

obably end in a crash and a repetition of  
ent miseries; but this may not happen until  
the election, and in the meantime the farmers  
have been rescued at least momentarily from  
slough of despond. The other chief cause of  
atisfaction, the administration's apparent lack  
foreign policy, and its failure to fulfill pre-  
ion pledges to create something like, and bet-  
han, the League of Nations, seems likely to  
issipated to some extent by the President's ad-  
cy of American participation in the Inter-  
onal Court.

While prophecy is therefore dangerous, there  
ne conditions which are now well within the  
fact. It is clear that of the Democratic  
ties William G. McAdoo is the strongest.  
ving to California he has blocked the charge  
ing "too close to Wall Street," and at the  
time got rid of the hostile Tammany machine.  
Democratic bosses of such states as New  
s, New Jersey and Indiana do not want  
doo. He is a more genuine liberal and less  
able as to the party patronage system than  
of the outstanding leaders of his party. The  
cians would prefer some one like Ralston of  
a whom they think they could control as  
Republican confrères control Harding. Un-  
ly for them, there is not only McAdoo to  
er, but Ford.

East makes a grave mistake in under-  
ating the importance of Henry Ford as a po-  
al figure. There are thousands of square miles  
territory in which he is better liked and more  
ected than any other man in public life. De-  
e the jokes, owners of his automobiles like him  
he belief that he produces the best motor car  
ie wld at its price. Laboring men like him  
his 5-a-day policy, and the fact that he is  
union does not alter this feeling. Railroad  
like the wages he pays them, and shippers like  
ort to reduce rates, which was balked by the  
tate Commerce Commission. Farmers like  
for his tractors and for his promise to pro-  
them with cheap fertilizer if the government  
him have Muscle Shoals. "Soft money" ad-  
tes, of whom there are many in the Middle  
st at present, like his heterodox monetary views.  
ple of all classes like him because he is success-  
and does not belong to the despised breed of  
ticians.

seems probable that Ford will seek the Demo-  
ic nomination. He won't get it; for the bosses  
control the convention had rather lose with  
neone else than win with a man they can't con-

It is not improbable that he will then start  
rd party of his own, perhaps amalgamate with  
st, or join the third party movement which  
orted Christensen in 1920. No such party  
win an election in 1924; but it would prob-  
secure such strength as it had at the expense  
he Northern Democrats rather than the Re-

publicans, and it might thereby reelect Harding.

The progressive Republicans, men like Borah,  
Johnson and La Follette are the ones confronted  
by a genuine moral problem. Harding's first ad-  
ministration has proved itself an almost complete  
violation of the principles these men say they hold  
dear. The party is now definitely committed to a  
continuation of reactionary domestic policies until  
1928. If the progressive wing consents to remain  
under the Harding banner in the next national  
election, its members will have tacitly confessed  
that they are more concerned about staying where  
the power is, than about their principles. Such a  
decision would seriously weaken the considerable  
public respect in which the progressives are now  
held. If the welfare of liberal principles is not  
to be left to the accident of a possible McAdoo  
victory in the Democratic convention, or to a man  
like Ford who, however respectable his business  
achievements may be, is politically irresponsible,  
ignorant of history, and unlikely to conduct the  
affairs of this nation wisely through a period of  
storm, the progressive group in the Republican  
party must make up its mind to do something a  
little more courageous than to gaze in the proper  
direction while the administration with which it is  
now affiliated carries them with it toward the  
opposite pole.

## Liberalism and the Censor

WHY is it that liberals are, as a rule, against  
the censor? Is it because they believe there  
is no such thing as corruption in art and literature,  
or that the influence of such corruption is neg-  
ligible? No; liberals are not persons who were  
born in blinkers. They know that there are and  
always have been artists and writers who seek de-  
liberately to trade in perverted tastes and desires.  
Nor are liberals prone to underestimate the influ-  
ence of art and literature. They are the first to  
ascribe an ennobling influence to the good in art;  
logically they must ascribe a degrading influence  
to the bad. Nor is there anything in liberalism  
that is repugnant to positive action for the curbing  
of degrading influences. When Léon Daudet,  
leader of the French Royalists, published a book  
compounded of piety and pornography it was the  
French liberals who led the attack and forced him  
to withdraw it from publication. It is safe to  
assume that a liberal state would maintain a  
censorship, and very likely a more drastic one than  
conservative states maintain.

The liberal is not opposed on principle to  
censorship. He is opposed to the stupidities of its  
practice. But when we say "stupidities," are we  
not begging a good many questions? It is stupid  
to do something that defeats your own end. Is it  
fair to characterize as stupid a tory action that  
defeats a liberal end? Censorship as we know it

is usually in the hands of the tories. Before we call it stupid we should consider seriously whether it does not after all work in pretty harmoniously with the tory scheme of life.

The censor is now engaged in an attempt to put off the stage Sholom Asch's *God of Vengeance*. There are unsavory characters in the play—a brothel keeper, a pimp, a number of prostitutes. A large part of the action takes place in a brothel. A very disgusting brew could have been concocted from such ingredients, if the characters had been presented as mere embodiments of their vices. But they are not. They are presented as human beings, animated by purposes that are only variants of ordinary human purposes. Whatever seductions they are supposed to practise in their profession, they practise none whatever on the audience. Any one who is induced to buy a seat for the *God of Vengeance* with the expectation that he will have his senses stirred will find himself shamefully cheated. The place for him is Broadway, where his requirements will be met by a number of shows on which the censor turns a friendly eye.

But does not that one fact prove the stupidity of the censor? Not at all. The tory world which the censor wishes to conserve is not a world without base passions and vice. In that world there is a place for the brothel keeper, the pimp, the prostitute. There is a place for indecent exposure, for the risqué story, the broad innuendo. That respectable old drama, *The School for Scandal*, recently put on the stage before audiences composed largely of little maids from school, had its place for the "little milliner," behind the screen in the apartment of a bachelor who admitted, not too shamefacedly, that "Joseph was not all Joseph." Joseph was lying; the "little milliner" was a respectable wife—a vastly different matter, as all the pre-debutantes in the audience were supposed to know. The tory world is not abolitionist in matters of vice. Its motto is simply, "Everything in its place."

In Sholom Asch's drama the brothel keeper and the prostitutes are not in their place. They are not practising prostitution. They are exhibiting that major part of themselves which is our common humanity. And that is what drives the censor to blind rage. As a tory he acts on an instinct, without knowing the reason why. But it is an instinct that comports with his whole system.

What is it that makes it possible to keep everything in its place, vice as well as virtue? It is precisely the carefully cultivated habit that makes us feel: "fallen woman—enough said." If we allowed ourselves to think of her in terms of her memories, her aspirations, her superstitions, her religious feelings, or even in terms of her small gluttonies and asceticisms, her petty selfishness and her naïve generosity—still more if we allowed her to think of herself in such terms—there is a danger that she would quit the life of shame. And then

what would we do with her? She would stand for something entirely without a place in a tory world.

A good tory ought to think of the prostitute only as prostitute, just as in the war a good patrioteer required himself to think of the Germans only as Huns—burning, raping, cutting throats. Would the patrioteers have stood for a dramatic representation of the German soldier as a devoted husband and father, an affectionate son, or even a poor greedy fellow who loved life, shuddered at the thought of wounds and death, but tried to do the job cut out for him by those he was bound to obey? Never. That would have been fraternizing with the enemy. Our tory war world had a comfortable place for the German as Hun, none for the German as man. Our tory peace world has no place for the humanity in Sholom Asch's drama.

It is unjust to malign the censor. He is only a faithful private in the ranks of toryism. As the liberal sees it his work is pure mischief. But let us recognize that the tory theory of keeping the fallen woman as prostitute and the German as Hun is by no means a mere stupidity. The tory strives, consciously or unconsciously, to keep the world just as it is, with all its virtues and vices unimpaired. This is, to the tory, the best of all possible worlds. He accepts vice and war as a part of this excellent world and works unconsciously for maintaining them, along with virtue and peace. The liberal knows that a better world is possible. He knows that vice and war are unnecessary evils. He knows that there is only one road to their elimination, and that is through breaking down the barriers of misunderstanding between man and man. The tory censor exists for the purpose of maintaining these barriers. He must be destroyed. But the way to destroy him is to understand him, and compel him to understand himself.

## For a Super University

CECIL RHODES was right in his conception. There is a fundamental unity among the English speaking peoples. It is essentially an intellectual unity, and its preservation and extension are immensely worth fostering. But Cecil Rhodes was first of all an islander, and unconsciously based his plans upon the mother country—colonial relation. He dreamed of Americans, Canadians, Australians, South Africans attending Oxford, giving of the spirit of the newer lands and taking of the established cultural values of the older one. But the taking was expected to be quite out of proportion to the giving. So at any rate it has turned out. Oxford may have adapted itself slightly to the Rhodes scholars, but the Rhodes scholars have been compelled to adapt themselves far more thoroughly to Oxford—too thoroughly, indeed, to re-