# TOPICS OF THE DAY

HAZARDS OF THE SEA: THE FLEXNER SCRUTINY: WISDOM IN EDUCATION: PROBLEMS OF RADIO: RADICALISM IN TORONTO.

AS a figure of international importance in determining the rights of rum-runners in and around territorial waters, Captain Jack Randell can still say "*I'm Alone.*" William Cluett, master of the *Josephine K.* out of Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, is not alive to dispute the claim. In the ordinary course of his business he had the misfortune to encounter United States coastguard officers who happened, for once, to be engaged in their business of preventing him. Instead of quietly discharging his cargo and collecting his profits, Captain Cluett was shot, and the circumstances of his death have made him a symbol. For a time it seemed that he might become a "case" for students of international law; but since there appears to be no immediate promise of a decision in the much clearer case of the firing on the *I'm Alone,* he may provide only a problem.

Unofficial opinion is sharply divided, but the line of division is by no means the international boundary. At the public funeral in Lunenburg, the death was called "nothing more nor less than murder on the high seas". The newspaper report of this statement drew verbal fire from a correspondent who explained, more in anger than in sorrow, that it "served him right". Across the border it was officially reported that "the death, though regrettable, was unavoidable under the circumstances"; but the partisan newspapers were a little more definite and emphatic, and showed how it simply went to prove, according to their respective opinions, that the methods of Prohibition were either wrong as usual, or right after all. It has not been suggested that Captain Cluett was engaged otherwise than in helping to circumvent, if not actually to break, the laws of the United States. His friends at home are concerned, pardonably and with complete truth, merely to point out that he was "a fine churchman, thorough-going and well-instructed, a good husband and father, a good friend and a master mariner". In an early press report of his death it was noted that there was a peculiarly ironic element in the tragedy, since the interrupted expedition was intended as one of Captain Cluett's few remaining voyages; by industry and good management he had amassed a competence, and

hoped shortly to retire. Captain Cluett was clearly not an ordinary criminal; but none the less he was perilously close to breaking a law that had been sufficiently proved to be dangerous in the breach and difficult of enforcement. Of Boatswain Schmidt's judgment there may be some doubt; but of Captain Cluett's intention there can be none.

One may sympathize with the belief of many American anti-Prohibitionists—not all of whom are "wets"—that the law is an ass. But to admit this as a reason for breaking the law is to establish a dangerous precedent, capable of almost infinite extension. When further arguments are based on the general good conduct and steady character of the law-breaker, the situation, apart from personal considerations, becomes Gilbertian. Racketeers must be excused if they subscribe to charity, and gunmen if they are kind to animals:

> When constabulary duty's to be done—to be done,
> The policeman's lot is not a happy one.

The happiness of Boatswain Schmidt's lot would seem to have been determined with a tape measure. The board of enquiry has decided that the *Josephine K.* was actually within the limits marked for that safest of anchorages, Rum Row. There are figures to prove it, correct to two places of decimals. Moreover, there are currents, and knots, and convolutions. If the *Josephine K.* were more than 9.55 miles from the coast when she was observed, "Ottawa would have every right to press the issue under the anti-smuggling treaty". Even with the encouraging absence of results from the *I'm Alone* enquiries, one is inclined to hope—"without prejudice" as the lawyers say—that she will have been found to have been less than 9.55 miles from the coast. Otherwise the results might be serious. The present writer has a vague recollection—perhaps from a dream—of an incident on a troopship. One calm night, in the middle of an ocean undisturbed by raiding submarines, the whole military personnel was asleep, except for the officer of the day, but not excepting—according to that conscientious officer—two large and lazy military policemen deputed to guard the vacant decks. Since life is monotonous on a transport, an elaborate trial was held, and an imposing array of evidence was presented. Just as a verdict was ready to be brought down—and on the evidence it could be of only one kind—it occurred to someone to enquire about the punishment. It then transpired that the alleged offence was committed "on active service"—and that the penalty was death. The evidence was hastily revised; the officer of the day checked his

observations, and decided that it must have been two other fellows. And life on the transport returned to its monotonous routine.

One has much more sympathy with Captain Cluett than with his associates on shore. He followed a skilled profession, and was accustomed to danger; the same paper that reported his funeral contained two separate and distinct references to the hardships and poverty of fishermen. The profits from rum-running are large, to compensate for a necessary risk. Jack Randell, at least, has put this risk on record as part of the game, and clearly did not expect the coastguards to assist him regularly with convoys and landing agents. If fishing declines, and good sailors are wanted for other employments, it is natural that some will offer to carry any commodity for which the freight is remunerative. In the Nova Scotia plebiscite, the county of Lunenburg declared a majority for Prohibition. Certain American newspapers called attention to the rugged honesty of simple fisher folk. But the prosperity of certain residents of the county requires an explanation involving less simplicity than that of pious attention to the price of fish. The clearest statement in justification of Captain Cluett's enterprise comes again—and again with perfect truth—from the address at his funeral. "Captain Cluett was simply the commander of a supply-boat carrying a commodity demanded by the people of the United States....Many in high places....are among the creators of that demand". For information on this and other enlightening aspects of the rum-running industry, the reader is referred to Captain Randell's engagingly frank narrative, *I'm Alone*. Apparently nothing has ever made Captain Randell sick except American bootleg whisky, and he regards himself as a public benefactor for trying to introduce alcoholic beverages of a higher quality than those provided by local enterprise. Unfortunately he has failed to understand the guiding principle of Prohibition, compulsory reversion to an age of innocence by having people shot by preventive officers or poisoned with canned meat, anti-freeze, and Jamaica ginger. Under Government Control things are arranged differently: the Government, itself selling the liquor, can devote some of the proceeds to providing better roads for drunken drivers and more police to chase them.

---

EVERYONE has some fault to find with the universities, from the stockbrokers who discover that customers' men recruited from the fraternities can neither add nor spell, to the fishmonger who complains that the degree of B.Sc. in Fisheries is given to students deplorably weak in the slicing of halibut. Even

within the college walls there seems to be less of that peaceful unanimity that formerly made the academic life at once a pleasant retreat from a workaday world and a useful preparation for it. Professors no longer regard their students, *prima facie*, as seekers after truth; nor do students invariably consider that studies are more than antiquated formalities incidental to the social routine of going to college and getting a degree. Students, professors, and "the practical man" seem agreed that the trouble lies in the failure of universities to give "a preparation for life". The acceptance of a common phrase might appear to indicate an agreement in values and beliefs. But it is not so. Many students share the regrets of the practical man that much of an arts course has no immediate surrender value in cash; and many professors of newly invented chairs are doing their best to supply the deficiency by offering instruction, for the coveted and allegedly cultural Bachelor's degree in Arts, in such courses as "advertising layouts", "practical poultry raising" and "elementary stenography".

But even in Columbia University, whose garland these choice blossoms help to adorn, there are professors and students for whom higher education implies preparation for life in a somewhat different sense, and to whom this intrusion of mercenary credits must seem to blaspheme the spirit of sound learning. "At Columbia College", writes Mr. Abraham Flexner, in *Universities* (Oxford Press, 1930), "an earnest student finds ample opportunity to study science, mathematics, language, literature, history, philosophy, economics—indeed almost every imaginable subject of sound intellectual value—under competent and at times highly distinguished teachers, and in reach of admirable laboratory and library facilities." These men feel that to make life worth living is not quite the same as to make a good living. Some such notion would appear to have occurred to the practical men of the Faculty. For—still at Columbia, and always following Mr. Flexner's admirable book—it is observed that an advanced student in the School of Practical Arts (whatever *they* are) may count courses taken at Teachers College in "food etiquette and hospitality", in "principles of home laundering", and in "gymnastics and dancing for men, including clog dancing." Other instructors agree with the practical man that the Arts degree is in danger of falling behind the times, but share the feeling of their more old-fashioned colleagues that there are subtler arts by which the social and domestic amenities may be served. "Service" is the watchword of this kind; and although they scorn the rigorous training and exact knowledge of science and the classics, they find great favour among those practical men who feel that a college

degree should "lead to something". That something is this same knowledge of life. These professors who give direct instruction in better living seem to profess the faculty of comprehending the whole of life without submitting to the fatigue of mastering any particular part of it. To them, problems of conduct and experience are as simple as they were to the small girl who was asked what she had learned at Sunday School; "Oh, nothing much. Just that love is love, and life is life, and stuff like that". This ideal of "service", of teaching the undergraduate how to live by telling him about life, is one that appeals to secretaries of welfare organizations and to moderately successful business men digesting platitudes with their luncheon. They feel that the colleges are doing something, and that "the boy"—a mythical abstraction as vague as the minds by which it was invented—that the boy, as a "social problem", is in good hands. So there are courses in "social life in the home", and—in the professional Faculties of education where such ideas seem chiefly to breed—in "awareness of situations and planning of behaviour" and in "methods used in counselling individuals". The choice of "methods" rather than "principles" in this last will suggest the reason for Mr. Flexner's chief complaint against the American trend to "service". Studies and instruction, however exalted in apparent scope, are commonly reduced in practice to a minute and unproductive study of particulars. For instance, the graduate summer Institute of Euthenics at Vassar College purports to offer instruction in the "science of efficient living"; but it is discovered that the "science" is

> artificially pieced together from bits of mental hygiene, child guidance, nutrition, speech development and correction, family problems, wealth consumption, food preparation, household technology, and horticulture. A nursery school and a school for little children are also included. The institute is actually justified in an official publication by the profound question of a girl student who is reported as asking, "What is the connection of Shakespeare with having a baby"? The Vassar Institute of Euthenics bridges this gap!

This *ad hoc* method of teaching leaves nothing to chance, nothing to general training:

> Can a girl's trained intelligence be trusted to learn how to wash, feed, or clothe a baby? Certainly not: there is apparently no fund of experience upon which an educated person may draw! The girl's education may therefore be interrupted, suspended, or confused, in order that under artificial conditions she may be taught such things, probably by spinsters. Can the trained intelligence of a young man be trusted to learn salesmanship,

marketing, or advertising? Certainly not: the educational process has once more to be interrupted, suspended, or confused, in order that he may learn the "principles" of salesmanship from a Ph.D. who has never sold anything, or the "principles" of marketing from a Ph.D. who has never marketed anything.

If this is a trend of modern American teaching, we may expect to find it followed with special thoroughness by the teachers of teaching. Columbia Teachers College offers courses in "the teaching of educational sociology"—which means presumably that someone teaches people how to teach other people the teaching value of the teachings of life; in "administrative procedures in curriculum construction"; and, not to be narrowly academic, in "extra-curricular activities including school clubs, excursions, athletic insignia, class parties and dances, extra-curricular finances and a record card for pupil activity". It might be supposed that courses in teaching would be offered by men who were specially trained in subjects commonly taught; but this is not suggested by Mr. Flexner's selected list of the researches(!) offered as a final proof of competency to direct the labours of those who have something to say. From his samples, fairly chosen from Chicago, Columbia and Harvard, the following will suffice: "The Technique of Estimating School Equipment Costs", "Public School Plumbing Equipment", "A Scale for Measuring Antero-Posterior Posture of Ninth-grade Boys", "The Technique of Activity and Trait Analysis Applied to Y. M. C. A. Executive Secretaries as a Basis for Curricular Materials", "The Intelligence of Orphan Children in Texas". The pseudo-scientific method of limiting these "studies" betrays the absence of any guiding scientific or philosophical principle. Mr. Flexner asks of the last offering "Why Orphan? Why Texas"? But why not? It had to be something. With such study and teaching pursuing each other in a vicious circle of ineptitude, it is not surprising to find Mr. Flexner quoting an unpublished memorandum by the head of an important Faculty of Education:

> There is in the United States no University School of Education in which a Faculty of marked power and distinction is devoting its full time to a highly selected body of graduate students under a program of ample scope systematically directed toward professional leadership.

Nor is it surprising to find that the products of such a system are slow to recognize the limits of their apostolate of service. If they teach, they endeavour to help (like many other holders of practical or missionary professoriates), by obtruding their subject everywhere. And so the teacher of mathematics is asked to give

instruction in commercial arithmetic; the philosopher to discourse on educational psychology; the department of modern languages to provide instruction in commercial Spanish and technical German; while English—which might be supposed incapable of special subdivision—offers courses in business correspondence and in journalism, and provides separate instruction for medical students and for prospective teachers. Why teachers should require a special kind of English is perhaps best explained by the need for a corrective to that professional jargon for which Mr. Flexner has borrowed the name of "pedagese". After a hopeless endeavour to disentangle a long and apparently learned dispute as to the relative merits of "correlation" and "integration", it is encouraging to find Mr. Flexner stating—and he seems to know what he is talking about—that the names do not matter much, and that both principles are dangerous. Foggy language, as usual, covers doubtful practice.

> Easy-going contacts within the university are stimulating and helpful; at deliberately arranged co-operation the really gifted shy. That attracts only the inferior, never the original mind. "The true scholar", writes Professor Zinsser, "the true scholar—an incorrigible individualist if he is worth his salt—will not become a mere tenant, but will make the soil he cultivates his own."

Probably the most elaborate effort at correlation (or integration) ever attempted is that of the Human Welfare group at Yalê,

> which will include the Yale School of Medicine, the Yale School of Law, the Yale Divinity School, the Division of Industrial Engineering, portions of the university departments dealing with human life in its mental, physical, and social aspects and with comparative studies of other living organisms, and, finally, add thereto an Institute of Human Relations.

An elaborate chart explains how everything is linked with everything else; but as Mr. Flexner notes, it really does not go far enough:

> There is nothing new in the proposed Yale Institute—not even "integration". Justice Holmes and Justice Brandeis "integrate" law, economics, and philosophy. Where did they acquire their point of view? Not in a special institute of human relations. As a result of education and contacts, they read, observe, enquire. Their point of view is percolating through courts, the profession, and the law schools. It will be finally established when law school Faculties are composed of large-minded men, not when a separate institute is created.

When all the necessary relationships are established, The Human Welfare Group proves to be identical with Yale University—with

this difference, that integration of all departments has produced disintegration of each. The schools will have destroyed themselves to help each other. We have been all round Robin Hood's barn, and come back a little the worse for wear. The problem of service to the community and preparation for life is just what it has always been.

Mr. Flexner's criticism of American universities is not mere partisan abuse. He is generous with the praise that is so often due; nor does he suggest that the great English universities are either perfect for their own ends or the best models for newer foundations. But, for all their many faults and failings, he finds that their eyes are usually turned towards the light, and that when they take a step, it is usually in the right direction. The defects and the virtues of the ancient colleges are strangely involved with one another:

> The same conditions that permit idleness, neglect, or perfunctory performance of duty are necessary to the highest exertions of human intelligence. Oxford and Cambridge are fortunate enough to supply all sorts of conditions—conditions that permit the idle to be idle, or nearly so, the conscientious to be conscientious, the creative to be creative; and to the idlers a certain value is attached on the basis of the possibility of their subsequent service to the Empire, though opinions vary greatly on this point. Anyway, the English colleges do not try to force all into one Procrustean bed; they do not try to do every sort of thing. We try this in America; we fail, and the best suffer. Germany in its universities is. . . . wiser; so, for all their regulations and formalities and conventions, are Oxford and Cambridge.

Searching for a term that would express the achievement of the English universities, Mr. Flexner finds the nearest to his purpose in the German *Bildung:* "What is *Bildung*? Knowledge, culture, the power of expression, character, manners, a rare balancing and maturing of qualities calculated to equip men to meet with dignity and competency the responsibilities of life".

And so we come back again to the responsibility for service, and to preparation for life. Both Oxford and Cambridge have recently learned from America to pay more attention to method; but method is kept within its limits, and is not applied *ad hoc*. The true principle is well expressed in an epigram—from an American, as it happens—quoted in one of the many excellent addresses to universities in Mr. Vincent Massey's *Good Neighbourhood:* "Depend upon it that the sword is best whetted on that which it is never destined to cut". Mr. Flexner's principles are so admirably summarized in the Founders' Day address at the University of Virginia that it is superfluous to offer more than a selective quotation:

It is probably a tribute to our faith in education that we regard the curriculum as a creative force in itself. Schools of government are of undoubted value in equipping the future public servant with the technique of statecraft and administration. *Ad hoc* courses in journalism and business administration and diplomacy all have their uses, but I would suggest that they can be no substitute for the mental discipline and humanizing influence of studies which are remote from the sphere of professional technology. Not only may such studies be remote, but I would suggest that they *should* be remote from the materials of one's future calling....The Indian Civil Service, as everyone knows, for generations has been charged with the task of administration in a most complicated country, which demands technical knowledge of a highly exacting nature. It is interesting to see that the candidates for admission to this distinguished body of experts in Indian finance and law and public administration are not required to exhibit a knowledge of these things in the first instance (that, of course, must come later). Rather must they show themselves in the first place competent in the use of English and in a knowledge of contemporary affairs. And secondly, their general intellectual capacity is demonstrated by proficiency in such apparently remote subjects as moral philosophy or metaphysics or Latin and Greek or pure mathematics....When my friends tell me of some miracle to be performed by a new addition to the plethora of college courses already existing, I am reminded of the well-intentioned efforts of a distant nation, which shall be nameless, to improve the reputation of its citizens in the world of trade by introducing into the national schools a new subject, with appropriate text-books, known as "Commercial Honesty". ....It is the task of a liberal education to help us to see life in true proportion, so that we can find our love of knowledge balanced by a feeling for humanity, and so that while being a friend of man in the abstract, we do not forget to be the friend of men. It will help us to avoid the high thinking without hard thinking, which is sentimentality, and the hard thinking without high thinking, which is materialism. It will help us to see our work in terms of the community, and our nationality in relation to mankind. Its product is the man of disciplined mind and broadened sympathies and quickened imagination, generous yet discerning, uncompromising, albeit gentle. It will give us, in the words of an Elizabethan prayer, "a spacious outlook into the world".

---

FOR no reason but the nature of our common humanity, we seem to be impatient of control (when we are aware of it) and forget that it is implicit in civilization. The suggested "Government control" of radio broadcasting in Canada is a case in point.

Many of the objections urged against nationalizing the ether—or at least as much of it as belongs on this side of the border—are sound in fact, but often supported by arguments that are narrow-

ly selfish or prompted by unreasoning fear of a dictatorship. There are suggestions of "wire-pulling" by wireless, of political propaganda, of dreary "improving" lectures and "highbrow" music that are to be paid for from taxes paid by plain men with no desire for "uplift". The quoted words are taken from speeches and articles directed against the proposed scheme for nationalization. They indicate ignorance, not so much of what may happen in Canada, as of what has long since happened in the United States under the highly organized system of private commercial enterprise. The air is often filled with insidiously persuasive controversy in politics, commerce and religion; "education", good, bad, and indifferent can always be coaxed from the void; and sometimes there is classical music. In England, on the other hand, there are programmes commercially "sponsored" with presumably some advertising value, some jazz, some very dull lectures, some good music, and by general consent some genuine education from distinguished scholars and men of letters. Both the English and the proposed Canadian systems suffer from the difficulty of erecting barriers against foreign competition. British advertising is now broadcast from the Continent; American advertising will continue to reach Canada from New York and Buffalo, from Cleveland and Los Angeles. And unless it is seriously intended (as certain adverse criticisms would appear to suggest) that Canadian key stations shall make it impossible to "get" anything but the official Government programme, those who want a change can take the law in their own hands by making a simple turn of the dial.

What people wish, or should be compelled, to hear, is a matter of opinion. A taste for Brahms elicits from its opponents the same retort as a taste for the Blues: "If you like that sort of thing, that's just the sort of thing you like." But, under private ownership or Government control, both music and jazz must be paid for, ultimately, by someone—though the "consumer", in the economic sense, may be difficult to charge. That private enterprise can provide good music, and also directly educate and elevate the public taste, is proved by the programmes offered by certain corporations both in Canada and the States. Of the two, in the present writer's opinion, Canada offers if not the better music, at least more that is very good; but there is too little from stations on either side of the line. In a certain week in the eastern States only five really good musical programmes were available for ordinary reception—three of these being timed for one period, and two for another. All that the so-called "highbrow" can ask is that he may have reasonable allowance made for his tastes, and reasonable opportunities to

gratify them. It is to be noted that these better programmes are sent out by merchants whose wares appeal to the wealthier and more leisured classes of the community. Advertising appeal must be directed at its proper object. Just as the sentimental love romances and detective thrillers are enfolded in advertising matter intended for people who are interested in horoscopes, ventriloquism, and trick cigars, so the popular programmes are chosen to gain favour from those who chew gum, read the "true story" magazines and live in mortal terror of halitosis.

There are also programmes for those who eat bread, smoke cigarettes and clean their teeth. Small profits make quick returns. The good programmes are usually destined for those who buy expensive electrical appliances, travel extensively, and are interested in banking and investment. Unfortunately one cannot show one's approval of a programme as easily or as often by taking a transcontinental journey as by the purchase of a therapeutic chocolate bar; and there are many people who like to hear a good orchestra without being able to purchase even one mechanical refrigerator. The only solution appears to be that a certain proportion of artistic and educational broadcasting should be maintained by the Government, if necessary by subsidy, and that other tastes be served by commercial interests catering to the more frequent needs of the multitude. (If the merchandise offered has lost its sales appeal by the operation of a protective tariff, the advertising is lost and the programme becomes a gift). Advertising, on a competitive basis, has solved its own problem and is reduced to a minimum. Government control could not do better. But whether or not Government ownership be instituted, there is need for Government control of the small independent stations, in which the only compensation for the amount and crudeness of the advertising is its merciful interruption of the programme. Such stations, and their "mail-fans", are often clamorous about their rugged British or American determination to keep free from dictatorship. The only question is whether the dictatorship shall come from a Government department, from an advertising campaigner, or from the corner grocery. In the long run, under whatever system, people get what they ask for, and ask for what they get. The real dictator is democracy.

---

THE alleged subversion to atheism and communism of university students and professors has been exercising the press and the pulpits that represent certain sections in Toronto. These advocates have the advantage of being able to argue without taking the

trouble to explain their reasons or to define their terms. Atheism, by derivation, would appear to most people, and especially to professing Christians, to be a bad thing. The difficulty is not to condemn it, but to see wherein it lies. Communism, on the other hand, might appear, considered in pure theory or in the light of certain early teachings of the Christian Church, to contain possibilities for good. The difficulty here is to see whether any grain of actual goodness remains buried under the accumulation of perversions that have attached themselves to the name and the ideal. As Carlyle has pointed out, we are at the mercy of names: perhaps "communism" has already been so contaminated by its associations that it is merely a term of abuse, and will soon—like certain other vulgar objurgations of equally innocent origin—become forbidden in polite society. It seems a little too soon, however, to pour the vials of wrath upon the heads of people who express a desire to know just what the name conveys to those who consider its implications to be not necessarily undesirable. Especially hasty does it seem to condemn unheard those who might reasonably be assumed, *ex officio,* to be less interested in undermining the foundations of society than in maintaining the ideals of a training and profession traditionally dedicated to the services of justice and truth.

The much-discussed letter of the sixty-eight Toronto professors seems to have been an innocent enough document. Certainly its language and its principles are less "malignant and vitriolic" than those of the critics who assert that the "attack" on the police has removed the disguise from a policy "which will let loose a stench of Soviet propaganda, a campaign against the Church. . . .the rearing of atheism". Lest it be thought that this paragraph conceal a similar "policy", let the professors' letter speak for itself. As quoted in *The Canadian Forum* for March, where an extensive collection of adverse opinions has been made for future social historians, the professors refer to the attitude of the Toronto Police Commission as "short-sighted, inexpedient, and intolerable". This seems injudicious language to direct at a Police Commission, but it appears to be justified by the abuse directed at the principle in defence of which the letter was written:

"We wish to affirm our belief in the free public expression of opinions, however unpopular or erroneous."

If it were not for their personal statements to the contrary, those who suggest action to be taken against the sixty-eight would seem, on the evidence, to be firmly convinced of the efficacy of what are commonly and unfavourably regarded as the theory and practice

of communism. "These dons should all be bundled off to Russia"; for apparently if they were compelled (by Canada) to toil in the Soviet factories and wheat fields, they would be grateful to Canada for the lesson, and admire her tolerance and justice. Moreover, the professors are reminded that the university is a State institution, and the property of the province—a principle to which communism, in the opinion of the editor concerned, is doubtless fundamentally opposed, though in another place his paper deplores "Russia's plan to work through the seats of learning".

The authorities of the university, however, are not reported as having taken any decisive action, and the matter might have dropped had not an undergraduate journalist seized the opportunity to announce, editorially, in the students' daily newspaper, that the majority of students in Toronto University were "practical atheists". University authorities and students suggested reasonably that the statement was absurd, or meaningless, or simply untrue. But the same newspapers and pulpits that condemned sixty-eight professors for suggesting that not all communists are atheists, were willing to accept the statement of one student that all undergraduates are atheists. Their intolerance of subversive doctrines and opposition to constituted authority was manifested in exhorting the young man to keep it up. Free-speech and British fair-play became their watchwords. Inspired by a passion for truth and a fine disregard for notoriety, the young man kept it up, ably supported by his professional brethren of the public sheets. The purity of their motives may be gauged from the fact that it did not occur to either university or civic journalists that the others might be moved by such mercenary considerations as filling space, providing for bigger and blacker headlines, and generally keeping up the circulation. One Toronto minister obtained a standing vote in a crowded church, by which his "attitude on atheism" was upheld by his congregation. His "attitude" was that of the sermon on sin as alleged to be reported by ex-President Coolidge—"against it". Anyone who disagreed with him was "for it". Atheism was conveniently classed with "communism and every other 'ism' that does not conform to the teaching of this Book", which is a good enough inclusive description, but hardly exact enough to justify wholesale application to the entire student body of the largest university in the British Empire.

If the intention of the charge of atheism was merely to indicate that students in the University of Toronto are somewhat vague about the nature of the Deity and of their belief in Him, the charge may be sustained; but it amounts to no more than may be sug-

gested about the congregation at large of an average church, and to much less than history shows to have been true of university students in earlier periods. If it is true that almost all the students possess clearly defined views on atheism and hold them consistently, they are possessed of intelligence, application, and unanimity of mind that makes their student body unique. Anyone who has tried for purposes of history, philosophy, or literature to induce a miscellaneous collection of undergraduates to clarify for twenty-four hours, under pressure, the distinction between Deism and Theism will best appreciate the importance of this collective phenomenon. What, assuming the wide-spread existence of atheism as a creed, is to be understood by "practical atheism" is matter for further conjecture. From its nature, atheism might be supposed to be generally abstract and negative; but once it becomes "practical" throughout a whole university, if words are to continue to have meaning, the evidence should be more positive and concrete than anything that has been submitted. It may perhaps be wiser to assume that the youthful editor is wrong, and that the students of Toronto, like most other young people, are by instinct and training at least moderately good, and inclined to further goodness so far as they can be induced to think about it. The greatest punishment that could have been given to the scaremonger would have been simply to ignore him. But the University of Toronto, like that of British Columbia in dealing with the criticisms from the editor of the *Ubyssey*, is doubly hampered. It has a responsibility to the State, and must answer a partisan or merely sensational criticism. It has accepted responsibility for "official" undergraduate publications produced with the sanction of the university and by authority of the students' council. If official publications were confined to impersonal announcements in bulletins, and contentious opinion were aired in independent sheets, it would be possible to give youth its head and allow it to exercise its privilege of being irresponsible. If we could devise means for being more tolerant of young fools, we might be less afflicted with old ones.

C. L. B.