

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-

turn to their own homes as the most effective exponents of English speaking unity.

It is easy to see now why the plan failed of complete success. Oxford and Cambridge are, and must remain, primarily embodiments of English culture, English unity. These are old things; the intellectual unity of the English speaking world is a new thing and needs an embodiment appropriate to itself. It needs a university built up on new foundations which may serve as the intellectual crown of the whole English speaking world. There are many good reasons why such a university should be founded in England rather than in America or Canada or Australia. England has a longer cultural history and hence a greater proportion of persons with fully formed cultural and scientific interests. She is the centre and clearing house for the English speaking world; and above all she is planted off the coast of Europe, in close relation with the intellectual movements of the great continental states. England is unquestionably the country in which such an institution could work most effectively, provided that it was new from the ground up.

It would have to be new, and at the same time powerful. It would need to be strong enough to attract to itself the most distinguished scholars not only from all parts of the English speaking world, but from France, Italy, Germany, Russia, as well. It would need laboratories, libraries and other equipment on a scale that would be lavish for even our richest American universities. It would need scholarship funds sufficient to draw the ablest young men from even the remotest corners of the world. Unless it could be, from the outset, unquestionably the greatest university in the world, it would be nothing at all. But if it could be that, its influence on civilization would be incalculable.

What is the use of beguiling ourselves with such a dream institution? It need not be left as a dream. What are the conditions of its fulfillment? Mainly, money. With money enough the buildings would rise as by magic; the corps of distinguished scholars would be drawn together in a few short months and students from all over the world would pack their hopes and ambitions and set out for London.

Money is the one prerequisite, a huge sum of money. Where is it to be had, in a world struggling under a mountain of debt? Why—with credit to Mr. Vanderlip—out of the debt.

England owes America some four billion dollars, under the recent debt agreement. There are tens of thousands of Americans, including many of our richest citizens, who feel that this debt should have been remitted. So far as their means permit, they can as private citizens bring about a revision of the settlement far better than mere remission. They can buy these British bonds from the American treasury and place them in a fund for the endowment of this greatest of universities. Let

every American who favored the remission of the debt calculate what addition that would have made to his tax bills for the rest of his life. So much he could easily afford to give in the form of British bonds to the endowment of this university. There would be, at once, an imposing sum, we guess some tens of millions. But very few would limit themselves to such mere conscience money payments.

Consider how freely Americans contribute to the endowment of their Alma Mater, to the commemoration of the work of some great educator or statesman, to the glory of city or state. Suppose that a body of the greatest educators of the English speaking countries were to draft plans for the world's greatest university, to commemorate the common effort in the world war, to testify to the common hope in peace and civilization. And suppose that the very character of the endowment were commemorative of the effort, testimony of the good will and unity of the English speaking nations. It is not conceivable that the project would be allowed to fail for want of funds.

## One Reason for Railroad Troubles

**R**AILWAY interests for the past few years have had one strong argument for everything they wished to do. The railways are underbuilt, underequipped, undermaintained. In order to serve the public they must have more capital. And in order to get more capital they must earn a fair profit to offer to the investor. This reasoning underlay the guarantee and the rate-making sections of the Transportation Act of 1920. It was used to justify "deflation" of labor, with all that policy involved of conflict with the unions and the disastrous shop strike. It will be used again in attempts to get away from "restrictive legislation."

It is true, of course, that many railroads find it difficult to earn a rate of return on their existing capitalization, under their existing managements, sufficient to attract investors in competition with highly profitable industries the prices of whose products are not under government control. Little or no railroad stock has been issued since 1915. Those who remember the financial manipulation of the Erie, the New Haven, and many other roads, however, question whether the real cause is too low earning power or the legacy of stock-jobbing and banker management. But we are told that all such matters are ancient history and must be forgotten; that the watering of values is not the fault of the present owners, and that in order to avoid confiscation and attract new investment we must validate all the bonds and stock now outstanding and pay high rates on them.