



(C) Paul Thompson

STEPHEN SMITH, COLUMBIA '50

ish method would be dangerously revolutionary. It is essential that we keep the Supreme Court as a check upon hasty and ill-advised action by Congress. Those who are most anxious to preserve our Governmental system as it has developed cannot afford to ignore the feeling which underlies so radical and subversive a plea as that of Senator La Follette. These sporadic uprisings of popular sentiment against what are regarded as unprogressive and illiberal finalities of the Supreme Court should warn the Court itself of the ever-present danger to its existence as a necessary check upon Congress in our Governmental system.

The La Follette manifesto, as well as that of President Gompers, of the American Federation of Labor, is leveled against the recent Coronado and child labor decisions of the Court. So far as the Coronado decision is concerned, Mr. Gompers and his group criticize everything which seems to them to injure the laboring class. As a matter of fact, the Coronado decision endangers it only in the sense that the labor leadership under Gompers has steadily arrogated to the laboring class certain peculiar privileges of action which do not stand the test of scrutiny from the point of view of the National welfare. On the other hand, the child labor decisions of the Court appear to us to rest upon uncertain foundations. The whole country wishes to do away with the evils of child labor. No one State can control the policies of another State. It cannot erect a barrier against unfair competition from the child labor of another State, and now the Supreme Court avers that the Federal Government can do nothing, either. An enlightened State which is interested more in the conservation of childhood than in child exploitation for profit must pay the penalty and be subject to the flood of child labor products into its own area, to the economic dis-

advantage of its own producing citizens. We cannot help feeling that here is an instance where a clearer vision and a profounder mental grasp on the part of the Court would have found a way of reconciling legislation with Constitutional precedent and of making judicial decision interpretative of the will of the people.

THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT

NO one can doubt the evils of sectarianism. They are abundant and only too evident. Half a dozen churches in a village do feebly a common work which, if they were working together, they might do with strength. Money is spent almost uselessly in maintaining separate church organizations at home which is sorely needed in doing the too often neglected work of the Church abroad. Each church is tempted to put its emphasis on its own pet doctrine or symbol, to the neglect of truths and duties the importance of which all recognize in theory rather than in practice. Hostility between the churches is mostly a thing of the past, but the emulation between the churches is not always an emulation in works of charity and mercy. And the great world without, which admires strength, looks with indifference and sometimes with contempt on churches whose feebleness seems to non-churchmen to be due wholly to immaterial differences.

But those in the Church who are attempting to cure these evils by making out of these fragments a united Church, with one theological creed, one form of worship, and one ecclesiastical order, appear to me to have short memories. They forget the greater evils which have always resulted when churchmen have endeavored to secure unity of the spirit by uniformity in doctrine and worship. The Roman Catholic Church in the Middle Ages insisted on one creed, one ritual, and one authority; the result was the Inquisition. The Greek Church pursued the same course, though less successfully, and the religion of Greece and Russia is the result—life sacrificed to form. The Anglican Church repeated the attempt; the despotism of Laud rivaled that of Strafford, and the persecution of the Scotch Covenanters was scarcely less atrocious than the Roman persecution of the Albigenses. The Puritans got a brief period of control; the worship with a Prayer-Book, made compulsory under Charles I, became a crime under Cromwell. The Pilgrims and the Friends advocated real religious liberty, but whether they

would have continued to advocate it if they had possessed the power of the Roman, the Greek, the Anglican, or the Puritan may be questioned. From the days of Caiaphas to the present day ecclesiastical power has stimulated ecclesiastical ambition. The problem of the Church is not merely how to bring about union. The evils of disunion are feebleness; the problem of the churches is how to achieve a union which will bring power without sacrificing liberty.

The advocates of Church unity might well learn a lesson from the political history of the world. Unity of spirit and division of authority has, I think, without exception been a condition of political freedom. England is a union of what were once independent kingdoms, but county government has survived the union and imposes limits on the power of Parliament none the less real that they are not defined by a written Constitution. The British Empire affords a striking illustration of power combined with liberty. The Established Church in England is Episcopal; in Scotland the Established Church is Presbyterian; and in Ireland, Canada, and Australia there is no Established Church. The union of free States in a free Republic is not less strikingly illustrated by the United States. It is a spiritual unity—that is, a unity of free men in a free Nation. "It was a true instinct which led the framers of the Constitution to begin with the statement: 'We the people of the United States.' It was the individual citizens who could unite, and not the 'States.' The same is true of the churches. The various churches cannot unite, though they may co-operate and associate themselves for more effective work."

In these words Dr. Leighton Parks admirably states in his recent volume, "The Crisis of the Churches," the problem of Church unity. In a single sentence in another part of the volume he states it with equal clearness and greater brevity: "The only possible way in which religious men can be held together is by substituting loyalty to Christ for theological agreement."¹ This book appears to have been written especially for the clergy or the lay churchmen of his own communion. Its size will probably limit its circulation to that constituency. I wish that he could be induced to make out of it a volume about the size of Dr. Fossdick's "Meaning of Prayer," addressed to the laymen of all communions. The movement for Church unity must first be won among the laity.

The fact that the rector of St. Bar-

¹ The Crisis of the Churches. By Leighton Parks, D.D. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. \$2.50.

tholomew's Church, one of the most influential and active of the Protestant churches in New York City, has devoted a volume to the elucidation of this truth, is one of the hopeful signs of the times; in my thinking, far more hopeful than the hitherto vain endeavor to find some common ecclesiastical ground on which all Christians can unite in a common organization. The Roman Catholics will not accept the Episcopal orders, Episcopalians will not renounce them; the Friends will not accept the Episcopal sacraments, nor the Episcopalians receive into their communion those who do not; the Baptists will not accept infant baptism, nor will the non-Baptists repudiate it. The Nicene Creed is doubted by some excellent Christians, and to many its phrases are meaningless; probably a large majority of the clergy of Protestant churches disbelieve in the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession, which all Catholics—whether Greek, Roman, or Anglican—regard as vital to organic unity. Union based on creed, ritual, or orders is quite impossible of accomplishment, even if it were desirable.

But there is nothing to prevent the churches anywhere, at any time, in any place, from uniting in a common work, bound together in a spiritual fellowship by a common purpose. The way to such a unity has already been marked out for the churches by the unity in Christian work and Christian fellowship in the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A. There is no reason why in any village where there is a Baptist church, a Methodist church, an Episcopal church, and a Friends meeting the worshipers should not continue to worship according to their various tastes and temperaments,

but unite in their public service to the community. And there is no *good* reason why we might not look forward to the time when one village church should become broad enough to hold an early communion every Sabbath morning at half-past eight, a full service of prayer and preaching at eleven o'clock, a Prayer-Book service at four o'clock, and a Friends meeting in the evening. Queen Victoria, I believe, attended the Episcopal Church in England and the Presbyterian Church in Scotland. It is not too much to hope that American Christians will in time become as broad as the English Queen.

LYMAN ABBOTT.

WE FORGET THE ELEMENTS

CIVILIZATION has a way of forgetting the elemental forces of nature, but the forces are not asleep merely because we choose to ignore them. Sometimes when our backs are turned they strike us down like the sudden and secret spring of a panther.

At least to civilized man the blow seems to come without warning. But those who have not forgotten all the lore of simpler times—those who know the ways of the winds and the waves—are not so often caught off their guard. If the blow comes, they can at least meet it face to face.

A short while ago a storm swept over the metropolis. When it passed, it left half a hundred dead in its wake. Many of those who died lost their lives in open boats in the waters surrounding New York. The newspapers wrote headlines concerning the catastrophe which

painted it as an unforeseeable disaster. Any one who knew the actual conditions of the day of the storm must have been certain that much of the loss of life could easily have been avoided by very simple precautions. The storm itself was not a local disturbance. It had been sweeping eastward across the country for many hours. Even to those who had no access to the weather reports the sky itself might have given adequate warning, but city folk cannot read the heavens and there was no Governmental agency to see that they did not suffer for their ignorance.

New Yorkers are likely to remember this storm and forget the lesson. We wonder if other communities faced by similar conditions can profit by New York's loss. Wherever city-bred people foregather in open boats for recreation there should first be a rigid inspection of the craft offered for hire and perhaps a drastic cutting down of the present number of passengers which such craft are permitted to carry.

The Police Department, or some similar agency, should have the power to prohibit the renting of boats on days when danger is in the air. At least there should be police launches enough to carry warnings to those who are ignorantly endangering their lives. The storm signal system should be extended to give warning of weather which might endanger the safety of small boats, even though it carries no threat to more seaworthy craft.

There are many lakes, rivers, and bays in the neighborhood of large cities where lessons of the New York disaster might be taken to heart, but we do not venture to hope that they will be so applied.

A PRIVATE DISPUTE AND A PUBLIC CALAMITY

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENCE FROM WASHINGTON BY WILLIAM P. HELM, JR.

THE people of the United States are facing a certain shortage of anthracite coal next winter. The damage was done during the three months of April, May, and June, and there is no longer speculation as to the result. Under no conceivable set of circumstances will there be enough hard coal for everybody when winter comes. If all the anthracite mines were to resume work to-morrow and work at full capacity, they could not produce sufficient coal to avert the shortage.

The bituminous-coal situation hasn't gone quite so far to the bad, but is on its way there with a whoop. The bare boards are showing at the bottom of the consumers' stock piles. Within the next two weeks stocks will touch the danger line of 20,000,000 tons. When that line

is passed, industries will begin to close down. The non-union mines, in clover for the past three months, can't bring enough coal to the surface to keep all American industries going. At our present rate of industrial consumption, non-union mines can supply from sixty to seventy per cent of what is needed. The other thirty to forty per cent of our reviving industries temporarily must go out of business. Either that or all industry will average about four days a week working time.

That looks like an overdrawn picture; but it isn't. Cold figures of production and requirements do not lie. Moreover, they are known quantities, not guesswork. The Federal Government takes their measure, and for years has come within two or three per cent of the truth

in its preliminary estimates. A certain shortage of anthracite and a probable shortage of bituminous are what the figures show, handle them as we may.

In the face of this prospect, about 500,000 workmen and 3,000 mine owners, solely responsible for the present situation, continue with unabated ardor the quarrel which brought it about. Indeed, in the anthracite industry the quarrel has intensified. It is more acute to-day than it was April 1. A nation's comfort, welfare, and prosperity have been flouted, disregarded, and subordinated to a private dispute over a day's wage.

In the bituminous industry the only apparent improvement since the day work stopped has been, at this writing, a whisper that miners and operators in Ohio and Illinois may get together after