

proposed bimetallist measures.—The New York Senate has rescinded its resolution for an investigation of the charges against Superintendent Brockway, of the Elmira Reformatory.



## The Silver Question

We devote considerable space in this issue of *The Outlook* to a discussion of the financial policy of the present Administration by two experts, the one of whom criticises, the other of whom applauds, that policy. We have obtained these two articles in pursuance of our habitual policy to give our readers both sides of every great question; for the currency question is a great one. Upon its solution depends the commercial prosperity of the country and the industrial and financial welfare of all homes. The demand for silver coinage cannot be treated contemptuously as though it were made only by silver-mine owners who want a market for their mines, by impecunious debtors who want to scale down their debts, or by financial cranks who imagine that the Government can do anything which the people want to do. Bimetallism, that is, the free circulation of gold and silver on a parity with each other, is advocated, as both practicable and desirable, by some of the most eminent statesmen of England, such as Mr. Balfour, by nearly all of its most eminent professors of political economy, and by such economic experts in this country as President Francis A. Walker and President E. Benjamin Andrews. A view advocated by such men cannot be laughed out of court. We give our readers both sides of the currency question, and we add with frankness our own.

We believe that the world's industrial distress is largely due to the demonetization of silver and the adoption of a gold standard; we believe that the road to prosperity lies through the adoption of gold and silver as a double standard. It is a serious question whether even so great a country as the United States can adopt a double standard without international agreement—whether the attempt so to do will not make it practically a silver monometallic country. But it is also a question whether even the disasters which silver monometallism might produce would be greater than the disasters liable to be produced by a continuance of gold monometallism. These last are questions on which we are not yet prepared to express any opinion.



## Woman Suffrage

In previous articles we have pointed out, first, that suffrage is not a privilege but a duty, and that the question presented by the pending petition for woman suffrage is not, Shall a privilege be conferred on women? but, Shall a duty be imposed on them from which they have hitherto been exempt? And we have, secondly, urged that this is a question which must be determined by the women, inasmuch as the men will certainly vote to extend the suffrage on even a moderate evidence that a majority of the women regard it as their duty and desire to assume it. If we believed that women ought to assume this duty, that they owe it either to themselves or to the State, we should say so frankly. But such is not our opinion. We agree that it is their right to vote if they wish to do so. We agree that they are quite as competent to vote as the present voters. But it does not follow that this is a duty which either they are bound to assume, or one which their male companions may impose upon them against their will.

There is no advantage in a mere extension of the suf-

frage. If one million of voters can decide a question, there is no necessary advantage in summoning two million voters to decide it. There is, on the contrary, some disadvantage, since it involves double the amount of human energy. It must be made to appear that this enlargement of the political tribunal is either of advantage to the new voters as an education, or to the community as an accession to its wisdom. These are the two questions which the women of the State of New York have first to determine. If all the women of the State, Protestants and Roman Catholics, in city and country, East Side and West Side, vote, will the vote materially modify the result? will it give a soberer, more self-restrained, more independent, less partisan judgment? On the questions now before the country—the tariff and the coinage questions—or before the State—the government of our great cities, the regulation of the liquor traffic, ballot reform—will the million and a third of women voters bring to the State an accession to its political wisdom adequate to compensate for the burdens assumed? Or will they gain enough themselves to compensate therefor, in the enlarged political education which they will receive, from reading the political press, attending political conventions, and going to primaries and nominating conventions?—for the right to vote is a barren right unaccompanied by a right to aid in making nominations and shaping policies. These are the first concrete questions for the women of New York State to consider.

And these are followed by another. If the women of the State are to assume the duty of suffrage, they must either add it to their other duties, or must lay aside other duties to take up this new duty. Which alternative will they accept? Doubtless there are a considerable number of idle women who could take on new duties without being overburdened. But we do not believe that the proportion of idle women is any larger than that of idle men; we doubt if it be as large. The women in agricultural districts are generally overworked. In towns and cities domestic cares are for many less exacting; but, relieved from household drudgery, women have taken upon themselves the sweet offices of charity and religion. They are increasingly the directors and managers of charitable, educational, and religious institutions. They are the almoners of bounty made possible only by the concentration of masculine energy in the accumulation of means out of which that bounty can be bestowed. In determining the question whether they wish to vote, the women are to consider whether they are prepared to add the duty involved in intelligent and conscientious voting to their present duties, or to lay aside some of their present duties as less sacred or less important than that of participation in the science and art of politics.

It is a great mistake to suppose that similarity of function is necessary to equality of position or influence. We look with sincere regret upon that phase of modern civilization which, under the appearance of opening more vocations to woman, drives her into breadwinning, and often into competing with and lowering the wages of her brothers, so that the husband and wife sometimes earn by their joint labor but little more than the husband might otherwise have earned alone, and the home is deprived of its natural builder and guardian. We look with suspicion upon the well-meant movement which, under the appearance of conferring upon woman a right and a symbol of equality with man, imposes upon her the performance of duties hitherto accepted and assumed by men. We believe that the division of labor which makes man the breadwinner and the administrator of the State, and gives

to woman the administration of the home and of those wider domesticities which are of kin to the home—the hospital, the school, and the like—has its reason in the eternal laws of God, and that no reform is for either her welfare or that of the community which, in its eagerness to affirm the equality of the sexes, confounds their social functions and endeavors to make them duplicate each other. Nor is this general law modified by the fact that in exceptional cases each has nobly assumed and fulfilled the duties which naturally would devolve upon the other.



## Church Unity

Prophecy is hazardous; otherwise we should venture to prophesy that before long Professor Charles W. Shields, of Princeton University, will be a priest, if not a bishop, in the Episcopal Church. We can see no reason why he should not be one now, except for the incongruity of being simultaneously an Episcopal priest and a Princeton professor. Certainly the episcopate would not easily find an abler advocate of its claims than Professor Shields proves himself to be in his essay on "The Historic Episcopate as the Basis of Church Unity." He surrenders the entire Protestant position in the declaration that "the institutions of Christianity, its ministry and sacraments, are revealed in the Scriptures no less than its doctrines." Surely he must know that he is here assuming what the Protestant school, even in the Episcopal Church, deny; that, for example, Dean Alford, perhaps the ablest New Testament scholar in that communion, declares that the New Testament affords no authority for the doctrine of Apostolical Succession; that Professor Hatch, perhaps the ablest historian in that communion, affirms the post-Apostolical rise of the episcopacy; that Archbishop Whately denies emphatically that the priesthood of the Old Testament was continued under the New Testament, and affirms the priesthood of all believers; that Dr. Lightfoot traces the development by human growth of the episcopacy out of the presbyterate; that, in a word, ever since the days of Cranmer, a large body of scholars in the Anglican Church have held, with Professor Latham, of Cambridge, that "Christ gave no system for recasting society by positive law, no ecclesiastical polity, for men could make laws better when the circumstances which called for them arose."

Three theories of the Church confront us: the Papal, the Anglican, the Protestant. The Papal theory holds that Christ organized an ecclesiastical society, founding it on the primacy of Peter, who had authority to appoint his successors; the Anglican theory holds that he organized an ecclesiastical society, founding it on the twelve Apostles, who had authority to appoint their successors; the Protestant theory holds that Christ did not organize any ecclesiastical society, that he taught certain great truths and inspired and still inspires a divine life, and left those who hold that truth and possess that life to organize their own institutions. The first two hold that Christ formed a society which he intended should be the depository of his special grace and the revelation of his truth and life; and that, though men may be possessed of Christ's spirit, and in so far be Christians, and still live without this Church, by so doing they separate themselves from his divinely appointed historic society. The other holds that wherever two or three are gathered together in Christ's name he is in the midst of them, and that any such fellowship clustered about him and working in his name is a part of his Church. The one conception of the Church is ecclesi-

astical and organic; the other is spiritual and mystical. We call the first theory Anglican and the second Protestant, for convenience, though many eminent Anglican scholars hold the second theory and some eminent non-Anglican scholars—Dr. Shields, for example—hold the first. We do not wonder that such scholars are ready to adopt as a basis of Church union "the Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his Church." We rather wonder that they do not make haste to enter the Church which has this Historic Episcopate. They are really Anglicans, not Protestants.

But the issue between Anglicanism and Protestantism, between the ecclesiastical and mystical conception of Christ's Church, can never be settled by the adoption of any such "glittering generality" as that proposed by the Lambeth Conference. Great questions are never permanently settled by ambiguous phraseologies. The Episcopal bishops themselves are not agreed in the meaning which they attach to this now famous sentence. It means to Bishop Seymour one thing; it meant to the late Bishop Brooks something very different. To Dr. Knox-Little it means one thing; to Archdeacon Farrar it means another. But the very fact that it is proposed as a basis of Church union indicates that, in the opinion of those who proposed it, episcopacy, in some form, is essential to a Christian Church. And this is just the doctrine which Luther repudiated when, in 1525, he ordained his private secretary deacon in the Reformed Church; and all his followers have with him repudiated it ever since.

Dr. A. V. G. Allen, in an article in the "New World" for March, suggests that the doctrine of Apostolical Succession may be, when truly interpreted, but another form of the doctrine that the Christian consciousness of the ages is the highest ground of certitude for the Christian faith; that "in the doctrine of Apostolic Succession lies embedded the truth that a divine influence is propagated in the world, from man to man, not so much by books as by personal contact." Perhaps! So in the adoration of the Virgin Mary lies embedded the truth that woman is not man's upper servant, but is made with him in the likeness of God. But in neither case are those who disbelieve in the form justified in pretending to accept it, for the sake of the truth which it both reveals and obscures. We will reverence woman; but we will not adore the Virgin Mary. So we will look for the Spirit of God in all good men and true; but we will not seem to concede that he has appointed a special succession of men, whether popes or bishops, through whom he has sent a special stream of grace to bless the world. The most intense Independent might be willing to adopt some form of ecclesiastical oversight, as a convenience of method, in forming a united Church, or a federation of Churches; but no Protestant, if he is a Protestant on principle, and understands his Protestant principles, will accept a Historic Episcopate as essential to the Church of Christ, for he holds that the only thing essential to that Church is loyalty to Christ, who is a living and ever-present head, and therefore needs no vicar or series of vicars; and he holds that the true bond of Church unity is spiritual, not ecclesiastical.

To sum all up: Church unity cannot be promoted by shutting our eyes to a radical difference of opinion, and substituting for a real agreement an ambiguous phraseology. The consummation of Church unity must wait until either Protestant Christians are convinced that Christ instituted an ecclesiastical society, into which every follower of Christ should enter, or he in so far fails of perfect