, O.

Recent Improvements in Iceland.

BY DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

It will be remembered that the present Icelandic Constitution is an indirect result of the thousandth celebration of the discovery of Iceland in 1874, when King Christian visited the island, the first royal visit with which the Icelanders had been honored during the five hundred years of their Danish connection. This Constitution places the legislative power in the hands of a parliament, or Althing, as it is called, the members of which, with the exception of the six crown appointees, are elected by practical universal suffrage. How far the material improvement of Iceland is to be attributed to this change in its political condition may be a matter for discussion; but there is no denying the fact that during these twenty-two years there has been an immense advance in almost every direction. Iceland is so isolated that we are apt to think of it as being cut off from the movement of European development. Indeed, when we consider the severity of its climate, the sparseness of its vegetation and the consequent poverty of its people, we are surprised that Iceland has continued to exist as a nation. Experience shows, however, that patriotism does not depend upon favorable climatic conditions, and that it even seems to flourish most where nature gives it least encouragement.

The facts in the following account of the material progress of Iceland have been taken from an article published in a recent number of the *Berlingske Tidende*, of Copenhagen, a paper whose statements have almost the authority of a Government report. It appears from this article that the improvement in Icelandic affairs has been most felt during the past ten years, when the majority of other people have been groaning over the hard times. A reflection of the Icelandic good times—which, by the way, seem to have resulted mainly from economy and a strict attention to business—is furnished by the contrast between the public budget of the first and the last session of the Althing, which are respectively 303,876 krone (\$85,000) and 1,308,400 krone (\$365,000), an increase in twenty-two years of over fourfold. Furthermore, during this period a reserve fund of a million krone has been accumulated. This latter gain is due to the fact that the actual revenue always exceeds the estimated amount, while the estimated expenditures are usually cut down. Between the years 1887 and 1895 the commerce of Iceland more than doubled at the same time that an excess of a million krone of imports over exports has been changed to a corresponding excess of exports over imports. The increase in the value of real estate has also been very great.

But not only are the Icelanders steadily increasing in material wealth, they seem also to be making the best use of their enlarged opportunities. As there are no great capitalists in Iceland the Government is

compelled to take the initiative in many enterprises that in other countries might better be left to private individuals. Thus a large appropriation has been made this session for subsidizing steamship communication with Denmark and along the coast. When these arrangements are completed it will be possible for the tourist to reach Iceland much more readily than is the case now. A contract has been made with a Danish company by which sixteen trips a year will be made between Reykjavik and Copenhagen and six trips along the coast.

Even more important for the future development of Iceland is the proposed plan for telegraphic communication with the Shetland Islands over the Faroe Islands. A large appropriation for this purpose was unanimously passed by the Althing, and the Danish Government has signified its intention to give the measure substantial aid. While no final arrangements with either of the companies that bid for the contract have been made, there is no reason to doubt that the plan will be successfully carried through. A natural extension of the idea would be a North Atlantic cable between America and Europe, with Iceland as a stopping place. One direct practical and scientific result of the present scheme would be to add immensely to our meteorological resources by furnishing daily weather reports from Iceland.

Of immense importance for the health of Iceland is the new arrangement of the State medical system. Thirty years ago there were only seven official physicians in the whole of Iceland. Under the new arrangement the island will be divided into forty-two medical districts, each with a regular physician. A salary, varying in amount in the different classes, is attached to the position in addition to patients' fees, which latter are regulated by Government ordinance; and there is a pension. But when one thinks of the enormous distances to be traveled on cold, dark winter days and nights, there seems to be no occasion to envy these Icelandic country doctors their salaries and pensions.

These great distances and the small number of physicians are in part responsible for the very slow increase in the population of Iceland. Dr. Ehlers, the Danish leprosy specialist, in one of an interesting series of letters from Iceland, published two years ago in the Danish paper referred to above, states that large families are the rule in Iceland, a family of from fourteen to eighteen children being by no means unusual. He adds, that of this large number of children frequently not more than three or four reach maturity, the majority yielding to croup, the commonest infantile disease in Iceland. The condition must be very similar to that in New England two hundred years ago. There must be the same pathetic suggestion of infant sacrifice in an Icelandic country churchyard as one sees in the little gravestones of a New England village with a past.

CHAMPAIGN, ILL.

Henry George.

BY WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

A CONTEMPORARY estimate of Luther, Columbus, Galileo, Darwin, or any of the great men of history whose achievements mark an epoch, has but a limited and local value. Excepting through the imagination, perspective is impossible, and the influence of a powerful personality, whether upon friend or foe, must color and deflect the judgment of the coolest. The noise and prejudice and atmosphere of the day assert their influence, for who shall escape his environment?

The statement of my individual judgment which THE INDEPENDENT requests concerning the strength and value of Henry George's economic work can only reflect the personal opinion of one who was, and

still is, under the spell of his character and genius. Moreover, without the academic stamp one's right to an economic opinion is quickly questioned.

If Henry George's domain of thought were simply in the speculative field of political economy, dealing with details and drawing deductions from heterogeneous facts, the layman would have small excuse for entering upon the premises. But the author of "Progress and Poverty" was more than an economist; he was a seer. Where the many groped blindly amid conflicting social phenomena, he discovered the moral law and revealed it with marvelous illumination.

It was not the originality of Henry George's ideas regarding rent which differentiates him from other writers. Ricardo and Mill had seen and demonstrated its nature. The wrongfulness of land monopoly and private ownership of natural opportunity had impressed other minds before he had begun to think. The French physiocrats, John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer and others, to whom Mr. George always conceded the largest credit, had comprehended the injustice. Spencer, in particular, had formulated an ethical protest that stands immovable in spite of the instability of its author.

It is true that his explosion of the old wage-fund theory and the Malthusian bugbear were invaluable contributions to economic discussion; but the supreme merit of the California printer was that, while seeing with others the source of social confusion, he alone saw clearly the remedy. His life henceforth was to be spent in carrying the glad tidings to all lands and peoples.

When William Lloyd Garrison awakened to the enormity of American slavery he naturally expected immediate aid from the Christian Church. Instead he met denial and abuse. When Henry George brought that divine ingredient of humanity which changed the dismal science to one of joy and hope, he received parallel treatment from those professing to hold in charge the garnered truths of economics.

How deeply he felt the repulse from those whose calling he was to exalt and glorify, was illustrated at the Social Science Association meeting at Saratoga in 1890:

"Let me say a direct word to you professors of political economy, you men of light and leading, who are fighting the single tax with evasions and quibbles and hair-splitting. We single tax men propose something that we believe will make the life of the masses easier, that will end the strife between capital and labor, and solve the darkening social problems of our time. If our remedy will not do, what is your remedy? It will not do to propose little goody-goody palliatives, that hurt no one, help no one, and go nowhere. You must choose between the single tax, with its recognition of the rights of the individual, with its recognition of the province of government, with its recognition of the rights of property, on the one hand, and socialism on the other.

"Gentlemen, do not quibble and split hairs about this matter. It is too solemn, too important. It involves the happiness, the health, the lives, the very souls, of human beings. It involves the progress of society, the fate of civilization. If you have had superior education, if you have had what to so many of us has been denied, the leisure for study, the opportunity to cultivate what is highest and best in your powers, the more it is incumbent on you to meet the question frankly and fairly. If you will not accept our remedy, what is your remedy? There must be some deep wrong underlying our organization to-day. If it is not the wrong we point to, the wrong that disinherits men of their birthright, what is it? There must be some way of securing to the laborer the proper reward of his toil, of opening to every man willing to work opportunity to work. If you will not take our plan, what is your plan?"

One blushes to remember the spirit of the trivial and evasive rejoinders to this impressive and pathetic appeal. But it was magnificent to see the lion at bay while assailants plied every weapon of perplexity and annoyance. In the light of to-day how strange the record reads!

If one wishes to find the strongest evidence of Henry George's permanence, let him scan the pages of economic journals and addresses, the world over, since "Progress and Poverty" was printed. With rare exceptions the criticism of his ideas is antagonistic, often contemptuous. Time and time again was he refuted. It became a pastime to slay him. Yet is his theory more alive than ever, its advocates multitudinous and increasing. The land question, because it is fundamental, rises at every turn and confronts every economic writer.

A worthless or fallacious contention requires to be killed but once. This heresy is, after eighteen years, the despair of its would-be annihilators. If it could

not be strangled in its cradle when Henry George, on his arrival from California, wandered a lonely stranger through the streets of New York, what promise now, when the great city pours out its tens of thousands to do reverence to his noble memory?

My judgment is that the name of the great reformer, like Abou Ben Adhem's, will, in the economic history of his time, lead all the rest. He has touched the marrow of truth in asserting that, unless mystery and confusion are banished from political economy, democracy is doomed. The masses are unable to be students. The lore of books is not for the toiler whose daily labor is insufficient for his needs. There must be simple laws which common and untutored minds can grasp. There must be principles appealing to the unlettered as plainly as to the sons of culture. To make clear the simple rule of justice and freedom, to reconcile the ways of God to man, was the mission of this world preacher.

Economists are useful, observation and collocation of social facts are essential; but without the intelligent soul laboriously constructed systems are devoid of heat and motion. Into the inanimate body of political economy Henry George breathed the breath of life. It is a new science, no longer dismal. It throbs and pulsates with humanity. It has become a mighty instrument for the overthrow of oppression, delivered from the special keeping of a select few to become the broad possession of mankind. The prophet of San Francisco is no longer without honor in his own country, a country which embraces the world.

BOSTON, MASS.

The Westminster Assembly.

BY CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., LL D.,
OF UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE Westminster Assembly met in accordance with the ordinance of Parliament on Saturday, July 1st, 1643, in Westminster Abbey, and listened to a sermon by the prolocutor, Wilson Twisse, the famous supralapsarian divine. After the sermon they went into King Henry VII chapel, where the roll was called and the Assembly began its work.

The Assembly was summoned by Parliament in order to

"confer and treat amongst themselves of such matters and things touching and concerning the liturgy, discipline and government of the Church of England, or the vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the same from all false aspersions and misconstructions, as shall be proposed unto them by both or either of the said Houses of Parliament, and no other, and to deliver their opinion and advice of or touching the matters aforesaid as shall be most agreeable to the Word of God, to both or either of the said houses, from time to time in such manner or sort as both or either of the said houses of Parliament shall be required."

The Westminster Assembly was composed of four divines from London, two from each of the counties of England, one from each county of Wales, two from each of the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, according to the first Act of April 9th, 1642, making ninety-nine in all; but subsequently twenty other divines were added and ten members of the House of Lords and twenty of the House of Commons. This was a carefully selected and fairly representative body. Episcopacy was represented by Archbishop Ussher, Bishops Brownrigge and Westfield, Drs. Feathey, Hackett, Hammond, Holdsworth, Saunderson, Ward and many others; but only Bishop Westfield and Dr. Feathey attended, the former dying June 25th, 1644; the latter being expelled in September, 1643. It was designed that the Episcopal body should be fairly represented in the Assembly and that the conclusions should be such that the Episcopal party would acquiesce in. But events were stronger than plans, and the Episcopal body was entirely excluded from work upon the standards of Westminster.

The Congregational party was represented by able men such as Goodwin, Philip Nye, William Bridge, Jeremiah Burroughs and Sidrach Simpson. It was designed that the Assembly should agree upon such measures as these Congregationalists would accept. But they did not. The Congregationalists became dissenting brethren.

The Presbyterians were in the majority in the Assembly, and they did not hesitate to carry out the Presbyterian program even to the extent of depriving both the Episcopalians and the Independents of toleration. The Independents had their revenge, because they so prolonged the debates and so retarded action through their influence in Parliament that the Presbyterian plan could not be enforced in England. Parliament, during the administration of Cromwell,

was against them. Another small but strong party in the Assembly was the Erastian party, John Lightfoot, Thomas Coleman and John Selden the ripest scholars in the body. They were unable to do much with the Assembly. But really Parliament was behind them, and they had their revenge when Parliament rebuked the Assembly for a breach of its privileges and put to them nine questions respecting the *jus divinum* which threw them into confusion and troubled them for many months, and which in fact they never answered.

On September 15th the Assembly welcomed the Scotch commissioners who came to represent the churches of Scotland. These brought with them as a bond of union the Solemn League and Covenant. And they came, according to the act of the Church of Scotland,

"to propound, consult, treat and conclude with them . . . in all such things as may conduce to the utter extirpation of Popery, Prelacie, Heresie, Schisme, Superstition and Idolatrie, and for the setting of the so much desired union of the whole island in one form of church government, one confession of faith, one common catechism, and one directory for the worship of God."

The Scottish plan was thus a narrowing of the English plan; it meant to the Scottish commissioners Presbyterianism, and Presbyterianism alone, as the sole lawful Church government for Great Britain. So soon as the Scottish commissioners arrived, all hope of a comprehension of Episcopacy and Congregationalism disappeared. The Scottish commissioners were few in number, but they were carefully selected and able men—Alexander Henderson, Robert Bayly, Samuel Rutherford, George Gillespie and J. H. Maitland. They were not as able men as the Erastians or as the Episcopalian appointed to the Assembly, but they had a solid, aggressive Church of Scotland behind them; and nothing whatever could be done without their consent. They were, therefore, from the nature of the case, masters of the situation, and they made the situation, after a while, agreeable to Scottish Presbyterians, but intolerable to English, Irish and Welsh Christians.

The first work of the Assembly was an attempted revision of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. They began on the eighth of July, and had completed fifteen articles when they were required by Parliament "to take in hand the discipline and liturgy of the Church." They never went any further with these articles, altho they were sent up to Parliament at a later date and printed by authority of Parliament. Their work upon these articles was for the purpose of "vindicating and clearing the doctrine of the Church of England" according to the original plan. When next the Assembly undertook the doctrinal side of their work, they followed the Scottish plan to prepare "one confession of faith and one common catechism."

On the reception of the order from Parliament, October 12th, 1643, the Assembly began their work on Church government. This involved a long conflict with the Independents and the Erastians. They sought accommodation for many months, but in vain, because the Independents would not submit to the Presbyterian platforms. The result was a Directory for Ordination, which was sent up to Parliament, April 19th, 1644, and a Plan of Church Government sent up July 4th, 1645. After much contention, the Parliament agreed to the establishment of the Presbyterian Church government in England; and the Provincial Assembly of London was constituted with twelve subordinate classes, the Provincial Assembly of Lancaster with several classes, and a few other classes in various parts of England, preparatory to other Provincial Assemblies. They were all short lived and were destroyed at the Restoration.

The original instruction of Parliament that they were to confer and treat "touching and concerning the liturgy," was transformed by Scottish influence into the preparation of "one Directory for the worship of God." It was no longer, therefore, a question of a revision of the Book of Common Prayer, or the construction of a new Liturgy, but of a Directory for worship. This Directory was completed and sent up to Parliament December 27th, 1644. It was adopted by Parliament on January 3d, 1645, and substituted for the Book of Common Prayer.

The Confession of Faith was constructed on the basis of the Irish Articles of Religion. It was completed and sent up to the House of Commons on December 4th, 1646, and to the House of Lords on December 7th. Parliament required the Assembly to prepare Scripture proofs. This took them several months. They were completed on the twenty-sixth

of April, 1647, and sent up to Parliament. The Confession was before Parliament for more than a year and was much discussed. It was finally adopted by Parliament, June 20th, 1648. But the chapters thirty and thirty-one on Church Censures, and Synods and Councils, were stricken out. Parliament also changed the title and made it more English thus: "Articles of Christian Religion."

Thus the English Presbyterian Church was organized on the basis of Thirty-one articles of Christian Religion. The Scottish Parliament adopted it February 7th, 1649. The Scottish Church, however, adopted the whole thirty-three chapters and called it Confession of Faith on August 27th, 1647. The Scottish Parliament adopted it February 7th, 1649. Inasmuch as England threw aside Presbyterianism and Presbyterianism prevailed in Scotland, the Scottish usage prevailed among Presbyterians in all parts.

The Assembly originally thought of but one Catechism. This was at first prepared on the basis of Herbert Palmer's "Endeavor of making the Principles of Christian Religion, namely, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the Sacraments, plaine and easy."

They had come to the Fourth Commandment of Palmer's Catechism when they left off to attend to the Confession of Faith. On January 14th, 1646, on motion of Mr. Vines, it was ordered "that the committee for the catechism do prepare a draft of two catechisms, one more large and another more brief." In accordance with this the Larger Catechism was first prepared. On the twenty-second of September, 1647, the Larger Catechism was ordered to be sent up to Parliament. The Assembly then went to work on the Shorter Catechism. They began on October 19th, 1647, with Mr. Tuckney as chairman of the special committee. He made his final report November 16th, 1647; and it was ordered to be sent up to both houses. It was carried up by the prolocutor on the 25th. In accordance with the direction of Parliament they then began to prepare the Scriptures for both Catechisms. April 12th, 1648, the Scriptures were completed and ordered to be taken up to Parliament by the Prolocutor.

The Shorter Catechism became in time the real standard of the Presbyterian churches, altho it was hastily prepared, chiefly under the influence of Anthony Tuckney in less than a month. The traditional story that the answer to the question, What is God? was due to a prayer of George Gillespie is a legend without any basis in fact. George Gillespie had left the Assembly before the Shorter Catechism was composed, and the answer of the Shorter Catechism is simply an abridgment of the Larger Catechism, and this a compacting of Herbert Palmer's questions on this subject. The Shorter Catechism has its merits, but these have been greatly exaggerated. It is by no means equal for the instruction of children to Herbert Palmer's; and many other printed catechisms of the time excel it for this purpose. Indeed, Wallis, the clerk of the Assembly, sought to improve its method by arranging it after Palmer's method. The Shorter Catechism is altogether too dogmatic in substance and in form for the use of young persons. It is also a mistake to make it a standard of doctrine, for it is too compact, too absolute and unguarded in its language. The most excellent of all the Westminster Standards is the Larger Catechism. This was the most carefully prepared of them all; it is also the richest and fullest in content. It is a very remarkable result that it has been so much out of use that few of the ministry ever use it, and it is seldom even quoted by Presbyterian divines. There is more of the spirit of Palmer in the Larger Catechism, more of the spirit of Tuckney in the Shorter Catechism.

The doctrinal system of the Westminster Assembly is an elaborate one, more elaborate than any other symbols, except, perhaps, the Lutheran Formula of Concord. Both of them were meant to be irenic, both of them alike have been in fact polemic. They both represent a polemic age. They have both of them been doomed by history. The Formula of Concord has long been discarded in Germany. The Westminster Standards have been rejected by all but Presbyterians. They are now distasteful to a large and increasing number of Presbyterians. They will soon be discarded in Great Britain and America. The attempt at revision has failed just as the attempt of the Westminster Assembly to revise the Thirty-nine Articles failed. Failure was inevitable in both cases. The next step in both cases alike is a new creed. The Westminster divines made a longer and more elaborate one. Instead of compacting Christianity in

Great Britain thereby, it became the greatest wedge of discord known to British Christianity. It divided British Christianity by barriers which are the most serious now existing. The next step in Presbyterianism will inevitably be the preparation of a short and simple creed, unless they come to the opinion that the Apostles' Creed is better than any they can make in our times.

The Directory for Worship is nominally a standard for the Presbyterian Church, but really not so—for few Presbyterian ministers pay any attention to it. Every one leads the worship of his congregation in his own way. A strong and irresistible tendency toward a more liturgical service has so prevailed in the Church of Scotland that a large proportion of the churches use a liturgy with but little if any free prayers. Large numbers of Presbyterian congregations in this country use more or less liturgical form. Few pay any attention to the order of worship in the Directory.

The Westminster Form of Government is adhered to in the main; but the Westminster divines built it on the divine right that it was prescribed in the New Testament—a theory which has been abandoned by all intelligent Presbyterians. The forms of Presbyterianism have been preserved in the American Presbyterian churches, but the spirit of Presbyterianism and its substance as held by the Westminster divines has, in large measure, departed. It is a question how long the form will maintain itself without the substance and without the spirit.

No one can intelligently study the Westminster Assembly and its documents in their historic setting without seeing that the Presbyterian Church has drifted so far away from them that it is an inconsistent and, indeed, untenable situation. It must either react to the original historic position of the Westminster Standards, or it must throw over the standards and make new standards which really express the worship, doctrine, polity and discipline of the Presbyterians of our day.

A Lesson in Forestry.

BY C. A. SCHENCK,

CHIEF FORESTER OF THE BILTMORE ESTATE, ASHEVILLE, N. C.

EVERY one who owns woods or forests is doing forestry, whether he be a farmer, using the wood-lot for pasture and for supply of firewood, or a lumberman "butchering" his timber lands, or a speculator preserving them.

This statement sounds, I am afraid, paradoxical to many of the wood owners, who have never thought themselves engaged in forestry undertakings. However, it must be made in order to arrive at a proper definition of the word "forestry," which simply is, "Any treatment, the object of which is woodlands." And we might add that, as in any other professional work, such forestry is best which complies best with the purpose in view.

There are, of course, many purposes for which the owner may own woodlands. Few of us are wealthy enough to keep them for sport or pleasure exclusively, in the shape of game-preserves or landscape parks. In the case of game-preserves such forestry is best as will provide the best conditions for the development and the propagation of game at the least expense. In the case of landscape parks we should call that man the best forester who creates the most beautiful landscape effects at the smallest expense.

Game forestry and landscape forestry are rare instances of forestry compared with the number of cases in which woodlands are kept merely for financial purposes with a view of making the largest excess of receipts over expenses.

The means of arriving at this result vary with the conditions prevailing in the woods and in the section of the country generally where the woods are lying. If there is no more timber left, or if there is no market for timber yet established, the woods are used as pasture for cattle, sheep, hogs and horses. This form of management is forestry, because its object is the forest—if not altogether so, partly—and it is the best method of forestry if it pays better than any other use that might be made of the forests. Of course in speaking of the revenue from wood pasture, it should not be forgotten that any wood pasture checks the productiveness of the forests in as far as concerns fuel and timber, water and rain, shelter and health. The old trees suffer from the lessened permeability of the soil, the young trees suffer from the nibbling teeth of the "stock"; and both old and young trees are annually or periodically damaged, even irreparably damaged—by fires.

As soon as the financial loss incurred through deterioration or destruction of standing trees, saplings and seedlings, reaches a certain figure, wood pasture ceases to be the most remunerative method of forestry.

It is impossible to give more than a very general idea of that financial loss. Of course, every one knows that even a seedling, altho offering no chance for immediate use or sale, has a value just as a newborn colt has one, altho it cannot now be used. The value of a seedling and the value of a colt consists of the usefulness expected from them after the lapse of some years, which are few in the case of the colt and many in the case of the seedling. There is no need to point out that the value of a single seedling is ridiculously low, say one one-hundredth of a cent. However, whoever has looked at the undergrowth in the woods with an open eye knows, from personal experience, that there are millions of seedlings. If a single seedling is worth 1-100 cent, one million seedlings are worth 1,000,000 x 1-100 = \$100. The loss from their destruction is almost invariably overlooked, as it is not felt by the losing party at once.

This truth is a warning to every owner using his woodlands for stock pasture, not to omit counterbalancing the loss of young and old trees against the enticement of temporarily high returns derived from feeding cattle, sheep or hogs in the forest. The owner of forest lands should not allow other people's stock to feed on his range free of charge, and he should act as cautiously and judiciously as possible when firing the woods with a view of improving the pasture.

Abroad, two hundred years ago, the same conditions prevailed in the mountainous regions which are prevailing in many stock-raising sections of this country to-day. There a strong Government has compelled the wood owners in due time and for their own benefit, to reduce wood pasture and wood fires. In this country every one is his own sovereign and has to look out for himself and for what is his best advantage. Under the rapid progress of this glorious country, increasing demands for fuel and timber and increasing prices invite increased caretaking of the forests. A house father who plants fruit-trees is wise; but wiser is he who protects his forests from the habitual mismanagement, for the benefit of his children and grandchildren.

In many sections of the country, owing to rough climate or the density of the coniferous growth composing the forest, wood pasture is and will be out of the question. Here, the wood owner has only one chance of revenue from the forests, namely, the cutting and marketing of the timber contained in them. The method of doing this with the highest net profit is the best method of forestry which the owner can adopt; Americans call it "lumbering."

The sentimental propaganda of botanists, gardeners and wood lovers has succeeded in establishing a contrast between forestry and lumbering. This result can only be regretted as it has no doubt hindered the development of more conservative lumbering. In addition, the contrast is based on a misinterpretation. Not all forestry is lumbering; but all lumbering is forestry, if it brings money into the owner's pocket. Moreover, as long as the destruction of the timber and wasteful methods of lumbering pay best, they continue to be the best forestry.

Let us, however, not misunderstand the little word "paying." Conservative lumbering, taking only a limited amount of lumber out of the woods annually, is apt to furnish a small annuity from the capital invested, amounting to not over four per cent. of it; for, even under the best management, the value of the timber increment of woodlands is scarcely higher than four per cent. per year; trees grow slower than we are apt to anticipate.

Rapid lumbering, by butchering any trees which are fit for the saw, may yield \$110 for each \$100 originally invested in the forests. Which method pays best every one must answer for himself. Mr. Smith prefers an annuity of four per cent. to a more risky and more temporary investment yielding \$110 for each original \$100, and Mr. Miller's opinion is to the contrary. To the latter class belong almost all American lumbermen for some obvious reasons:

1. Many of them are under financial obligations, for which they pay over four per cent. annual interest.
2. Money in the safe is thought to be safer from destruction than trees in the woods; and it is at the owner's disposition for further speculations any time.
3. There is a chance of extraordinarily high returns.