



Keystone

Photographs transmitted by telephone—An example of the new method, showing the Public Hall of Cleveland, Ohio, in which the Republican National Convention will be held on June 10. This photograph was sent from Cleveland to New York in five minutes

through the war, begins almost at the bottom and regardless of cost recreates an efficient merchant marine and now sends us a very notable object-lesson, the Columbus, one of the finest liners in the world.

### Why the Helicopter?

**D**URING a flight recently made in France the Oehmichen helicopter successfully covered a circuit of over a mile, thus winning a prize of 90,000 francs. In speculating on this hopeful advance in helicoptric flight it is interesting to note that it was just twenty years ago that the American, Wright, attracted world-wide attention by making a similarly short flight at Le Mans, France. Is the helicopter, then, destined to reach the present well-proved status of the airplane?

No one knows as yet, but steady progress has been made during recent years. Other larger prizes have been posted by foreign governments awaiting the day when a helicopter can compete on comparative terms with an airplane. But with the latter already a success, why perfect the former?

The helicopter, unlike the airplane, would be able to rise directly from and land directly on the ground without the necessity of a long runway. Better still for purposes of attack, it would be able to hover over one spot indefinitely, while an airplane must keep moving or fall at

once. Instead of the kite-like action of the planes driven forward while inclined at a small angle with the earth, the action of the helicopter is essentially a vertical one. If a screw propeller were to be held on a shaft in a vertical position, like an umbrella, and whirled, it would tend to lift the holder straight up. This is the very simple principle of the helicopter.

### Photographs by Telephone

**W**HILE from time to time there have been exhibited specimens of photographs which have been by ingenious devices sent over the telephone, an advance has been lately made which bids fair to revolutionize that form of art work. The fact that the process just exhibited is practical for news purposes is shown by the announcement of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company that it will be put in use at the Republican Convention at Cleveland for transmitting by telephone photographs of the exciting scenes in the Convention for free distribution among newspapers as a demonstration of the methods and possibilities of the invention.

Recently pictures were sent from Cleveland to New York and printed in the next morning's papers. What is most notable is the fact that only forty-four minutes elapsed between the time when the photograph was taken in Cleveland

and the time when it was shown completely developed in the office of the company in New York City. The actual transmission of the picture was only five minutes, the rest of the time being used for developing and printing.

The results obtained are described by those who saw the transmission carried out as a triumph of electrical genius and extraordinary inventive ability.

The exact process is described in its fundamental features in as simple a way as possible as follows: "Thin vertical lines constitute each picture; the sending apparatus transforms these lines into electrical waves, which vary in strength according to the degree of light or dark in that part of the picture; when received, a beam of light is played upon a sensitive film and the strength of the electrical current determines the width of the lines recorded. Thus, line by line, the pictures is reproduced."

### Dr. Eliot Speaks for Prohibition

**T**HE citizens' Committee of One Thousand for Law Enforcement has made public a comment by the President Emeritus of Harvard, Dr. Charles W. Eliot, concerning the anti-prohibition views of President Nicholas Murray Butler, of Columbia University. In brief, Dr. Eliot disagrees, in a thoroughly dignified but emphatic manner, with every one of Dr. Butler's criticisms.

Contrary to the opinion of many, he feels that Dr. Butler's statement "will not increase the number of wets in the United States; it will dishearten no dry students; it has no tendency whatever to prove that constitutional government has failed."

Dr. Eliot then tells how unitedly the teachers and educators of the country favor teaching all children the effects of alcohol on health and society, and the reasons for the abolition of alcoholism. He believes that the marked improvement in the condition of the population at large will convince all that disuse of alcoholic drinks brings enormous benefits. He declares that prohibition is being better and better enforced, and strongly predicts that neither Republican nor Democratic party "will venture to put a wet plank in its platform at the coming Presidential election."

"Even the wettest of politicians," he says, "see the strong trend of public opinion toward the enforcement of all the

laws against the manufacture and sale of alcoholic drinks."

## Abolishing Freedom and War—by Resolution

**A**LL the signs of the times point to a coming religious renaissance. Indeed, the renaissance is here. With larger knowledge has come larger faith. With a new understanding of the universe have come new and greater conceptions of God, and new and sounder views of the relation of man to the universe and to God.

There have been other renaissances, and they have been always fought tooth and nail by those who identify faith with tradition. So it is to-day. Those who wish to stop the dawn attempt to do so by wringing the neck of the crowing cock. Again history repeats itself. As those ecclesiastics and their lay followers who resenting the discovery that the earth was round tried to keep it flat by their attacks on Galileo, so to-day the ecclesiastically minded try to keep the universe static by efforts to silence or expel those who reinterpret religion in terms which new knowledge supplies. These opponents of knowledge call themselves Fundamentalists. They had their predecessors in the Sanhedrin. They will have their successors in the years to come. Whenever light breaks forth, they try to shut it out.

To-day, fortunately, the Fundamentalists have not the means at their command that their predecessors of the priesthood in Jerusalem and of the Inquisition had. They can no longer burn at the stake or crucify; but they can pass resolutions.

What has been going on in the Presbyterian Church is thus a sign of the new renaissance. The Fundamentalists would not be so bitter if they were not aware of the dawn. In the General Assembly in session at Grand Rapids, Michigan, Dr. Clarence E. Macartney, the candidate of the Fundamentalists, after a bitter campaign that has been described by a friend of ours as resembling a Philadelphia ward contest, was elected Moderator, and William Jennings Bryan, former Secretary of State, the spokesman of those who have been attacking evolution, was appointed Vice-Moderator. The vote which gave the victory to the Fundamentalists was not overwhelming; it was 464 to 446; but on this slender margin Dr. Macartney bases the right of

his party to expel Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, the Baptist liberal, from the pulpit of the First Presbyterian Church of New York City.

In such a contest only those who have a professional or denominational interest in church matters can be much concerned. Nothing that the Presbyterian Church can do will alter in the least the progress of scientific study or prevent those who are thinking for themselves from continuing to do their own thinking. It is not an issue between one doctrine and another; it is the issue between shackled and unshackled thought. Perhaps freedom of the mind can be destroyed by fire and sword, but it will survive the adoption of resolutions.

And so, unfortunately, will war. No one, in America at least, loves war. In fact, all peoples hate it thoroughly in all its forms; but the intelligent man realizes that it cannot be abolished by resolutions. To pass laws against it is as futile as passing laws against headache and sore throat. War is an effect, not a cause. The Church can do much toward removing the ultimate causes that make for human discord; but only an intelligent, tolerant Church can do so, not an intolerant or merely sentimental one. The Church can do much to develop the high idealism and understanding necessary if we of the human race are to live peaceably together; but it must do so by putting not peace first, but justice. Resolutions against war, or against participation in any war for any cause whatever, not only do not prevent war, but encourage those who profit by injustice to think that they can gain their ends without incurring peril of resistance. When the Church, confronted by the choice between peace and righteousness, deliberately chooses peace, it causes thinking men more than ever to doubt its moral leadership.

Wonder is often expressed why so many in these days do not go to church. The real cause for wonder is that so many still continue to go, despite repeated affronts to their reason and their hopes. Happily, one need not judge the Church by its official action. Throughout the country it is the Church that serves, perhaps even more than ever, as the symbol of man's ability to see the invisible, as the reservoir from which men draw for power to do justly and love mercy. The dissensions within the Church are a sign that the Church itself cannot stand still, that it is moving in the

direction of knowledge. Those who are struggling and protesting against the Church's advance are the unwilling witnesses to its progress.

## Unifying Our Foreign Service

**T**HE bill, passed by both branches of Congress, known as the Rogers Bill has as its object reorganization and improvement of our Foreign Service. It provides that the diplomatic and consular services shall together be known as the Foreign Service of the United States; that hereafter all permanent officers in the Foreign Service below the grade of minister, whether engaged in the diplomatic or the consular branch of the Service, shall be known as Foreign Service officers; that they may be assigned to duty in either branch of the Service at the discretion of the President; that any such officers may be appointed as secretaries in the diplomatic service or as consular officers, or both, but only with the advice and consent of the Senate; that a retirement and disability fund shall be established for the aid of any officers of this Foreign Service who may meet certain requirements; a uniform salary scale and provision for paying one officer who is acting in another's place make the Service more attractive financially than it has been.

An important provision of the Rogers Bill is that hereafter all appointments to the position of Foreign Service officer shall be made only after examination and a period of probation or, after five years' continuous service in the Department of State, by transfer from the State Department under the supervision of the President.

Another important provision is that hereafter the customary titles, Second Assistant Secretary of State and Third Assistant Secretary of State, shall both be changed to the title Assistant Secretary of State; that a new or additional Assistant Secretary of State shall be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, and that he shall take the place of the present Director of Consular Service.

All these and other minor provisions of the bill do not confuse or consolidate the duties of consular and diplomatic representatives. The first will act under the direction of their head, who, however, will now be more directly under the guidance and authority of the Secretary