

CHAS. FITZHENRY
WASHINGTON, ILL.

4 - 18 - 24

Miss Ida M. Tarbell,
New York City.

Dear Miss Tarbell:

If you have found opportunity to read my paper on THE HUMAN AND THE DIVINE IN LINCOLN, forwarded to you with an inquiry some time since, you probably noted its rather inconsequential conclusion. In squeezing my theme to the limitations of a magazine article, this seemed unavoidable. But I have another plan. May I ask you about it?

It has been my thought to expand the article, as you have it, into a brochure, with a chapter analyzing certain contributing circumstances of Lincoln's life and a third and final part answering somewhat dogmatically the questions raised in the closing paragraph of the present article.

In this latter part I propose to maintain, in as near a rationalistic method as possible, that the Divine ~~is~~ is sometimes projected into the human in even the most orthodoxly scriptural way, if you please; but that few are so likely not to see its burning-bush significance as the ultra orthodox. That the ultimate statesmanship comes ever and only out of this mystical union which lies in the tide of human affairs like a deer undercurrent; that it wells to the surface, periodically or at need, and is not too much to expect to be repeated, nor too much to be required of those who would lead humanity out of its deepest needs to its highest resurgence of progress; and that elementary forms, methods and experiences are the surest means of propagating it.

Can I do this without pointing backward into ignorance, superstition and empiricism? Will you be so good as to give, in a word, your opinion on this whenever, if you please, you can favor me with brief reply to my former inquiry. I shall be more grateful to you than I can tell.

Very sincerely yours,

Chas FitzHenry

*On the way to mail this I received yours of the 15th.
Thank you! Don't see how I missed that dream in Lamon -
but believe now I discounted Lamon and so forgot it. Have
just finished Nathaniel Wright's "Lincoln". His power and facility of
analysis is marvellous, but his conclusions sometimes fall short.
For Lincoln was more than the resultant of Thomas Lincoln and Katherine of the '60s.*