

culture, however complete, cannot be expected to do more for a man than a comparable course in law or medicine or mechanics can do for its students; perhaps it can do even less, so far as practical results are concerned, because every farm business is a very local problem. Yet a man should be much better prepared for practical farm manager work by a college training than the same man would be without it. The competitions and complexities of agricultural work are now so many that the very best training is required to enable a man to meet them with any degree of success. Untrained men are hopelessly handicapped, and the disability will become more apparent as time goes on. The college man needs training

in business after he leaves college; and he must learn the particular problems of the one enterprise that he is called on to handle. It is time that he receive help, coöperation, and encouragement at the period when he is trying to get a hold. The farm must coöperate with the college in the training of men.

I HOPE that I have been able to indicate, although imperfectly, a type of obligation to the student in agriculture that is seldom discussed, and to suggest to my reader that we need a redirection of our attitude toward the value of the services of these young men and the kind of encouragement that they should receive.



LEADERS

WE recently said a brief word here as to *organization* in a political campaign, its utility and, occasionally, its futility. If there is any other subject conspicuously suggested by the progress of a campaign it is that of *leaders*: the function and utility of leaders; the character of true leaders as compared with the perfunctory, the superficial, the corrupt and the cowardly,—the leaders who follow when they should oppose, and who follow when they should follow till the time arrives when they can effectually lead; and the brave and thinking men in the press, the pulpit, and the school, who wisely lead the leaders themselves.

It is probably Lord Cromer's reference, in his remarkable book on Egypt, to a certain kind of leader that has given present currency to a delicious illustration. At a certain juncture in Egyptian affairs the government, he says, did not attempt to lead public opinion, they followed it—like the French revolutionary "chef," who defended himself for having obeyed the dictates of the Jacobin mob by declaring:

"I am their leader; therefore, I must follow them." This kind of leader we have with us always.

The State of New York of late has furnished conspicuous examples of contrasting leadership in the supposed dominant party of the country. On one hand has been seen the leadership of opportunism,—such as that of Lord Cromer's Jacobin,—or of abtuseness as to moral values and influences; on the other, the leadership of devotion and principle. On the one hand an eye to "the organization"; on the other, an eye to the public good. On the one hand vacillation and timidity; on the other, courage and statesmanship. On the one hand "the machine"; on the other, the people's conscientious executive.

The training of a party "boss" really tends to unfit a man to be a party "boss" in the sense of leadership. Even if he does not become demoralized by opportunities for exploitation, his outlook is so limited, and his activities are so narrowly "practical," that he is apt to become less capable of seeing things as they are, than his disinterested, unsophisticated fellow-citizen,

the village shoemaker, or some "hayseed philosopher" of the outlying districts.

There is seldom anything inspiring in such a "boss"; because he is always under suspicion of self-interest; whereas the quality most valuable in one who aspires to political leadership,—given a sufficient amount of intelligence and adaptability,—is that element of character which makes it easy to surrender everything for principle—in other words, the capacity for self-abnegation. Nothing so deeply endears a leader to the people as absolute moral courage. This is the test to which we bring our heroes. Americans would at any time rather give the Presidency to a man who is capable of throwing it out of the window, than to a man who betrays an overweening anxiety to obtain the prize.

If the advocates of a so-called socialistic State should ever succeed in bringing about the specific desire of their hearts, it would be by means of that very individualism which they seem to underestimate,—nor is it likely that the anti-individualistic, socialistic State could continue to exist, except by that same leadership of the individual. The utility of leadership is indeed unquestionable; the only question being who shall be the political leaders in a democracy like ours.

That political "machines," of some sort, are necessary and, properly manned, useful under our political system is evident. That there are morally intelligent and politically wise leaders connected with our political machinery is also evident; and such men should be supported in their difficult work and defended from captious criticism. Outside of the machine there is fortunately one class of leadership our countrymen are particularly prone to make use of—a kind of leadership very different from that of the complacent Jacobin of the story; and that is the leadership of men of whom the people "take notice" as disinterested, industrious public officials, who put conscience and scruple into their work; not only show capacity but principle; and who take up problem after problem as it arises with open minds and absolutely as trustees for the people. So long as in the States and in the Nation our people listen to leaders of this character and follow them, our democratic experiment is sure to be successful.

A COMPULSORY CHOICE

IN the June CENTURY, shortly before the Presidential Conventions, we called attention to the lamentable lack of attention usually bestowed upon the selection of nominees for Vice-President, a choice which is apt to go by haphazard or default, or to be made by reason of factional pressure, or for other unworthy considerations. This practice goes far to justify both the charge that the office itself has fallen into contempt and the imputation of our reckless willingness, as a people, to take enormous risks,—or, as Kipling says, to

"match with Destiny for beers."

In view of the flippancy with which this duty of the Conventions is regarded, it has the aspect of playing with priceless jewels at the edge of a precipice.

It may be urged further that the present system is not only likely to provide personalities that may not be acceptable to the advocates of the respective candidates for President, but that,—as has more often been the case,—it may compel the voter to aid in the establishment, in a contingency, of a policy to which he is opposed and one obviously discordant with that of the "head of the ticket."

While we have no disposition to criticize the present candidates for the second place on either of the principal tickets,—both of whom are entitled to the respect of the country, by reason of their individual character,—yet we presume that it will not be denied that the claims of these candidates were never considered by the country previous to the Conventions, and, whatever their merits or fitness may be, either alone or in comparison, the choice of each was in the nature of a surprise, since neither was a man of national reputation.

It is generally assumed that additional strength is given to a campaign by taking the two candidates from different wings of the party. It was Gwendolen Harleth in "Daniel Deronda," who said that she disliked the things she did n't like more than she liked the things she liked; but the politicians proceed on the opposite theory—that the voter will accept a disagreeable candidate for the chance of voting for the one he desires. Whether this