LINCOLN TALK

On June 15th, 1929, I spoke at the inauguration dinner of the Abraham Lincoln Foundation. Here is the outline of what I said:

When the historian of a hundred years from now attempts to appraise the ten years which have passed since the close of the Great War - what will he find to be the most pregnant and enduring idea, which has moved men? In all probability it will be the fact that, for the first time in history, all the nations in the world have attempted a co-operative organization for handling their affairs in peaceful fashion. That is, the nations, individually and collectively, have been giving since the end of the Great War as continued and serious attention to peace, as before they have always given to war.

The historian will unquestionably follow the rise and growth of various peace organizations - the League of Nations - the Worlds Court - the Kellogg treaty and it will note, that from the beginning of these collective efforts, in the interest of peace, certain features were admitted to be necessary in order to bring them to an effective position, and influence.

First, the peace organization must be inclusive. It must include all nations. It must also, attempt to handle all international interests, which if neglected might lead to war. Hence, we have departments studying treaties - armaments - laws - disease - economic property.
2) The agencies must be continually on the job.

3) Watchful of what might cause difficulty. Modifying arrangements, wherever it is necessary and whatever the sacrifice may be. It is necessary to relieve friction - allay suspicion. The great safety rule: "show me where or not it can happen and I will show you where one will happen," is the rule of the new war organization.

4) They are concerned with causes, recognize that long standards and that fewer national suspicions, prejudices, must be removed before the Nation is fit in spirit for peace.

5) Whatever the perfection of a peace organization - the happiness of its acceptance - of the principles and the methods of procedure of proxies - however sincere its efforts to limit armaments, or the complete adjustment of economic inequality, no one or indeed all of these efforts can bring the certainty of world peace.

World peace requires more than organization and wise procedure. It requires a creative spirit, which will awaken in all the people of the earth safe in the possibility of peace - safe and a spiritual consent beforehand to the sacrifices which may be necessary. How create this spirit? Where can we find a model for it? The Lincoln Foundation believes that it has found a practical approach to the creation in the world on such a spirit, in its proposed Abraham Lincoln University.
They say that they believe that if they can found a University, where students from all the Nations of the earth, will be taught to cultivate Lincoln's mindedness, that they will gradually suck up - this new spirit. That is, they take Lincoln as their prophet and teacher. I do not suppose that they mean by this, that he alone, of all the leaders of the world, has the zest - the qualities they believe essential to making effective the peace measures of today. But rather, they see in him one whom the people of the earth have already accepted, by expressing in an unusual measure the spirit. This acceptance of Lincoln, by the common people, particularly, is a striking world fact. He has been a man beloved from the day, and before the day, of his death. Bayard Taylor told, at the time of Lincoln's death, how walking in the famous sidewalks of New York City, he found Lincoln's picture in the tenements. Years ago, walking on the top of the wall around the English town of Chester, I found in the guard house at one corner of the wall, a picture of Lincoln, and the guard said to me quite simply, "He was a friend of us poor men."

What are the qualities of this man which make it possible to build around him the movement - the movement which the founders of this University seek? I can speak only of what I find in him - those qualities which seem essential in my mind to the creative spirit which we seek for the peace of the world.
1) He had faith in the unions of people, its possibility. He believed it was the only road to liberty and justice. In his mind unionism was the supreme political movement. It was a virtue. It had the quality of a religion. This attitude toward unionism dated from his boyhood, when he conceived dimly, probably, but still conceived the idea that the revolution, the following union of colonies their constitution, meant something more than common to men. They meant something more than national independence. He felt, rather than saw, perhaps, that in what was taking place in the country there lay a great promise to all the people of the world to all time to come, as later in life he has told us.

2) He had faith in the power of men to achieve in time international mindedness. That is, a mind to work together. This faith was based on his acceptance of men of all types. He attitude had an amazing confidence in humanity. His toward men was large tolerant understanding. He never asked more from any man than what he saw he could give. He believed that there was a key to every man's heart mind and he was amazingly adroit from his young manhood in finding and using this key. He had faith in popular intelligence and popular will to do right. (Flowell)

In handling men he used the appeal, not only to their intelligence, but to their humour their sentiment their good nature. Emerson noting the way that Lincoln's understanding of men had been understood by common man, said at the time of his assassination, that his death traveled over the minds of men
POTTER IN 11 WORDS Defines "HUMANISM"

Explains Why Fundamentalists Fight to Maintain Belief in the Supernatural

Dr. Charles Francis Potter yesterday gave an eleven-word definition of his philosophy in an address at the First Humanist Society, Chalif Hall, No. 163 West 57th Street. He said "the recent Wall Street crash will seem like child's play when the crash of theism comes."

Humanism is "faith in the supreme value and self-perfectibility of human personality" Dr. Potter gave as his definition. Only the individual can improve himself, Dr. Potter continued. "Any one else who tries to make you good, whether that any one is your mother or a Prohibitionist, will do you more harm than good.

"No miracle can make a man good, nor can it prove any religion to be true."

Declaring belief in the virgin birth and the Resurrection a part "of the very structure of Christianity," Dr. Potter said: "Well do the Fundamentalist fight hard to retain them. They know, if the Modernists do not, that if you reject the supernatural in Christianity you may have religion left, but it is not Christianity."
like the shadow of a non-calculated eclipse over the planet. They
That is, he had so won them, so relied on him, when suddenly he
was taken away from them, the world was thrown into sudden darkness.

Probably the supreme element of character in whose exhibit of
himself in the war watching the spirit of toleration, you could
not goad him into retaliation into anger. There was no malice
in him. He once said to Horace Greeley, who was trying to drive
him to an act of retaliation, "Mr. Greeley, the things with which
I deal are too great for malice."
LINCOLN

In this undertaking it is right that we should seek help, wherever it is to be found, most should we study the men who have agonized over the problems of peace and war - had their failures and their successes. We ought to be able to learn much. There is no man whose experience is more significant, more pregnant with suggestion than Abraham Lincoln. There are reasons for this. Lincoln faced the problems of peace and of war in a democracy. Now I think, we will all admit, that whatever the failures of democracy - whatever tax may be legitimately and be made illigetimath upon it, it is the most truthful form of Government yet devised for the future of that time. In its best state we can conceive it as the ideal form of Government. Certainly, personally, I am convinced that nothing better has been offered the world, dissatisfied as I am with the results in our own Government today. Now, Lincoln, was of all our public men the one who had a supreme faith in democracy. It was the thing which animated him throughout his life, so that what he did throughout war and peace is particularly valuable to a world which is headed that way, as nearly as we can tell. Most significant consideration is that Lincoln was animated throughout his public life by the same ideal that is situating the world today, in its efforts for peace. Unionism was the passion of the man. It is the passion of the present world - the genesis of this ideal of unionism in Lincoln's life, is not hard to find. It came to him in his boyhood, when he first became familiar with the revolution - with the forming of the Constitution.
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UNIONISM

He looked on unionism as the only path to human freedom. The idea of human equality took a deep hold on him. It was through the union of people that this was to be worked out. It became a kind of religion with him, more or less mystic to be sure, nevertheless with that impelling, controlling impulse, which a true inward religion has on a nature which seeks to find the truth of things in the universe. He saw the union of something more than a device for the preserving the freedom and progress of the new country. It was something, he said, which was good for all mankind—necessary for all mankind—that the larger unionism which we are accustomed today—the world union. But Lincoln early was disturbed by an institution which existed inside the American union, and which he felt was a contradiction of its possessions, a violation of its spirit—that was the institution of slavery.

As a boy, he saw the country almost at the point of Civil War in the years 1819-20 over the handling of slavery. It looked then and he heard it talked that the union would be broken up, but it was saved—saved by a compromise which put slavery within certain bounds, corrall ed it, so to speak, and there were those who objected to slavery and consented to its compromise, felt that it was, they said, in the way of extinction if it could be kept within these boundaries. Lincoln accepted this idea until he was a man of forty and more—that slavery was in the way of dying out.
The use of chemical agents in warfare has been common throughout history. If the concentration is high enough, if the weapon is used in a way that allows it to penetrate and contaminate the environment, the effects can be devastating. The use of sarin gas in the 1980s in Iraq was a case in point. It caused respiratory problems and nerve damage, leading to long-term health effects for those exposed.

These gases were used as a proxy for traditional chemical weapons. Today, the use of chemical weapons is considered a violation of international law and is prohibited by the Chemical Weapons Convention. However, the threat still exists, and nations must remain vigilant in the face of such threats.

The use of chemical weapons is not just a military concern; it also has implications for civilian populations. In cases where chemical weapons are used, the impact can be felt for generations to come, leading to health problems and economic consequences. Therefore, the international community must continue to work towards a world free of chemical weapons.
Hefn William the White
accepted in the sixth corral. As the Missouri Compromise had put it. One of the interesting and important facts in connection with his life is whether or no he and others like him were right in thinking that slavery would die a natural death. There is more to be said for the idea than against it, I believe. There was the economic side to it, the expense of supporting your own labor body, being responsible for their food, clothing, housing through good and bad times. Consider for a moment what it would mean for a steel plant in the Mahoning Valley to be obliged to be responsible for its labor body, as a man is responsible for his family. Instead of a wage scale from the control you have property which must be taken care of - human property. You must take care of it through dull periods, shut downs - you cannot dismiss it. There were many owners of places which were finding the burden of their labor problem too great - the talk of its economic unsoundness was already heard in the land. Then there was the moral revolt against slavery as an institution. Europe jeered at a country having the democratic pretension as ours and yet supporting slavery, while aristocratic countries, like England and France, were doing away with it. Lincoln at least held to this view refusing to join the abolitionists of the country. He felt unrightly that in the violent doing away with slavery that war was inevitable, war or the division of the union - he could not consent to the latter. Now you see his predicament - a believer in unionism of the hope of the freedom of mankind, the hater of slavery as an institution, the contradiction
to his great faith in the union. The situation is not unlike our
own in peace. Almost all of the world, we might say, have expected
the idea of unionism. Yet we support armaments.

(See Note) Speeches of League of Nations, etc.

Deeply as Lincoln felt the illogical, inconsistent
attitude of the United States in allowing the institution to exist,
his took no direct active part over it all, until he was
shoved into it by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise in 1854.
That is the thing which had held slavery back, if it
might spread over the whole union - it was given a new lease of
life - new territory into which to multiply. That brought him at
once into the fight, not of the abolitionists but against the
extension of slavery - against the going back on the contract,
which had been made to keep it within certain bounds. His method
of attacking this evil inside the union, an evil so parallel to the evil
of armaments, in a world seeking peace, parallel in its contradictions,
is as well worth study by those who would really prefer the cause
of peace as we have certainly in this country, if not in many countries.
He based his attack on the wrong of the institution, not an appeal
to emotions, not on prejudice, but on a thorough knowledge of the
history, the experience of the world in the matter. He knew he
was attacking an institution which was rooted deeply in man's
experience on the earth. How rivet it without destroying the union?
That was his question. He must convince men, first in allowing it
to spread they were going back on their own agreement. He must
convince them that if they began to allow its spread, that inevitably it would infest them and the country would become, instead of eventually all free, eventually all slaves. He must arouse them to feel that this should not be done, because slavery was wrong, contrary to their own contract, their own professional faith. He spent five or six years on the hardest kind of labor working out his arguments against the extension of slavery. He wanted men to see it as he saw it. He was convinced that he was right. He was not willing that there should be any doubt in their minds.

It is well worth the theory of study of every American citizen. He saturated himself with his subject, was never satisfied that he knew all about it - welcomed new attacks from those that opposed him - rarely repeated himself, thinking of new ways of putting what he had in mind, new electricity, the freshness of his arguments, the fullness of it, the unexpected light he threw upon it, caused confusion and finally anger in his chief antagonists, even Douglas.

Douglas had the handicap of being a rich and successful man, one of the chief handicaps to continued intellectual effort - to hard work. He had one great and moving speech - he was a man of unusual charm and magnetism. Lincoln had none of his advantages, but Lincoln was thinking, was working. and Lincoln was in deadly earnest.
UNION AND SLAVERY

Absolutely devoted to the idea of union, believing that the majority of the people of the country shared his feeling—fearing the influence of slavery on its stability—the dangers that sectionalism caused. Sectionalism arising from the divided ideas about slavery. Lincoln well described the situation as a house divided against itself. The Union could not exist—was his conclusion—divided into slave and free states—did not expect to be dissolved, expected it to be become all one or another.

It was the only question, he told the country, too, which had ever menaced the firmness of the union. It was the root of all discord between the states. Mr. Douglas asserted that the Union could endure half slaves and half free, but this he believed to be a violation of the law of God. The which held the union together in the slave states was commerce. Slavery was a menace to that commerce. The extent of the dissension which the institution caused was demonstrated by the immediate threat of secession, which the election of 1860 caused.
Lincoln did not fall into that intellectual pitfall where so many of us land, because he knew much about the origin, the growth, the struggle over the institution of slavery. He did not conclude that, therefore, he knew enough. Nothing satisfied him but to know all. He was never satisfied that he had mastered all the facts or all the interpretations that might be given to these facts. He was keen, not only to develop his own arguments slightly, but to test both the strength and the weakness of his opponent's arguments. Particularly was he insistent on dragging out democracy. John Hay has said of him that he could rattle a sophist out of a hole better than all the trained logicians of all the schools.
His knowledge - his familiarity with the long task
of the institution of slavery, gave him patience in dealing with it.
It is half knowledge which makes us rush towards the end we desire -
unfamiliarity with the way a thing has come about, with the strength
of its roots, the manifold ramification. We rush hastily into that
which stirs our anger - our scorn - which seems to us to be, and
generally is, in conflict with the higher ideas and aspirations of

These things should be, therefore they must be. Many a
fine enthusiasm - many a fine movement has gone on the rocks in this
country, in the last fifty years, because of the impatience, born of
half knowledge in the people behind it. Lincoln brought to his
thorough mastery of the slavery question the demonstration that he
had made to the people - a conviction that it was what he called a
durable problem - that it could only be solved by the willingness to
go out as slow as the march of people would go. He knew, what we do
not all realize, that democracy is made up of many minds, many kinds
of people, notions often conflicting, background widely different,
people of all degrees of idealism, selfishness, greed, fear. In a
democracy you must work out an average. What was the average in this
country in 1861, when he became President of the United States? He
had been elected by a minority of the popular vote. That meant that
it was a minority which believed with him that slavery
should be confined where it was. It meant that between those who wanted the nation to
become a slave nation and those that wanted it to be all free - there
were various proofs which classified them

(See note)

He must somehow win over all these people, or a majority of them, to his conviction that the union must be preserved. Parallel to his attitude, toward his problem, have not been like him in the Naval Parley. There never has been an international conference in which the element of patience was more strongly demonstrated at the outset, than in the present one. An enthusiastic element demanded an immediate limitation of armaments, throwing out battle ships. It seemed easy for them to do, but the leaders of the Nation have grown wise in the last ten years. The case has grown wiser, having understood how frequently it complicated matters by taking sides from really knowing what was behind the position that they were advocating. All of the councils from the American Delegation, from the wisest people in other delegations, have been towards patience, to make haste slowly. Lincoln had no experience in national affairs, as such as the delegation to the London Conference have all had. He came new to affairs - the country was new to any such convulsions as now threaten it, but from the first he made haste slowly. His consciousness, his knowledge of the "bigness of the issues and of the different points of view of those who must solve the problems, must help that he could be patient, knew that patience was his greatest weapon.

He was patient and adaptable. If he could not do what he wanted to do, he would find another way. He wanted, from the
start to wipe slavery out of the nation, but he did not want to do it by violence. Hence, his plan for colonizing them, a plan that was acceptable to few, which though he pled so hard for it, never went much beyond his own office in Washington. Unable to carry that on which his heart was really set, in the first year and a half of the war, he turned, as he had recognized, for many months that he might have to turn, to the policy of emancipation. He hesitated studied emancipation because he knew that, if forced to it, he was sowing seeds of bitterness, that it would take many generations to wipe out of the south. There are no wounds, which are slower to heal, than those which are caused by the violent seizing of property. But to save the union he must use this violent weapon of emancipation, cost what it might then and in the future. He was right in his judgment about the bitterness engendered. You will hear the of the south today saying, "If my great grandfather's property had not been stolen from him, I would be a rich instead of a poor man." Moreover, Lincoln knew well enough that he did not have a united North behind him in emancipation. After he had signed the document he made a remark that showed how justly he had estimated what he was in for. ("The less we hurry, the quicker we shall be." "The way to get a short conference is to prepare for an interminable one," and "It may be that we shall find we have reached agreement at this conference without having been able to agree on an agenda at all.")
He sought them only by persistent effort, willingness to test any method, which gave promise of result. His use of the emancipation of the slaves is the most important, probably, in a study of his patience. He was confronted by a great body of abolitionists in the north, who felt now is the time for immediate emancipation.

(See Note)

The handling of these matters was largely a question of handling men. It was through men that he must do his work. One of the chief objections to him as a President of the United States was that he had no national experience with men, that he was, as the people said, a country lawyer. That was true, but from boyhood Lincoln had been a student of men. He understood in a almost uncanny way the motives which actuated them. He had enormous respect for what he called big men - the men who had achieved - the men who he had deliberately brought into his cabinet because he expected to get from them a quality of service for the union, which he doubted if he himself would be able to get. But he knew so much of human nature that no sooner was he put in close contact with these big men - Seward, Chase, McClellan, Stanton - than he unerringly put his finger on the weakness as well as the strength of these associates. He found them all big in certain ways, amazingly small in others. He was confronted in his own providence with jealousy and a kind of contempt for his lack of experience. Two members of his cabinet, particularly Mr. Seward and Mr. Chase, both of them men active in the conflict against slavery, long before Lincoln
came into the field, resented his election. He felt that he should have been President. Mr. Seward, when he accepted the position as Secretary of State, did not hesitate to write to his wife, "That of course he would be President. That Mr. Lincoln had not the least anxiety for it." For a month he openly assumed that he was directing affairs. He did not hesitate to say so to members of Congress - to Representatives of the southern states, but he did not reckon with Abraham Lincoln's knowledge of human beings. Lincoln read through it, from the start, like a book. He saw that with all his great ability he was ambitious - vain - meddlesome, - obsessed with the desire to give the impression that it was he that was running things. The story, how within a few weeks he was put in his place, is one of the most extraordinary in the history of the relations of men in public life.

While Mr. Seward learned his lesson and did not attempt to interfere with Mr. Lincoln only to go on putting up a front to the public, in so far as he dared, that he was running things - Mr. Chase intrigued in a most undignified, disloyal way for a member of the cabinet. Everything that went wrong in the war - in the Government, he attributed to the fact that Lincoln, and not he, was President. He wrote letters to all sorts of people and angered perpetually through the first administration for the nomination in 1864, instead of Mr. Lincoln.

Even, when his own state, the state of Ohio, refused him in its convention and asked for Lincoln he did not give in. He was a great man obsessed with his own sense, for the place and doubt of Mr. Lincoln's place - a doubt which as it then showed the common people
Lincoln's treatment of Seward and Chase is one of the best proofs we have of his feeling his conviction that all talent of the country must be rallied to the preservation of the union, in some cases administratively. Seward and Chase had both done things, that if they were known to the country at large, would weaken their influence, bring criticism and worst than all a certain ridicule upon them. He must save them from themselves. It was the policy so often needed in politics, the saving of the faith, took care to save Seward's faith, to save Chase's faith, by keeping silent at their attempt to discredit him. As for himself his inner dealings, and his of the final victory of the right decent thing was so strong that he was willing to take whatever harm they could do him without complaint. He needed them in his great undertaking.

He said a great thing once to John Hay, "Hay, the business of statement is using the public meanness of men for the public good." He was willing to take from any man, however mean, business which he could render the republic. Nothing could have been meaner than the contempt, the discourtesy of McClellan, the Commander-in-Chief of the Army, towards Lincoln, his superior, the President of the United States. But Lincoln dismissed that with the familiar remark, "I will hold McClellan horse, if he will give us a victory." It was not his dignity which was at stake, it was the union and he must bear the unkindness and misunderstanding, selfishness, greed and vanity of his associates, if
from them he could get what he needed in the great undertaking.

He had a marvelous sense that everybody could do something, but that nobody could do all kinds of things. He was willing to take from a man what to give and never, so far as I know, did he ask of a man what he found was not in him to give. By this wise policy he piled up from a great variety of men, of mediocre ability an immense volume of service. A lesser man, one less understanding of human quality and human limitation would have said, "I want this man for such and such a piece of work. He has proved he cannot do it, therefore throw him out." That was not Lincoln's way. "He can't do this but he may do something else. We must keep his interest, get what he can give." In no way did he show himself of greater nobility than his refusal to harbor resent toward those who abused him. One of the best of biographers of the Civil War was an Englishman, Lord Radcliffe, who wrote weekly letters to the English papers and who gradually learned the qualities of Lincoln. Nothing more impressed Radcliffe than the fact that in none of his state papers, none of his speeches, none of his letters, do we find any violence either of language or opinion. He has never once been betrayed into those paltry out-bursts of passion and spite, which are so common in the writings and speeches of his senators. Lincoln told Radcliffe never and although there is probably no living man who has been the object of more blackguard abuse. He has never, so far as I know, replied with an expression of impatience or resentment.
This is high praise from an experienced observer. That distinguished Englishman, Lord Charnswood, who has written one of the finest lives of Lincoln that we have, says of Lincoln's letters, "There is not an expression in any one of them which might not have come from a gentleman born." No better proof could we have that he was a gentleman born than this of Charnswood. A gentleman in the democratic sense, one of high thought, of noble, consistent action, the only gentleman worthy of that name.

Lincoln's restraint in the face of jealousy, discourtesy, stupidity, assumptions of superiority, where there was no real superiority, is more astonishing, when we remember that the man was born with a gift of satire, which in his youth and early years in politics and law, he used with a robust policy, which angered his victims even to tears. There are records of his metrical attacks on his boyhood associates, attacks made in rhyme, which had a more telling effect than an out and out physical beating would have had. There was an indulgence in satire towards a political rival, which resulted finally in a challenge to fight a duel, an episode in his career which at the time threatened to ruin his political life in Illinois. But these youthful excesses in his satirical gift had all passed away under the serious discipline which he had given himself in handling the mighty task the war had put upon him. That his patience, tolerance, far seeing handling of men, was his faith in them, and if one is to succeed as a leader in a democracy he must believe in men. They
are his material. If that material is not trustworthy, if it has not the qualities that must be used in the undertaking, then there is nothing for it but autocracy and Lincoln believed in this human material. One of the treatments of those difficult personages shows it. It is shown in no better way than in the care he took to explain that every step in the progress of his attempt to explain to people why the institution of slavery must be kept back and later before he took to keep before them the sacred character of the union, its meaning to them and to the future, his reasons for each step in saving this precious union. His work over his arguments, his infinite pains in getting what he had to say clear, in getting the perfect word for the thing he wanted to convey. All of that shows that he thought the material which he was addressing was worthwhile material. Lowell says, in talking of what he calls a familiar dignity of Lincoln in his state papers, "That no higher compliment was ever paid to a nation, than the complete confidence, the fireside familiarity with which Mr. Lincoln always presents himself to the reason of the American people. This indeed," says Lowell, "was a true democrat who grounded himself on the assumption that a democracy can think." "Come let us reason together about this matter," was the tone of all his addresses to the people. A strong element, his handling of men was his good nature, his humour. It enabled him to pass over much that in a humourless person would have been unforgivable.
He would not allow the march of events to be slowed up by the failure to treat irritating events, as if they were crimes. He could laugh things off and did it. His sense of humour in the tragedy, in which he lived, the comedy of it, enabled him to weigh the values. It enabled him to protect himself, to keep a secret, to make the wind out of the sails of the suggestions, the men with more sentiment and good intentions then knowledge and understanding afraid——and the problem. The height of his character, his greatest power and his deepest insight lay in his freedom from anything like malice. The longer the war went on the nearer it came to the conclusion that he had so at heart, a conclusion where a union was saved and if slavery wiped out, the more exalted, the more evident, this lack of malice became. The more powerful it became, too. It more began and more to get over to people. Lincoln is not for punishment, not for revenge, they began to say. Now that spirit was in treason to a radical element in the country and congress. It called for punishment, hanging, exile, the secession of property. Demanded that the states which had seceded should become something like states, should not be allowed representation in congress, should be governed by a species of Roman Fiscus, they should have no hearing from the President on these points. As he saw the end coming, he began to prepare, to forestall the policy of vengeance, that he knew was in the radical mind. His
The writer is attending a concert nearby on a rainy evening. They mention that the music from inside is filling the air, and they are looking forward to a warm concert experience. They also note that the venue is small and intimate, providing a unique atmosphere.
plans for reconstruction were far feeling, merciful and wise — far beyond the understanding of most of his time. Let us have the union as it was — see no bitterness — no hanging. Our enemies must be restored to their farms, must be allowed to work out their hard problems in their own way, and as members of this union. It is hard for us to realize today the extreme bitterness with which this program of mercy was met. It went to such an extreme that at different points in this country his death was greeted with a cheer. A cheer that was dangerous for the one who uttered it. Lincoln's policy of mercy had taken too deep a hold. He, himself, had too deep a hold, for revenge to be uttered aloud, after his assassination. This policy of mercy was an expression of the man, the thing that he was. He could not see life — he could not see man's great undertaking, particularly an undertaking like that of the union of these states, as possible, if vengeance was to be nourished, if punishment was to become a political policy. Of course, his supreme expression of what he felt to be the true spirit, temper of the nation in facing the new problems of re-construction he found in the last paragraph of his second inaugural.
Men do not often reach a higher spiritual plain of
This is no piece of oratory. This is a matured fruit of a long
suffering spirit. It came from much pondering, from travel of
soul, from a passion to be right, to think right, to help others
to be right and to think right. Here then, the man what he has t
to say to us, in the greater, the more difficult, that the
parallel problem of forming a real union of discipline and of
driving out of that union the greatest contradiction to the idea
that today remains in it, and that is the idea that men misunder-
standing, international misunderstanding can only be settled by
force. If we are to ever have a full fruition of these noble
notions, ever to have a real union animated by the will to war,
it must be through the practice of the method, the cultivation of
the spirit of Abraham Lincoln.

This with which I deal are love in malice.
Douglas had all the advance - at the fall - great man - so fine. Mr. S. Sunday - in mind for President. He was a fine gentlemen -

In the challenge of his position - no more emotionalulletin - against fully slavery - based in the development of a sound organ. He needed a new discerning sentiment.

Money for man - turn a down - if not wise - he will -

Not - economy a minds protection of life - you know well -